

Updated Review of Darwin'S Evolution Theory Showed That It Is Still an Unproven Philosophy, Which Was Abused by Racism and Imperialism

Abdel Khalek H. El-Sebae¹

A. Darwin's Evolution theory is still a philosophy

Ernst Mayr (1985) published a review under the title: "What is Darwinism Today: " He stated that Darwin when published his theory of " Evolution" in 1859, had no knowledge of the origin and the nature of genetic structure and variation which was only revealed after the originator of Genetics the scientist Mendel (1902).

Mayr (1985), then added that we now benefit from the recent 85 years of genetic research and knowledge. However, there is no doubt that the future challenge is still the understanding of the molecular structure of the genotype and its functioning during development.

Mayr (1985), concluded that the exploration of the structure of the genotype will be the great frontier of evolutionary biology in the future decades. However, he concluded that after more than 150 years, Darwin's evolution theory is still a mere philosophical theory.

Orgel (1997) Published his review on " Origin of life on earth". He stated that in the mid of 19th century, two important scientific advances set the stage for modern discussions of the origin of life. In one advance, Louis Pasteur discussed the concept of spontaneous generation. He offered proof that even bacteria and other microorganisms arise from parents resembling themselves. He, thereby, highlighted an intriguing question; How did the first generation of each bacterial species come into existence.? The second scientific advance, was in the theory of : "natural selection". Orgel (1997) then concluded that Darwin, bending somewhat to his religious biases of his time pointed in his final paragraph " in his book "The Origin of Species" admitted that the "Creator " originally breathed life into a few forms or into one, then evolution took over. Orgel concluded that "from so simple a beginning, endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been and are being evolved"

Orgel (1997) concluded that there is a growing evidence that supports the idea that the emergence of catalytic ribonucleic acid (RNA) was a crucial early step. How that first RNA came into existence remains unknown. Then he added that whether the first RNA arose spontaneously or replaced some earlier genetic system, its development was probably the watershed

event in the development of life. It has very likely led to the synthesis of proteins, the formation of DNA and the emergence of a cell that became life's last common ancestor. The precise events giving rise to the early RNA world remain unclear. As we have seen, investigators have proposed many hypotheses, but evidence in favour of each of them is fragmentary at best. The full details of how the RNA world, and life, emerged may not be revealed in the near future. Nevertheless, as chemists, biochemists and molecular biologists cooperate on ever more ingenious experiments, they are sure to fill in many missing gaps of the puzzle.

Lemmon (1985), in his book review " The Mystery of Life's Origin and the Supernatural", concluded that the following three scientists; *Charles B. Haxyon*, a chemist and Director of research at the foundation for thought and Ethics in Dallas; *Walters L. Braetey*, a materials scientist and Prof. of mechanical engineering at Texas A & M., and *Roger L. Olsen*, a geochemist in Englewood, Colorado., these three scientists contend that traditional science cannot explain the "Orgin of life" without also considering and accepting metaphysical powers.

Tom Woodward (1994) reported under the title "Ruse admits evolution is a philosophy" that; M. Ruse, a Prof. Of Zoology and Philosophy of Science at the Univ. of Guelph in Ontario Canada, at the Dallas symposium (1992); shocked his colleagues by endorsing one of his key points, that Darwinism doctrines are ultimately based as much on "philosophical assumptions" as on scientific evidence. Prof. M. Ruse, indeed had streamed his listeners at the 1993 annual AAAS meeting in Boston by announcing that he had recently come to view the evolution theory by Darwin as ultimately based on several unproven philosophical assumptions.

Korthaf (1999) in his review under the title "Darwinism: Science or Philosophy?" stated that the analysis of this subject by Peter van Inwagen is insightful and concluded that " I myself think that the statement " God is the creator of the cosmos" is true and I think it is a far more important truth than anything

¹ Emeritus Prof. of Environmental Toxicology, Faculty of Agriculture, Alex. Univ., Chatby, Alexandria, Egypt.

Received October 09, 2011, Accepted November 03, 2011.

discovered by Newton, Darwin, or Einstein. But I do not mistake it for a scientific theory".

Korthof (1999), then concluded that "Darwinism and NeoDarwinism as generally held in our society, carry with them an a priori commitment to metaphysical naturalism, which is essential to make a convincing case on their behalf".

B. The Abuse of Social Darwinism to support the Worldwide Imperialism and Racism

According to Hans-Junter Zamarfik (1974) social Darwinism was abused to support and justify the more brutal aspects of late nineteenth century society. It was claimed to justify rising capitalism by the Anglo-Saxon imperialists produced by the industrial revolution, natural selection meant the survival of the fittest competitor.

Imperialism and dogmatic racism were translated into biological language under social Darwinism. (Eberhard Jacked, 1972).

Kaye (1982) published a paper under the title "The Myth of social Darwinism". He reported that the Darwinian concept as "natural selection" and the survival of the fittest was abused to justify the ruthless capitalism, racism, imperialism, and militarism abroad and even Pro-Nazi allegedly behind both world wars (1914 – 1918) and (1939 – 1945) and the intellectual and political opposition to liberalism. These implications that social Darwinism is now used to discredit current socio biological theories.

Mosse (1974) and Weindling (1989) described the German crisis of political ideology affected by social Darwinism.

Weikart (2002) concluded that there is no doubt that Hitler was a social Darwinist, viewing history as a struggle for existence among equal races. Therefore social Darwinism was condemned to contribute to

militarism and imperialism, especially the flaming German militarism.

El-Sebae, (2006) Published a review under the title: "Let us reconsider the Evolution Theory of Darwin".

REFERENCES

- El-Sebae, A.H. (2006). Let US Reconsider The Evolution Theory of Darwin. Alexandria Science Exchange Journal, (91-107) Vol. 31, No.1, January-March 2006).
- Hans- Gunter Zamarzlik ,(1974). "Social Darwinism in Germany. An Example of the sociopolitical Abuse of Scientific knowledge. Gunther Altner (ed.). The Human creature (Garden City, 1974) 355-368.
- Eberhard Jackel, (1972). "for the influence of social Darwinism on Hitler's thought Herbert Arnold (Middleton, Conn, 1972).
- Kaye, H.L.; (1982). The Myth of Social Darwinism, Contemporary Sociology. Vol. 11, May; 274-300 (1982).
- Korthof, Geri: Darwinism: Science or Philosophy? Review (30 June 1999)
- Lemmon. R.M. (1985). Life's Origin and the supernatural. Chemical and Engineering News, July 1. P26-27; 1985.
- Mayr, Ernst; (1985). What is Darwinism Today? Philosophy of Science Association, Vol. 2: 145-156 (1985).
- Mosse, G.L. (1964). The crisis of German Ideology: intellectual origin of the third Reich. (New York, 1964. 88, 91-92, 98-101: Karl Dietrich Bracken, the German Dictatorship.
- Orgel, Leslie, E. (1997). Origin of life on Earth; Edwards Diaz Diaz April 24, 1997.
- Weikart, R., (2002). Darwinism and Death: Devaluating Human Life in Germany 1859 – 1920. J. of the History of Ideas Inc. P. 323 – 341 (2002).
- Weindling; (1989) Health, Race, and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism 1870-1945, Cambridge, 1989, Ch.1.
- Woodward, Tom (1994) The Real Issue: Ruse Gives Away the Store, Admits Evolution Is a philosophy. Darwinism: science or philosophy? (Richardson. TX foundation for Thought and Ethics, 1994).

الملخص العربي

المراجعات الاخيرة لنظرية "دارون" للنشوء والتطور أثبتت إنها مازالت مجرد نظرية فلسفية لم تؤيدها مستحدثات البيولوجيا الجزيئية ولكن اسئ استخدامها اجتماعيا في تعضيد العنصرية والاستعمار

عبد الخالق حامد السباعي

ومن ناحية اخرى فان فكرة " التطور الاجتماعى Social " evolution، والتي نشأت فكرتها منذ سنوات، حيث بدأ تطبيقها منذ اواخر القرن التاسع عشر لتساند فكرة "البقاء للأصلح" في مجال التنافس الاجتماعى البشرى وان البقاء للأصلح اى الاقوى قد ادت الى تعضيد افكار الرعة النازية والفاشية والعنصرية والاستعمارية لدول اوروبا حتى انها مسئولة عن الحربين العظمتين الاولى والثانية (١٩١٤-١٩١٨)، (١٩٣٩-١٩٤٥) وما صاحبهما من سقوط ملايين البشر كضحايا لهذه الحروب فضلا عن محاولة تعضيد الاستعمار والديكتاتورية والوقوف في وجه حرية الانسان في مجال التقدم البشرى الحر.

بعد مرور اكثر من مائة وحسين عاما على نشر "دارون" لنظريته للنشوء والتطور (١٨٥٢)، اظهرت المراجعات الحديثة انها مازالت مجرد نظرية فلسفية لم يسعف التقدم الحالى في علوم البيولوجيا والوراثية الجزيئية ان يؤيدها مما اضطر بعض العلماء الذين كانوا يتبنون الدفاع عن صلاحيتها ان يعلقوا اخيرا في مؤتمرات علمية عالمية اعوام ١٩٩٢، ١٩٩٥ وما بعدها اهم بعد عشرات السنوات من الحماس للنظرية، استقر بهم الرأى الى ان نظرية التطور هذه مازالت ليست الا نظرية فلسفية لايسعف الواقع من علوم البيولوجيا الجزيئية سرياتها.