

"Moral Darwinism: How We Became Hedonists." Review.

Post by "Hiram" of April 1, 2019 at 11:53 AM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

Hiram you are much better read in Darwin than am I. Did Darwin ever even cite Epicurus or Lucretius approvingly in his main works for any aspect of his ethics or epistemology (or his physics)? Did Darwin even have an ethics that he promoted as proper, or is all the "Darwinian morality" stuff that people added on as their take on the logical implications.

Darwin was a naturalist, not a philosopher. He did not elaborate ethical repercussions of his finding, as a scientist. He stayed within his realm, and only posthumous interpretations of his SCIENCE by philosophers have been done (sometimes leading to error, as in the case of Nietzsche's mis-understanding of evolution and adaptation via natural selection as if it led to a "superior" or "higher" man or form of life necessarily).

Darwinian "morality" (whatever that means) is an invention of post-Darwin intellectuals.

But note that in nature we see competition, but also cooperation, and that all life exists within ****systems**** that involve mutual benefit and symbiosis (mutual inter-dependence at many scales), so that so-called "social Darwinism" is a HUGE politically-inspired error. If there is anything that deserves to be called "social Darwinism", it's networks of mutual aid and mutual benefit.

Darwin does not cite Epicurus or Lucretius, as far as I know. He did follow the Lucretian method of FIRST observing nature, then reasoning explanations for what he sees, only based on what has been observed.