

A Reflection on Social Darwinism and Its Repercussions

Hamid Rezaia Shirazi¹ Davoud Rahimi Sojasi²

Received: 23 November 2020 / Accepted: 16 January 2021

Abstract

The world today accommodates many communities, consisting of diverse cultures with their distinct and similar characteristics. There are different conceptions of the nature of humans and the world, and the necessity of a comprehensive revision of various intellectual and cultural foundations for purposes of preventing the ever-growing conflicts makes itself felt more and more. Finding the roots and providing theoretical philosophical analyses of such tensions, as well as social repercussions of the philosophical views, will present us with a context in which the problem is illuminated. The social approach to the Darwinian theory of transformism is one such theory that provides philosophical and social contexts for aversion of the other. In this paper, we draw upon the analytic-descriptive method to collect data and documents to examine the philosophical and theological aspects, and then the social aspects, of this approach. We conclude that social Darwinism is not only a threat to cultural interrelations and peaceful coexistence of ethnicities, religions, and races, but also a threat to the world by encouraging racism, radical nationalism, and ethnical and religious supremacy, providing scientific justifications for such manners and habits.

Keywords: Social Darwinism, beliefs, culture, the other, repercussions.

Statement of the Problem

There are innumerable people with diverse interests and tastes in each community, and what turns such a heterogeneous group of people into a community is culture, which is indeed the meaning and identity—temporality and spatiality, or history and geography, so to speak—which play a role in their solidarity. In this way, the culture is an existential requirement for every community in that no community is formed without a culture. The world today has accommodated many communities, consisting of many cultures with their distinctions and similarities. Geographical and even cultural borders are overcome in the

1. Assistant Professor, Al-Mustafa International University, Qom, Iran.

Email: hamidrezania@miu.ac.ir (Corresponding Author)

2. Assistant Professor, Shahed University, Tehran, Iran. Email: d.rahimi@shahed.ac.ir

contemporary world, and human communications are growing on a daily basis. Cultural interrelations are deemed inevitable for peaceful life and avoidance of wars between civilizations, cultures, and even states. Such relations culminate in obviation of misunderstandings as well as unreal personal ideas, preparing the ground for solving international disputes. This is why the problem of different ways in which cultures are known has been considered by various scientific approaches. Nevertheless, it seems that, despite the alleged globalization that is supposed to bring people around the world closer to one another, theological and philosophical kinds of beliefs as well as a variety of norms have failed to achieve this goal, and in consequence, people are still distant from each other. Such cultural differences that are part of varied approaches to values, systems, and spiritual heritages give rise to different conceptions of the nature of humans and the world as well as their positions, which has in turn made it necessary to provide a comprehensive revision of the foundations of diverse cultures and civilizations in order to prevent ever-growing conflicts. Finding the roots and providing theoretical philosophical analyses of such tensions, as well as the social repercussions of the philosophical views will present us with a context in which the situation is understood and described more accurately. In this paper, we discuss social Darwinism as a theory with both philosophical and social aspects, putting forward the thesis that this theory has intentionally or unintentionally provided a bedrock for endangering peace, encouraging racism, and justifying class differences. Now the central question is: What are the theological roots, and social repercussions, of Darwinism?

Although many attempts have been made by prominent figures to identify the theoretical achievements of the theory, the acceptance of Darwin's theory has until the present day been permeated by reservations and doubts—no one in British churches or the scientific community has ever been happy of “all being monkeys” (Dickson 1397 Sh, 106; also see Darwin 1988).

In the West, the theory is thought to be in conflict with the Biblical story of how the human was created, and the translation and publication of the theory in the Islamic world gave rise to discussions of whether or not it is consistent with Quranic statements about the human creation.

The Foundations of the Darwinian Theory of Evolution

1. The Principle of Evolution

Darwin says about the origin of the common root that naturalists used to think that varieties of products are unchangeable and have come to existence separately—a view advocated by many researchers. On the other hand, few have come to believe that the species are subject to changes, and the present structure of life is derivative of earlier structures.

This statement by Darwin is, indeed, a refutation of non-developmental and non-evolutionary creation, both with regard to humans and with regard to other species.

2. The Principle of Natural Selection

Darwin sees natural selection as the main factor involved in biological evolution, suggesting that minor changes will survive if they are helpful in that they are concerned with the human power to select. He sees natural selection as the factor that preserves good and desirable traits and excludes disturbing traits.

In his account of geographical and geological changes, Darwin asserts that natural selection takes place over a very long period of time and during continuous gradual changes. For him, there is no difference between different species in this regard, and humans are subject to the same process. Inhabitants of consecutive periods in the world's history have beaten their predecessors in the race for life, and are, in this respect, higher in the scale of nature (see Darwin, 1859, 345).

Evolution or Constancy of Species

Natural scientists have proposed two theses concerning the creation of living beings, both plants and animals:

A. The thesis of the evolution of species or “transformism” according to which living species were not the way they are now at the beginning of their origination. They started out as unicellular organisms in oceans, which emerged by way of a mutation from the sludge at the bottom of the seas; that is, non-living beings came to be situated in particular conditions from which living cells developed.

Such microorganisms began to evolve into different species, moving from the seas to deserts, and then to the air, creating various species of aquatic and land plants as well as birds.

The most fully evolved in the links of such evolution are present-day humans, which have emerged from monkey-looking animals.

B. The thesis of the constancy of species or “fixism” according to which living species have had origins identical to their present forms, with no species having been transformed into any other. Thus, humans were independently created in the first place with exactly the same form as they have today (Darwin 1971, 1:63; also see Darwin 1985-2015; also see Lennox 2019).

Inadequate Biological Evidence

Having comparatively dissected animal fetuses as well as fossils found in diggings, biologists have proposed that the development of those species occurred gradually—from simple to more complicated forms. Nevertheless, their evidence is inadequate to show that more fully developed organisms were born from the less developed ones.

In scientific terms and in accordance with empirical evidence, every new species is more developed than the previous species, but such evidence does not demonstrate that the former has been developed from the latter. Moreover, even among the philosophers who subscribe to the theory of evolution, there are many who reject the atheistic consequences of the theory, just as Hans Küng, as a Roman Catholic philosopher and theologian, surveys theories in chapter five of his book *The Beginning of All Things—Science and Religion* that talk about the origination of the human; that is, the physical human, rather than the human reality, asking the following questions: Did early humans live six million years ago? Is this theory confirmed by discoveries through DNAs, which purport to show that early humans in Africa and Australia lived five million years ago? (Hans Küng 2007, 85).

He believes that evolution makes us think more carefully about how God exerts His influence on the world, which is why even if the God of evolution is not a dictator and the causal process does not seem to be disunited, then religious faith will necessarily imply that there are still several significant ways in which God influences, and interacts with, the natural world. We think this is the most appropriate framework for interpreting the history of evolutionary science (Hans Küng 2007, 85).

The failure of the theory of evolution in accounting for the development of the first living organism is criticized by other biologists as well as proponents of the intelligent design theory. When Darwin proposed his

theory for the first time, the idea was that a cell has a simple architecture, and in consequence, it will not pose a challenge to naturalists. Darwin himself had conceived of the origination of life in small and warm ponds where ammonia, phosphorus, light, heat, and electricity were concentrated. With advances in molecular biology, however, it turned out that a cell has an extremely complex architecture.

For advocates of the intelligent design theory, the first living cell is an instance of an organized design and complexity, which cannot be accounted for in naturalistic terms. It cannot be explained except by recourse to a supernatural intelligent designer. In other words, environmental conditions of the earth and the resources on lands or in oceans, as well as volcanos do have the potential and primary material for the formation of a cell, but the design of a cell is so complex that matter and nature cannot lead to its formation on their own without an intervention of, or as guided by, an intelligent designer. Michael Denton's ideas about genetics, evolution, and the anthropic argument are widely known. Moreover, he is a senior fellow at the Discovery Institute in the State of Washington and a leading advocate of the intelligent design theory (Denton 2002).

Moreover, according to some Muslim intellectuals, biologists have never encountered a case in which an instance of a fully evolved species was evolved from another species. Biology has just subscribed to gradual evolution in one species, rather than the transformation of species. In fact, what has been established is change in the traits of one species, rather than change in the species itself. For example, it is never observed that a more fully developed animal is evolved from a monkey (Ṭabāṭabā'ī 1363 Sh, 16:383).

In any case, what is implied by Muslim philosophers and intellectuals concerning the human creation is that they neither refute the thesis of evolution, nor do they claim that the Quran is explicit on the independent creation of the first human. To the contrary, they believe that the transformation of a species into another is not confirmed by any evidence, and that the independent human creation is apparently implied by Quranic verses, although they are not so explicit on the matter that they cannot be interpreted otherwise (Ṭabāṭabā'ī 1363 Sh, 3:143-44).

At any rate, we can provide the following summary: today, scientific theories are deemed "falsifiable" (the Popperian view); that is, they are assumed as true unless they are succeeded by a better alternative theory. This is why, although the theory of evolution has not been conclusively

proven, it is widely endorsed by the majority of the scientific (empirical) community, whereas the theory of the constancy of species is still out there as a possibility.

What is more, Quranic verses might be compatible both with the theory of evolution or transformism and with the theory of the constancy of species or fixism. There is no Quranic verse that is explicit on each side, or strongly connoting it, for that matter. Thus, neither of the theories might be conclusively attributed to the Quran. The evaluative basis of the theory is objectionable, and it cannot be appealed to in other scientific fields, although philosophers and other practitioners of humanities have relied on the theory with their conscious or unconscious evolutionary tendencies, encouraging all kinds of extreme views. A case in point is Thomas Huxley who was led to Darwinian or evolutionary racism. As an agnostic Darwinian scientist, he believed that “No rational man, cognizant of the facts, believes that the average negro is the equal, still less the superior, of the white man. And if this is true, it is simply incredible that our prognathous relative ... will be able to compete successfully ... in a contest which is to be carried out by thoughts and not by bites. The highest places in the hierarchy of civilization will assuredly not be within the reach of our dusky cousins” (Huxley 1871, 24). Huxley was an agnostic, and in a work on Hume, he agrees with this Scottish philosopher that judgment should be suspended when it comes to metaphysical issues. He believes that we have our scientific knowledge, and practitioners of science have learned that they should believe in scientific justification; that is, justification by means of verifiability, rather than justification by faith. Accordingly, as for what falls outside of the realm of verifiability, we should remain agnostic, suspending any judgments. Furthermore, he believed that Darwin had founded his theory of evolution on a solid ground, following a harmonious method (Copleston 1393 Sh, 8:167). Now given the refutation of the four principles of Darwin’s thesis and the objections raised against it, it might be said that the thesis is still surrounded by an aura of suspicion and skepticism, and it cannot be a matter of concern when it comes to conflicts between science and religion.

An Analysis of Social Darwinism: The “Other” in the Society

Now the question arises: if there is a truth, and the truth is one and constant, and if humans share the same essence and innate nature, then where do these differences come from? The question has received a variety of

answers throughout the human history. Muslim philosophers who believe that there is an absolute truth, which is attainable by humans, have made remarkable efforts at providing an answer to the question. In his *al-Jam' bayn ra'y al-ḥakīmayn* (Reconciliation of the views of the two philosophers), al-Fārābī believes that it is incredible for two prominent and reflective philosophers—Plato and Aristotle—to disagree on so much, whereas they both saw it possible to obtain the truth and believed that the truth is one and unchangeable. Although al-Fārābī's efforts were in vain, he nevertheless sought to show that there is no essential difference between the two philosophers, as all the disputes boil down to subsidiary and superficial matters. Moreover, Muslim mystics have also proposed the path of love for overcoming the predicament, although mystical apprehensions are personal and unsusceptible of generalization—each mystical practitioner should find the truth with his or her unique experience (Lāhijī, n.d., 86). Finally, one might as well deny the absolute truth and think of truths as relative. The emergence of the new, positivistic view of the facts, as exemplified by the Darwinian theology, leads us to the idea that, at any rate, people are strongly governed by theological-philosophical beliefs, and spatial, historical, and social conditions as well as many constraints, where without epistemic modesty, countless cultural challenges would ensue even at international and political levels.

If the truth is deemed an exclusive asset of some people, and otherness or alterity is underlined, and then those people seek material and spiritual dominance and the exclusion of the other, and if they claim, say, to spread democracy to save people from regress and tyranny and to secure their human rights according to the logic of “those who are not with us are against us,” then on the other side of the coin, there will be people who say that those who are not with us are disbelievers, and thus, excommunicative and fundamentalist groups such as ISIS and Salafists will grow, deploying all means to fight what they see as disbelief. If the truth lies on one side, then there should either be no other, or there should just be a submissive other, in which case the world would be full of misunderstandings and antipathies.

Philosophers of culture have tried to theorize the implications of such a modern life: to reflect upon methods of thinking in diverse cultures to think of theoretical and practical implications for peaceful coexistence with others. They believe that, for such coexistence to last, fundamental changes should be made to the visions of all cultures, and so, no culture should be

seen as absolute, exclusive, and pure (Ernst Cassirer 1380 S.H., 22). On this view, cultures have entered a new epoch in which they cannot survive by absolutism and negation of others, and the understanding of one's own culture might as well depend on an inter-cultural approach. For the truth is spread across all cultures, and the heritage of no culture is absolute. Arts, sciences, philosophies, and all phenomena of a culture can just be understood within its own context, and the future is not an exclusive monopoly of any particular culture.

The contemporary Western culture has dominated the present-day world not only by its technological superiority, but also through its long-term colonial and post-colonial exploitations, and since the sixteenth century, the Western civilization and culture were involved in any great challenge; that is, the West is party to all intercultural debates.¹ However, intellectuals such as Nietzsche, Husserl, Jaspers, Heidegger, Wittgenstein, and post-modern philosophers, particularly hermeneuticians, have talked about the expiration of European and Western dominance in culture and thoughts.

To replace the conflict with the other with knowledge of the other in such issues, particularly in their epistemological foundations, in order to bring about intellectual and cultural changes and to know the thoughts and discern the pure from the impure before any affirmative or negative judgments, we need to reflect on obstacles to such knowledge of the other, interaction, and peace. Such knowledge is definitely based on dialogues and reasoning which are preconditions of any attempt at cultural and philosophical coexistence among all traditions and schools of thought, since to claim the exclusive possession of culture and religion without mutual understanding is to deprive oneself of shared thoughts among cultures.

With the disappearance of dogmatism and absolutism, and preparation of the ground for new horizons of thought, underrepresented and collapsed intellectual and cultural corners as well as cultural and intellectual plurality will come to display. Such a dialogue is not as much an acknowledgement and recognition of the other as it is a self-trust, and it does not put an end to differences. To the contrary, it is intended at the truth and accurate understanding, since as long as the other is not recognized, its existence cannot be confirmed.

As an approach that acknowledges the social repercussions of the denial of the other, relativism is a critical view in that it criticizes the Western

1. By "Western culture" we refer to countries that had numerous colonies.

ethnic evolutionary view, endorses the importance of each culture from the standpoint of its own frameworks and criteria, and challenges the place of the West as the superior culture. However, within the framework of Islamic epistemology, relativism has its own challenges.

According to evolutionary theorists, humans have undergone an evolutionary process from barbarism to civilization, and they all agree that the development of the culture and society is linear. Thus, undeveloped groups of people undergo conditions experienced by more developed groups in the past. Critics of the view believe, however, that no general law might similarly apply to all cultures—each culture should be understood in light of its own past. The human behavior is governed by cultural factors, and racial, biological, and environmental accounts of evolutionary theorists do not work. Accordingly, it is necessary to adopt intercultural perspectives and to know and explain cultural diversity.

Traces of Evolutionism

Aristotle sees the intellectual faculty as a specifically human characteristic, believing that any development of the concept of rationality is a development in one's conception of oneself and the world. Moreover, for a long-time argument used to be divided into rational and irrational, and after enlightenment, empirical science replaced part of rationality, resisting the tradition for a long time. It characterized certain cultures as barbarian and others as mystic and irrational (Trigg 1382 Sh, 114).

Such "rationality" characterized others as primitive societies, treated its own culture as rational and those of others as irrational, and then tried to teach the other how to be rational. Nietzsche offered his perspectivalism to challenge the modern rationality. Although Wittgenstein's relativism was overshadowed by the positivistic atmosphere governing academic circles, he believed that life is meaningless.

On the above account, although the modern civilization and different religions have tried to establish peaceful coexistence, we still see the flourishing of approaches that negate the other and claim supremacy. In the following, we critically consider a major classical origin of such an approach; that is, social Darwinism.

Extension of Darwinism to the Social Realm

Half a century later, such an ascending and linear account was rejected by Darwin. Inspired by Malthus, a British economist and demographer, Darwin

introduced two notions: the struggle for survival and natural selection, according to which there is a serious rivalry between organisms throughout historical periods and geographical areas over survival, and only organisms survive that can best fit with the environment. Just like Lamarck, Darwin had in mind here the principle of mutation; that is, the transformation of the acquired features into hereditary traits (Trigg 1382 Sh, 124).

Later, the idea was generalized to other fields, as a result of which social Darwinism was developed famously by Spencer. The approach was elaborated in the late Victorian period in the UK, the US, and other places. It is mainly grounded in the survival of the fittest, the strong, and the competent, on the one hand, and the elimination of the impoverished, the poor, and those who play no particular tasks or functions. The survival of the fittest, and hence the classification of the society, lead to radical nationalism and legitimize false identities, as manifested in recent antipathies against minorities and immigrants in the US, in the violent approaches of ISIS, as well as in Hitler, Stalin, pan-Arabism, and pan-Turkism. Excommunication and negation of the other would flourish as a consequence of social Darwinism, and one might even attribute World War II to this philosophical and social approach.

It is justified to attribute this view to Spencer, since Darwin's writings do not involve references to social phenomena. However, Spencer and Darwin are as similar as Ibn Khaldūn and Montesquieu. In fact, social Darwinism was a subsidiary issue in Spencer's work, which was tackled by Darwin. That is, what is known as social Darwinism was proposed by Spencer prior to *On the Origin of Species*, although Spencer was an advocate of Darwin and a nineteenth-century philosopher who applied the implications of biology to the field of sociology. Spencer saw evolution as a science that should not be resisted. His idea is similar to that of "invisible hand" in classical economics, which supported free markets and rejected governmental interventions. Similarly, Spencer believed in social evolutionary facts, where compliance with essential evolutionary rules would be followed by social progress. He envisaged the course of social life from simple to complex, from homogeneity to heterogeneity, seeing it as a teleological and purposeful process directed at progress and improvement. He thus believed that we should not prevent natural elimination of the impoverished. In his view, the reproduction of the impoverished is to leave the worst for the future generations. Moreover, he opposed the foundation of charity institutes, organized interventions as

well as individual aids for the poor so that all obstacles to natural evolution and reform are removed (Delaney 1391 Sh, 178).

What is noteworthy in Spencer's views is that although he acknowledges the struggle for the survival and natural selection, his evolutionary mechanism did not consist struggle and natural selection; instead, he introduced hereditary traits. That is, humans acquire new traits throughout their life, and these traits are inherited by later generations. Just like evolutionists, he believed that every living organism contains a limited amount of vital liquid that can enhance reproductive power and brain abilities. He argues that elites tend to have fewer children, because they have developed more complex brains, and as a result, the vital power is not directed at reproduction. The theme of social Darwinism—its moral for the human survival—is the victory and selection of the competent and the elimination of the defeated (Fukūhī 1381 Sh, 128-29). The serious question here is: Why should complex heterogeneous conditions be treated as better than simple homogeneous conditions?

Spencer's theories can be seen as origins of social Darwinism; that is, the approach that seeks to analyze social relations and natural laws governing natural organisms. It explains away social inequalities as natural, inevitable, and even necessary (Fukūhī 1381 Sh, p. 130).

In contrast to those who attribute social Darwinism to Spencer, there are those who see it in continuity with the theory of evolution, arguing that there is a relation between Darwin's theory and certain kinds of social Darwinism. In his *The Descent of Man*, Darwin says that those with weak bodies will be eliminated, while we attempt to halt the process by building hospitals and shelters, and by developing the medicine. In this way, weak members of the society will reproduce more weak humans, whereas rarely do we breed sick or flawed animals. In his *Common Ancestry and Natural Selection*, however, Darwin claims that all living organisms have a common ancestor, and will evolve in the course of a purposeless process. For him, evolution is not purposeful, and humans are, just like other animals, products of natural selection. On this construal, social Darwinism seems to be a product of evolutionists who were influenced by Lamarck (the idea of progress), rather than Darwin (purposeless natural selection) (Gould 1981, 393).

Sumner, an American sociologist and an advocate of Lamarckian (though not adhered by Lamarck himself) social Darwinism, promoted Spencer's idea and believed that the struggle for survival is inevitable,

whereas he viewed Darwin's law as immoral (Delaney 1391 Sh, 52).

Huxley, a British biologist who strongly advocated Darwin's theory of evolution, believed that the human culture is not affected by the negative repercussions of the struggle for the fittest, since one can always oppose the nature and make more valuable products, such as reclaiming a naturally dry land for harvesting better agricultural products (Huxley 1889, 5:105).

The Downsides of Social Darwinism

The downside of social Darwinism is its implication of sexist and racial discriminations: it sees men as stronger and more thoughtful than women or whites superior to blacks. It has provided a defense of Nazis and neo-Nazis as well as the market economy policy in virtue of which weaker countries are exploited by stronger countries. On this theory, human communities are just like biological organisms, struggling for survival, and at present, Western communities are superior to others, and are thus credited with the highest degree of social progress. Such a Eurocentrism, which is essentially involved in social Darwinism, was unveiled by anthropology and Eastern studies in the guise of relativism. The development of Darwin's theory from biology to social Darwinism, and then to political and international Darwinism provokes the idea that the world is like a jungle permeated by Spencer's principle of the survival of the fittest; that is, the extension of the law of the jungle to the civilized world as a justification for colonialism.

In other words, for Darwin, the attempt for survival is the main factor for the selection of creatures with privileged traits for continued reproduction. From among the instances of an animal or plant species, one or more might be born with a special trait that might help them in the struggle for survival. They survive longer than their fellows do, and transmit their traits to their offspring through heredity. In this way, the privileged traits are strengthened through generations.

Sumner also holds that if the survival of the fittest is not accepted, then the unfit would inevitably survive. In agreement with Spencer, he opposed governmental interventions to help the defeated and the impoverished. Lester Ward also endorsed the principle of evolution, maintaining that the primitive society was characterized by simplicity and moral poverty, while the new society is more complicated, more prosperous, and full of freedom. Moreover, he believed that humans have evolved from inferior forms to their present state (Outhwaite 1392 Sh).

Since social Darwinism provided a pretext for the suppression of the impoverished and the survival of the wealthy and the powerful, and many great wars, such as World War II, were to a large extent caused by the followers of this philosophical system, it came to be disrepute and rejected. Michael Ruse, a contemporary evolutionist and moral philosopher, revisited social Darwinism, which has resulted in a new evolutionary ethics (Asgarpur Ali and Sheykhrezaee 1397 Sh).

Social Darwinism as a Theoretical Ground for Racism

If development and establishment of theories fit cultural circumstances as responses to local and national demands, then advocates of social Darwinism in the twentieth century were mostly racists who promoted the theory.

Racism is the belief that certain human races are superior to others. Examples of racism include the degradation of blacks by merchants in the ancient world, antisemitism in the Medieval era, and racial hatred of Muslims by Europeans (Fukūhī 1381 Sh, 116).

Racism rests on two basic arguments: first, there are biological distinctions beyond ethnicities and nationalities, which are enjoyed by few people in the world, and second, there is a hierarchical classification of races in accordance with aptitudes and biological traits (whereas biologists and anthropologists believe that racism is scientifically unfounded), since racial arguments are mainly grounded in appearances such as complexion, skin, hair, and anatomy, ignoring invisible traits. New studies show that humans are products of distinct intercourses among different ethnicities, and there is in practice no pure race—race is a plain myth. Moreover, racial and ethnical classification is impossible, since such classification rested upon initial political, social, and cultural superiority, which can by no means be evidence of biological superiority. Because of xenophobia and self-interests, racism has turned into an organized system, which both alleviated the colonialists' feelings of guilt and help them advance their colonial enterprises under the guise of progress and civilization-making (Fukūhī 1381 Sh, 181). Gobineau, a French author and politician, believed that civilizations collapse not because of natural factors, weariness, and malfunctioning, but because of racial differences, and of the three races—white, yellow, and black—he believed that the white was the superior. He maintained that racial integration (intercourse between superior and inferior races) caused the collapse of civilizations. A case in point, he

believed, were Indian casts (Fukūhī 1381 Sh, 119). The belief in racial purity or evaluative biological hierarchies among races might be extended to social strata, which then leads to anti-democratic tendencies.

Conclusion

The idea of natural inequality among people is perhaps as old as the human history. Moreover, there have always been antipathies toward others and feelings of national superiority, but such inequality and conflicts in human societies began to be called into question. People began to talk about equality, and people had greater feelings of equality toward others to the extent that more heterogeneous elements entered their cultures. All the while, there have always been endemic elements of early thoughts among cultures, which negated any equality. Philosophical and social grounds for such a negation of the other were prepared after the Renaissance period when new epistemic methods, and hence, new theories and a novel view of the world and the humans—including the social approach to Darwinian transformism—were developed.

In this article, we began by delineating philosophical aspects of the problem and a brief theological critique, and then we sought to carve into the social dimensions of social Darwinism. Not only is it a threat to intercultural relations and peaceful coexistence of diverse ethnicities, religions, and races, but also a threat to the whole world by encouraging racism, extreme nationalism, and ethnical and religious superiority, as well as by providing a scientific justification of such manners and habits. This article aims to reveal the destructive disadvantages of this approach in order to prevent its vicious repercussions.

Thus:

- (1) It seems necessary to consider philosophical backgrounds and roots of, and socially track, the theories in order to clarify social realities.
- (2) Consideration of ontological, epistemological, and anthropological dimensions of theories will reveal their social dimensions to us.
- (3) Failure to consider the philosophical backgrounds of theories and the philosophy of social realities would lead to the distortion of the reality and emergence of pseudo-problems.
- (4) It seems that social Darwinism, as inspired by biology, committed a positivistic confusion of application of natural sciences to the humanities—Auguste Comte’s well-known conflation.

- (5) The devastating social repercussions of social Darwinism were probably unintentional. It would never occur to scientists that such social realities could arise. They were merely engaged in their own scientific curiosities.
- (6) Social Darwinism as an ideology has provided a false consciousness combined with the distortion of the reality, the defeat of which requires fundamental and subsidiary critiques.

References

- Holy Qur'an: Translated by Ali Quli Qara'i. 2004. London: Islamic College for Advanced Studies.
- Akhavan, Mahdi. 1386 Sh. "Gozarish, tahlil wa-naqd kitab jam' bayn al-ra'yayn Farabi" (Review, analysis, and critique of Farabi's reconciliation of the views of the two sages). *Naqd va nazar*, no 45-46 (Spring and Summer): 116-40.
- Asgarpur Ali, Maryam and Hossein Sheykhrezaee. 1397 Sh. "Dawinism ijtimai' az nigah Michael Ruse: arzyabi naqqadani" (Social Darwinism in the view of Michael Ruse: a critical assessment). *Justarhayi falsafi-pazhuhish-hayi falsafi* 14, no. 33 (Spring and Summer): 117-42.
- Behe, Michael J. 1996. "Darwin under Microscope." *New York Times* (October 29): 25.
- Cassirer, Ernst. 1380 Sh. *Risali dar bab insan, daramadi bar falsafi farhang* (An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture). Translated by Nadir Buzurgzadih. Tehran: Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies.
- Copleston, Frederick. 1975. *A History of Philosophy*. New York, USA: Image Books (Doubleday).
- Darwin, Charles. 1380 Sh. *On the Origins of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. Vol. 1. Translated by Nur al-Din Farhikhtih. Tehran: Nashirin.
- Darwin, Charles. 1898. *On the origin of species*. New York: Appleton and Company.
- Darwin, Charles. 1985-2015. *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin*. Edited by F. Burkhardt. Volumes 1–21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Darwin, Charles. 1988. *The Works of Charles Darwin*. Edited by Barrett, P. H., and Freeman R. B. Vols. 1–29. New York: New York University Press.
- Delaney, Tim. 1391 Sh. *Nazariyi-hayi kilasik jami'ishinasi* (Classical Sociological Theories). Translated by Bihrang Siddiqi and Vahid Tulu'i. Tehran: Ney.
- Denton, Michael. 2002. *Origin and Evolution of Life on a Frozen Earth*. Third edition. Maryland: Adler & Adler.
- Dickson, Thomas. 1397 Sh. *Daramadi Kutah bar 'Ilm va Din* (A Short Introduction to Science and Religion). Translated by Shahram Dihdashti, Isfahan: Daftar-i Tablighat.
- Fukūhī, Nāṣir. 1381 Sh. *Tarikh andishi wa-nazariyyihayi insanshinasi* (History of thought and theories of anthropology). Tehran: Ney.
- Futuyma, Douglas J. 1997. *Evolutionary Biology*. Cary, USA: Sinauer Associates.
- Gould, Stephen J. 1981. *The Panda's Thumb: More Reflections in Natural History*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Husayni, Sayyid Husayn. 1394 SH (2015). “Khudabavari va Takamul-i Darwini” (Theism and Darwinian Evolution), *Pazhuhishnami-yi Falsafi-yi Din (Nami-yi Hikmat)* (13), no. 1 (Spring and Summer): 5-16.
- Husayni, Sayyid Husayn. 1394 Sh. “Az sazgardirayi ta ziddi-Sazgardirayi-yi khudabavari wa-takamul Darwini: barrasi wa-naqd chahar didgah” (From compatibilism to anti-compatibilism of theism and Darwinian evolution: a consideration and critique of four views). *Pazhuhishnami falsafi din (Nami hikmat)* 55, no. 1 (Spring): 71-88.
- Huxley, Thomas Henry. 1889/1909. “Agnosticism: a rejoinder.” In *Science and Christian tradition; essays*. London: Macmillan.
- Küng, Hans. 2007. *The beginning of all things: Science and religion*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Lahiji, Shams al-Din Muhammad. 1371 Sh. *Mafatih al-I'jaz* (The keys of the miracle). Edited by Muhammad Rida Buzurqi Khaliqi and 'Iffat Karbasi. Tehran: Ruzbih.
- Lennox, James. 2019. “Darwinism.” In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward Zalta. Accessed in December 2021. URL:< <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/darwinism/> >.
- Mas'udiyān, Muhsin. 1382 Sh. “Tanazu' baqa'” (The struggle for survival). *Nami 'ilm wa-din*, no. 21 (Fall).

- Outhwaite, William. 1392 Sh. *Blackwell Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Social Thought*. Translated by Hasan Chawushiyan. Tehran: Ney.
- Rezania Shirazi, Hamid. 1394 Sh. “Wakawi munasibat ‘ilm wa-din dar nighah Hans Küng” (An Inquiry into Science-Religion Relations in Hans Küng’s View). *Faslnami pazhuhish-hayi i ‘tiqadi-kalami* 5, no. 17 (Spring): 29-49.
- Rezania Shirazi, Hamid. 1399 Sh. “Bazkhani fardiyi thubut (fixism) ba fardiyi takamul anwa’ (transformism)” (A revision of fixism by the thesis of the evolution of species). *Faslnami mutala’at Qur’ani*, (Fall): 137-62.
- Rezania Shirazi, Hamid. 2012. *Religion and Science; a philosophical study*. India: Manohar. Concept Publisher.
- Sulaymani, Marziyi. 1387 Sh. “Naqd nazariyi takamuli Darwin” (A Critique of Darwin’s Evolutionary Theory), *Etemad Daily*, no. 1765.
- Tabataba’i, Sayyid Muhammad Husayn. 1363 Sh. *Al-Mizan fi Tafsir al-Qur’an*. Tehran: Markaz Nashr Farhangi Raja.
- Trigg, Roger. 1382 Sh. *Didgah-hayi darbari sirisht adami: ruykardi tarikhi* (Ideas of Human Nature). Translated by a number of translators. Tehran: Institute for Humanities and Cultural