

Clash of Theories in the Realm of Behavioral Sciences: Globalization vs. Pop Sociobiology

Saeed Shoja Shafti; M.D

*Full Professor of Psychiatry, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences (USWR),
Razi Psychiatric Hospital, Tehran – Iran*

Summary:

As like as the well-known dichotomy of ‘nature vs. nurture’, factually, always a continuous dialectic has been manifest in relation to different rules and guidelines for management of social, political and economic concerns of societies through history; possibly, because every epoch demands its specific strategy, which is dependent on different causes like mass of people, quantity of demands, quality of necessities, educational position, social expectations, public toleration, availability of resources, system of distribution, domestic happenings, class struggles, volume of investments, etc. The impact of sociopolitical or socio-economic conditions on social courses in an indisputable fact, which deserve enough attention by decision makers if they are in search of finding better systems for advancement of their societies. In the present paper, globalization, as the most important contemporary socioeconomic philosophy, has been contrasted with sociobiology, or according to some critics pop sociobiology, as the greatest organic scheme about social behavior of human being, which has been supposed in the last century, to see that, really and based on the former hypothetical or practical endeavors or aspirations, with a variety of outcomes, can the innermost self-centered drives of human being, including national egocentricity and independence, compromise with the said new plans, including globalism and worldwide economical collaboration, for making a better life and surroundings. On the other hand, while globalization and sociobiology have faith in contradictory outlines for social development and interaction, with definite proximate and ultimate mechanisms, is their coexistence possible, at any rate.

Keywords: Sociobiology; pop sociobiology; Neo-Darwinism; Evolution; Globalization; Internationalism; Nature; Nurture.

Introduction

As like as the well-known dichotomy of ‘nature vs. nurture’, factually, always a continuous dialectic has been manifest in relation to different rules and guidelines for management of social, political and economic concerns of societies through history; possibly, because every epoch demands its specific strategy, which is dependent on different causes like mass of people, quantity of demands, quality of necessities, educational position, social expectations, public tolerations, availability of resources, system of distribution, domestic happenings, class struggles, volume of investments, etc. The impact of sociopolitical or socio-economic conditions on social courses in an indisputable fact, which deserve enough attention by decision makers if

they are in search of finding better systems for advancement of their societies. In the present paper, globalization, as the most imperative contemporary socioeconomic philosophy, has been contrasted with sociobiology or Neo-Darwinism, as the greatest organic scheme about social behavior of people, which has been supposed in the last century, to see that, really and based on the former hypothetical or practical endeavors or aspirations, can the innermost drives of human being, including national egocentricity and independence, compromise with the said new schedules, including globalism and worldwide economical collaboration, for making a better world. So, after a brief description of the said hypotheses, their potential coexistence will be discoursed based on the doctrines of every attitude and past consequences of comparable philosophies in the last epochs.

Background:

A) Sociobiology:

The term sociobiology was coined in 1975 by Edward Osborne Wilson, an American biologist whose book, which is called *Sociobiology* (1), emphasized the role of evolution in shaping behavior (2), and defined sociobiology as "the extension of population biology and evolutionary theory to social organization" (3). Sociobiology is the study of human behavior based on the transmission and modification of genetically influenced behavioral traits. It explores the ultimate question of why specific behaviors or other phenotypes came to be (4). Evolution is described as any change in the genetic makeup of a population. It is the foundational paradigm from which all of biology arises. It unites ethology, population biology, ecology, anthropology, game theory, and genetics. Charles Darwin posited that natural selection operates via differential reproduction, in a competitive environment, whereby certain individuals are more successful than others (5, 6). In Darwin's terminology, fitness meant reproductive success. Studies in sociobiology have stimulated one of the oldest debates in psychology. Does human behavior owe more to nature or to nurture? (7) So, the discipline seeks to explain behavior as a product of natural selection (8). Sociobiologists contend that in order to fully understand behavior, it must be analyzed in terms of evolutionary considerations (9). The term "inclusive fitness" incorporates actions that increase the reproduction of an individual's relatives, as well as the individual. Kin selection offers a profound evolutionary explanation for basic human behaviors, such as parents making sacrifices that benefit their children. This discovery led to thinking in terms of "selfish genes." If genes are selfish, this seems to imply that organisms must be selfish. However, capacities for generosity and moral behavior exist because they increase inclusive fitness. Human empathy, emotions, cognition, and capacity for language and love, as well, are the products of natural selection; or, more exactly, the brain, and its mechanisms for regulating thinking, emotions, and behavior (2). Sociobiologists are often interested in instinctive, or intuitive behavior, and in explaining the similarities, rather than the differences, between cultures. Studies of human behavior genetics have generally found behavioral traits such as creativity, extroversion, aggressiveness, and IQ have high heritability (10). The "descendants" of sociobiology include human behavioral ecology and more recently, dual inheritance theory (11) and evolutionary psychology (12). Projects as a group are now sometimes referred to as the "evolutionary social sciences" (13). All three projects keep some of the features of Wilson's original project; however, in particular it's methodologically adaptationist approach. Human

behavioral ecology (HBE), or human evolutionary ecology, is the current evolutionary social science most closely related to the original sociobiological project; it is the project that is sometimes still referred to as “sociobiology” by some philosophers of science (14, 15). Other common names for HBE are “evolutionary anthropology” or “Darwinian ecological anthropology” (using anthropological fieldwork as the main means of assessment about human behavior) (16). Of these three, it is human behavioral ecology that is most often called “sociobiology” due to its focus on the evolution of behavior (17). Evolutionary psychology focuses on the evolution of psychological mechanisms or modules such as those for cheater detection and attempts to explain useful mental and psychological traits—such as memory, perception, or language—as adaptations (18); dual inheritance theory studies the cultural evolution of traits that are socially learned) (19). Moreover, while “narrow sociobiology” is roughly equal to “behavioral ecology” (a science that uses evolutionary theory and especially adaptationist methods to try to understand animal behavior), Pop Sociobiology is so-called because it is a view about how to study human behavior described in a variety of literature written by Wilson and others for a general, rather than an academic audience (20). In this literature, Wilson and the other “Pop sociobiologists” present some speculative and preliminary sketches of how an evolutionary science of human behavior might proceed: Wilson’s main focus in *On Human Nature* (21) and to a lesser extent the last chapter of *Sociobiology* (22) is to show that such a science is possible, to describe some of the techniques that might be used in pursuing it, and to sketch some possible evolutionary analyses for certain particular human behaviors.

Because of its presentation in the popular press, “Pop Sociobiology” was probably important in shaping popular perceptions of the nature of sociobiology (23). So, in this regard, genetic determinism, ignoring learning and culture, and strong adaptationism have been claimed by major opponents of sociobiology as tough prejudices of Wilson’s theory (24). For example, according to some critics, like “Sociobiology Study Group (SSG)”, Wilson believes that there are particular genes “for” behavioral traits, including indoctrinability, territoriality, warfare and reciprocal altruism, and that these genes are subject to natural selection in a relatively straightforward way. Also, Wilson claims that trying to change human behavior from its heritable form usually fails or causes misery (24). It was this concern that ignited the “sociobiology wars” in the early days after the publication of *Sociobiology*. The SSG was concerned that Wilson was trying to argue that many problematic or harmful features of current societies, such as oppressive gender roles, negative race relations and interpersonal aggression might be unchangeable (24 - 27). Accordingly, sociobiologists tend to debunk what nationalists say about their own nation or nationalism. For example, they interpret allegedly altruistic nationalist behavior, such as sacrificing oneself for one’s nation, as driven, at some deeper level by the imperatives of reproductive success. Or, they diagnose the language of ‘kin’ and ‘kinship’ regularly invoked by nationalists as direct evidence for their theses (28). Their political vision is bleakly ‘realistic’. Most socio-biologists generally adhere to what Steinberg (1981) has dubbed ‘the iron law of ethnicity’, viz. the belief that where there is group difference, especially difference based on kin, there will be ethnic conflict (29). Ethno-centrism, prejudice, and national and ethnic conflict are seen as natural outcomes of conflicts of group interest, deriving from kinship identity and belonging, part of the competitive world of nature (28). In socio-biology nationalism is a form of ethnic identification, a group-interest motivated belief, similar to xenophobia. Nations are extended families, really so, or imagined as such (in an important qualification); and people are said to be naturally disposed towards ethnic nepotism, selection in

favor of their own kin. Instrumentalist theories of nationalism presently come in three packages, each of which is generally lacking in respect for the others. They are the socio-biological, the sociological and the individualist (30). Sociobiology, despite its complicated history, remains of interest to philosophers and has some import for certain important philosophical debates (31). While sociobiology has strongly resisted the idea that humans have a ‘nature’ in anything like the traditional sense of a fixed essence (32, 33), there is also some debate about whether humans could be said to have a nature in the sense of a set of evolved traits in much the way that Wilson suggests (34 - 36). Philosophers in this area are instead focusing on notions of human nature that take into account the flexibility of human development and the capacity of human beings to construct their own development and hence their own ‘nature’ (37, 38).

Globalization:

The term globalization derives from the word globalize, which refers to the emergence of an international network of economic systems (39). Some scholars have defined globalization as all those processes by which the people of the world are incorporated into a single world society, or as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa, or as the compression of the world and the intensification of the consciousness of the world as a whole (40, 41). Practically, globalization is the process of interaction and integration among people, companies, and governments worldwide. As a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, globalization is considered as a form of capitalist expansion which entails the integration of local and national economies into a global, unregulated market economy (42). For years globalization was equated with progress and economic growth and generally supported. However, in the last few years an increasing number of voices have started to criticize this phenomenon and point at several flaws and dangers associated with it. For example economic globalization echoes the views of neoliberal and neoclassicist thinkers in which states lose prominence and the world becomes a single global market of individual consumers. These consumers are characterized by their material and economic self-interest – rather than cultural, civic or other forms of identity (43). In 2000, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) identified four basic aspects of globalization: trade and transactions, capital and investment movements, migration and movement of people, and the dissemination of knowledge (44). Further, environmental challenges such as global warming, cross-boundary water, air pollution, and over-fishing of the ocean are linked with globalization (44). Academic literature commonly subdivides globalization into three major areas: economic globalization, cultural globalization, and political globalization (45) (Table 1). Current globalization trends can be largely accounted for by developed economies integrating with less developed economies by means of foreign direct investment, the reduction of trade barriers as well as other economic reforms, and, in many cases, immigration (46).

Discussion:

Evolutionary biology provides a framework that can transform the bio-psycho-social model from a catch phrase into a solid working model. It provides, for psychiatry, what physiology provides for the rest of medicine - An understanding of normal functioning as the foundation for understanding pathology (2). It was soon recognized, however, that it was not behaviors themselves that natural selection shaped, but behavior regulation mechanisms. That is, the brain. A general core principle soon became clear: Brains are shaped by natural selection to give rise to behavior that maximizes Darwinian fitness. Instead of implying rigid behavior patterns, this principle recognizes the enormous fitness benefits of flexible behaviors that allow organisms to adapt to rapidly changing situations. Learning is not an alternative to an evolutionary explanation, it is a capacity shaped by natural selection. The old idea that organisms are shaped to behave in ways that benefit their groups and species was replaced by recognition that selection generally shapes traits that maximize individual fitness, even if that harms the group (2). The brain was, like every other organ, shaped by natural selection. Its function is to regulate behavior and other responses in ways that maximize inclusive fitness. Capacities for learning and relationships are especially valuable ways to carry out that. Humans have, perhaps uniquely among all animals, capacities for abstract representation that make language and causal thinking possible. Humans also have distinctive capacities for enduring relationships that go beyond merely trading favors. These capacities, in turn, make possible social complexities and cultures that create new selection forces that further shape brains, in a feedback process that has shaped humans' astounding social and cognitive abilities. An evolutionary approach to human nature emphasizes the remarkable plasticity and adaptability of behavior to different circumstances (2). Globalization, as a new-fangled theory for cultural, economic or political confederation of world is not devoid of earlier philosophical prototypes in the grounds like ethnicity, politic, value or religious conviction. Maybe, the major difference of present-day globalization with the preceding samples lies in its practical and purposeful nature and related auxiliaries, like neoliberalism and its expected social and economic developments, or portraying of a new and more constructive sociopolitical order, while many of the foregoing parallel schemes had an ideological basis, free from economical purposes or political hegemony. On the other hand, in philosophy instrumentalism is the doctrine that scientific theories are not true descriptions of an unobservable reality but simply useful instruments which enable us to structure and interpret the observable world (28). In the social sciences, similarly, instrumentalism is the doctrine that ideas can primarily be explained by their uses for their beneficiaries, rather than by their accurate representation of truth or reality. So, instrumentalist theories explain both the genesis and maintenance of nationalism by the interests it is alleged to serve (30). Instrumentalist theories of nationalism are trivially true in one respect: no political phenomenon is likely to survive indefinitely if it is entirely useless to all conceivable human collectivities or individuals (28, 30), and political frameworks such as the concept of sustainable development are devoid of scientific foundations, operating only with good intentions for the growth of material prosperity (47). While sociobiology or Neo-Darwinism, in theory, promotes egocentrism, at an individual level, and patriotism, at a societal level, globalization promotes solidarity and partnership at both singular and communal level. Therefore, an internal inconsistency is tangible at this juncture, which may forecast a premature unfavorable outcome in this regard. So, again, directly or indirectly, a contrast is clear between nature and nurture, or heritage and acquirement. Is such a contrast soluble? Historical analysis of previous

philosophical prototypes, like proletarian internationalism, politically, or pan-ethnicity and pan-nationalism, genealogically, was not as outstanding as what had been expected by their theoretic frontrunners (48-52) (Table 2). Though for a while, some provisional or scattered collaboration could be visible among their devotees, permanent cooperation was not possible due to unexpected sociopolitical incidents. Because, many times: 1) theoretic aspirations are not adaptable with pragmatic realities; 2) imaginary calculations are not based on pragmatic assets; 3) genuine followers are not as plenty as presumed supporters; 4) assumed believers have no deep-rooted intuition and their emotional desires is not parallel to their logical insight; 5) forthcoming consequences are not bearable or predictable by frontrunners or admirers; 6) inherent paradoxes have not been exposed or resolved beforehand; 7) personal ambitions have not been detached from collective benefits; 8) revengeful intentions have not been separated from planned strategies; 9) unconscious egocentrism has not been removed from conscious assemblage of beings; 10) resemblances have been aggrandized, while dissimilarities have been overlooked or undervalued; 11) folks' behavior is perceived collectively, not trans-culturally; 12) social customs are realized communally, not culturally; 13) genesis is analyzed chronologically, not along with cultural-historical developments; 14) changes are comprehended in line with ontogenetic courses, not phylogenetic routes; 15) events are grasped cross-sectionally, not longitudinally; 16) mindful or oblivious ignorance of overlapping between distinct identities; 17) ambiguity, immaturity or impracticality about final outcome or cost-effectiveness of struggles for attainment of demanded ideals in the realm of social ranking, social role, sociopolitical status, or achievement of preferred political economy. Presently, among all said reasons, maybe the last one plays a particular role. Idealism without pragmatism is not everlasting. Pragmatism without favorable cost-effect equilibrium is not reachable. Attainment, too, without tangible advantages is not serviceable. The presupposed advantage of globalization, at least financially and in the frame of neoliberalism, is economic and fiscal growth of world through restructuring of resources and productions. Certainly, such reorganization, which may not have the same sense or course in industrialized and unindustrialized states, is a huge program with great intentions, which have different aftermaths, as well, for different social classes. Disregard to the assumed separated outcomes, and only based on a national level, which can be assessed by the known socio-economic markers, prosperity, progress, unemployment, happiness, safety, placement, and so on, as the tangible outcomes of globalization may guarantee its applicability and survival. On the other hand, while social class struggle may weaken or impede the smooth course of program, due to dissimilar burden or expenses in short-term in some countries, it may not block it in long-term in most other nations, due to expectable and promising benefits, which may not be accomplished otherwise. Also, cultural effects of globalization, which are expedited through immigration and acculturation, have a multidimensional characteristic, with coinciding detrimental and beneficial features. Such clash of civilizations, between existing traditions and impending customs, as well, if be resolvable or manageable thoroughly, may further support globalization. Weakness of national states, as well, which is declared as another complication of globalization, if compensated by economic prosperity, decrease of unemployment, and relative management of public troubles, can be ignored by local politicians. So, globalization has important goals which are valuable, real, substantial, favorable, and productive, whether individually or communally, if be accomplished systematically and efficiently. Otherwise, it will have the same conclusion as other said ideological ideas, which, while had strong philosophical basis, lacked tangible profits. Though sociobiology or Neo-

Darwinism generally believes in inherent egocentrism, patriotism, xenophobia, independence, nationalism, on one hand, and in-built altruism, self-sacrifice, and philanthropy for the sake of kinship and raise of genetic fitness, on the other hand, globalization may overwhelm all of these if the desired socioeconomic objectives be achieved nationally and internationally. On the other hand, issues like discrimination, injustice, autocracy, deprivation and poverty, whether actually or imaginary (suspiciously), can weaken every kind of federation, whether political or economic. In cognitive disturbances, like delirium or confusion, during mental status examination, it is a fact that the last disorientation often takes place in person, after time and place. Even in the item of person, self-deteriorates after others. Improvement, as well, takes place in the said line reversely; from self to other, place, and time, sequentially. Cells, too, stem from unique stem cells in bone marrow, and then differentiate according to genetic sequences and transcriptions. But an organism, like human being, includes primary stem cells plus whole of finale products. Healthy sensorium and consciousness, as well, is based on thorough function of all separate cognitive components, whether earlier or later. The above metaphoric examples show that confidence in self and kinship, which has been the prime archetypal affiliation in primary commons and has tough evolutionary and biological origins, does not contradict intrinsically greater or worldwide societal collaboration or confederacies. But it is conditional; as like as survival of an organism, which depends on perfect function of vital tissues; otherwise the resulted condition ends in sickness or annihilation. Every nation includes several cities, every city has many districts, and every district may include various ethnicities. Similarly, every rural community may include different ethnic groups or people. Every family, as well, may include, culturally, dissimilar persons. Conflict, too, can be found in all places; whether intra-familial, intra-cities, intra-national or international. So, prevention and management of conflict is more important than its place. Management of conflict, too, necessitates insight, fairness, rubrics, and assets. Balancing between the said elements will decide the final outcome of globalization, comparatively or totally. Welfare without justice, justice without democracy, democracy without organization, organization without regulation, regulation without employment, employment without economic aptness, and economic aptness without happiness cannot guarantee survival of any kind of sociopolitical formulation, hegemony or social order. Contemporary sociopolitical events and collapsing of socialist regimes in the last decades, whether thru internal pressures or external forces, shows that the presumed economic justice and fading of social classes does not generate, per se, functional political insight or system's devotedness, without considering other intervening factors in the field of political psychology. Short span of historical memory in later generations, as well, may promote splitting-up between populace and government, even in communalist regimes. No political design can guarantee reaching and saving of its desired societal organization based on just hypothetical thought, for the reason that social and political issues are dynamic elements with dialectic interactions, in the context of human's basic needs. Basic needs, also, are flexible and not independent from period, media, intelligence, yearning, and learning. History has revealed that nothing is, absolute, definite or endless in sociopolitical processes. Regarding sociobiological theories, as well, the situation seems comparable. For example, some scholars have optimistic view about harmoniousness between globalization and sociobiology and believe that while the analysis of the globalization processes shows their organic relationship with the universal evolutionary laws for biosphere, the mismatch between human activity and the laws of functioning of biosphere threatens the extinction of the humanity (47). On the other hand, there are scholars, who believe that while evolutionary theory can make

sense of some patterns of ethnic conflict, its central weakness is linking proximate triggering mechanisms of nationalist violence to biological foundations, and without a convincing connection between micro-level propositions and survival and reproductive imperatives, evolutionary theory fails to offer a unique and credible explanation of nationalist violence (53). Anyhow, if intelligence, learning, analyzing, symbolization and abstract or multidimensional thinking are absolute outcomes of evolution for better environmental adaptation and further development, then synthesis of creative socioeconomic or sociopolitical formulations, as well, can be considered as an outcome of cultural evolution, too, which can be faster than biological evolution (54, 55, and 56). Surely, such novelties deserve consideration and analysis for attainment of evidence for making a better prospect.

Conclusion:

While globalization and sociobiology have faith in divergent outlines for social development and interaction, with specific proximate and ultimate mechanisms, their coexistence is possible if advantageous socioeconomic outcomes of the first perspective aid the goals of the later view. Inner instincts of human being, though inescapable or everlasting, are not intractable against further growth or integration, which is comparable to their sublimation and adaptation during development. Once more, nurture neither oppose nor halt nature from realization of its own ambitions.

Pros of economic globalization	Cons of economic globalization	Pros of cultural globalization	Cons of cultural globalization	Pros of political globalization	Cons of political globalization
Cheaper prices for products and services (more optimized supply chains)	Some countries struggle to compete	Access to new cultural products (art, entertainment, education)	Spread of commodity-based consumer culture	Access to international aid and financial support	State sovereignty is reduced
Better availability of products and services	Extractive behavior of some foreign companies and investors in resource-rich countries preventing economic diversification	Better understanding of foreign values and attitudes. Less stereotyping and fewer misconceptions about other people and cultures	Dangers of cultural homogenization	It contributes to world peace. It reduces risk of invasions, more checks on big powers and limitation on nationalism	The functioning of international and supranational organizations is often not “democratic” in terms of representation and accountability
Easier access to capital and commodities	Strong bargaining power of multinational companies vis-à-vis local governments		Westernization, cultural imperialism or cultural colonialism	International organizations are often committed to spread values like freedom and to fight abuses within countries	Big countries can shape decisions in supranational organizations
Increased competition	“Contagion effect” is more likely in times of crises			Smaller countries can work together and gain more influence internationally	

Producers and retailers can diversify their markets and contribute to economic growth				Governments can learn from each other	
				Access to international aid and financial support	

Reference: <https://netivist.org/debate/globalization-pros-and-cons-economic-cultural-and-political>

Table 1 – Pros and Cons of Globalization.

Including	Not including : Partly including
Globalization	Nationalism
Globalism	Chauvinism
Imperialism	Pan-ethnicity
Internationalism	Ethic nationalism
Independent Internationalism	Civic nationalism
Liberal Internationalism	Spiritual egotism
Hegemonic Internationalism	Fascism
Revolutionary Internationalism	
Proletarian internationalism	
Multilateralism	

Table 2 –Dichotomy of sociopolitical systems concerning all-inclusiveness.

References:

- 1) Levallois C. The Development of Sociobiology in Relation to Animal Behavior Studies, 1946–1975. *Journal of the History of Biology* 2018; 51 (3): 419–444.
- 2) Nesse R M. Evolutionary Foundations for Psychiatric Research and Practice. In: Sadock BJ, Sadock VA, Ruiz P, eds. *Kaplan &Sadock's Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry*. 10th ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer; 2017: 769–780.
- 3) Freedman D G. Sociobiology and the human dimension. *Ethology and Sociobiology* 1985; 6 (2): 121–122.
- 4) Sadock BJ, Sadock VA, Ruiz P, eds. *Sociobiology and Ethology*. Kaplan &Sadock's Synopsis of Psychiatry. 11th edition. Philadelphia: Lippincott Wolters Kluwer; 2015:131-132.
- 5) ShojaShafti S. *An Introduction to Sociobiology (Neo-Darwinism)*. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publishing Company; 2003.

- 6) ShojaShafti S. Experimental Appraisal of Obsessive-Compulsive Traits: An Evolutionary Inquiry in the Ground of Social Darwinism 2015; 1(1): 17-22.
- 7) ShojaShafti S (2019) Obsessive-Compulsive Traits, as Behavioral Invention & Foundation of Cultural-Historical Evolution: A Pilot Study. American Journal of Biomedical Science & Research 2019; 3(3): 201-205.
- 8) Kitcher P. Vaulting Ambition: Sociobiology and the Quest for Human Nature. Cambridge, Ma: MIT Press, 1985.
- 9) Wilson E O. On Human Nature, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- 10) Wilson EO. Rethinking The Theoretical Foundation of Sociobiology. The Quarterly Review of Biology 2007; 82 (4): 327–348.
- 11) Boyd R, Richerson PJ. Culture and the Evolutionary Process, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- 12) Cavalli-Sforza LL, Feldman MW. Cultural Transmission and Evolution: A Quantitative Approach, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- 13) Smith E A, Borgerhoff Mulder M, Hill K. Controversies in the evolutionary social sciences: a guide for the perplexed. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 2001; 16 (3): 128–135.
- 14) Sterelny K, Griffiths P. Sex and Death, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- 15) Griffiths P E. Reconstructing Human Nature. Arts: The Journal of the Sydney University Arts Association 2009; 31: 30–57.
- 16) Vayda A P. Failures of Explanation in Darwinian Ecological Anthropology. Philosophy of the Social Sciences 1995; 25: 219–249.
- 17) Krebs J R, Davies N B. The Evolution of Behavioural Ecology. In Krebs J R & Davies N B (eds.), Behavioural Ecology: An Evolutionary Approach (4th ed., pp. 3–12), Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1997.
- 18) ShojaShafti S. An Introduction to Clinical Sociobiology: Evolutionary Psychology, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publishing Company; 2016.
- 19) Griffiths P E. Ethology, Sociobiology and Evolutionary Psychology. In Sarkar, S. & A. Plutynski (eds.), Blackwell's Companion to Philosophy of Biology, Oxford: Blackwells, 2008.
- 20) Wilson E O. The Response: Academic Vigilantism and the Political Significance of Sociobiology. Bio Science 1976; 26(3): 183; 187–190.
- 21) Johnson, G. R. (1995). The Evolutionary Origins of Government and Politics. Human Nature and Politics. A. Somit and J. Losco. Greenwich, CT, JAI Press.
- 22) Wilson E O. Sociobiology, Cambridge, MA: Belknap/Harvard University Press, 1975.
- 23) Wilson E O. “Why you do what you do”: Sociobiology, a New Theory of Behavior, Time, 1977.
- 24) Sociobiology Study Group of Science for the People (SSG). Sociobiology: Another Biological Determinism. Bio Science 1976; 26 (3): 182; 184–186.
- 25) ShojaShafti S. Experimental Appraisal of Social Darwinism By Way of Temperament and Personality. Peer Reviewed Journal of Forensic & Genetic Sciences 2019; 3(5):1-5.
- 26) Johnson, G. R. (1997). The Evolutionary Roots of Patriotism. Patriotism in the Lives of Individuals and Nations. D. Bar-Tal and E. Staub. Chicago, Nelson Hall.

- 27) Warnecke, A. M., R. D. Masters, et al. (1992). "The Roots of Nationalism: Nonverbal Behavior and Xenophobia." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 13: 267-82.
- 28) O'Leary B. Instrumentalist Theories of Nationalism. *Encyclopedia of Nationalism* 2001:1-6.
- 29) Steinberg S. The "Iron Law of Ethnicity" Revised. *The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America*. Boston, Beacon Books, 1989. p.169-72.
- 30) O'Leary B. On the Nature of Nationalism: A Critical Appraisal of Ernest Gellner's Writings on Nationalism. *British Journal of Political Science* 1997; 27(2): 191-222.
- 31) <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/sociobiology/>
- 32) Lewens T. Human Nature: The Very Idea. *Philosophy & Technology* 2012; 25(4): 459–474.
- 33) Lloyd E A, S J Crowley. Essentialism and Human Nature. *Encyclopedia of Life Sciences (eLS)*, published online 28 MAY 2003.
- 34) Machery E. A Plea for Human Nature. *Philosophical Psychology* 2008; 21(3): 321–329.
- 35) Machery E. Reconceptualizing Human Nature: Response to Lewens. *Philosophy & Technology* 2012; 25: 475–478.
- 36) Powell R. Human Nature and Respect for the Evolutionarily Given: a Comment on Lewens. *Philosophy & Technology* 2012; 25: 485–493.
- 37) Ramsey G. Human Nature in a Post-essentialist World. *Philosophy of Science* 2013; 80(5): 983–993.
- 38) Stotz K. Human nature and cognitive-developmental niche construction. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 2010; 9: 483–501.
- 39) Guttal S. Globalisation. *Development in Practice* 2007; 17(4/5): 523-531.
- 40) Albrow M, King E. *Globalization, Knowledge and Society: readings from International sociology*. London, Sage, 1990.
- 41) Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991. p. 64.
- 42) Held D, Goldblatt D, McGrew A, Perraton J. *Global Transformations*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.
- 43) Fabbrini S. *Compound democracies: Why the United States and Europe Are Becoming Similar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, second edition. 2010.
- 44) Bridges G. Grounding Globalization: The Prospects and Perils of Linking Economic Processes of Globalization to Environmental Outcomes. *Economic Geography* 2002; 78 (3): 361–86.
- 45) Robertson. *Globalization: social theory and global culture*. London: Sage, 1992.
- 46) Babones S. Studying Globalization: Methodological Issues. In Ritzer, George. *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization*. John Wiley & Sons. 2008. p. 146.
- 47) Snakin V. Globalization and Sociobiology. *Век глобализации* 2017; 4:23–32.
- 48) Okamoto G, Mora C. Panethnicity. *Annual Review of Sociology* 2014; 40: 219–239.
- 49) Halliday F. Three concepts of internationalism, *International Affairs*, 1988; 64 (2): 187–198.
- 50) Akira L. *Global Community*. London: University of California Press, 2002. p. 9-10.
- 51) Jacques D. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*, 1993.

- 52) Duncan H. *The Comintern: A History of the Third International*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, 2008.
- 53) Hislope R. Can Evolutionary Theory Explain Nationalist Violence? Czecho Slovak and Bosnian Illustrations. *Nations and Nationalism* 1998; 4 (4): 449-602.
- 54) Vygotsky LS. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1978.
- 55) ShojaShafti S. *Review of Cultural-Historical Psychology*. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publishing Company; 2018.
- 56) ShojaShafti S. A Pilot Study re Behavioral Root of Cultural- Historical Development: A Neo-Darwinian Stance. *Online Journal of Neurology and Brain Disorders* 2019; 2(4): 156-161.