On Dawkins

The Biologist's Shadow on the Cave Wall

Mark A. Brewer

May 13, 2025

Abstract

Richard Dawkins is widely celebrated as a key figure in contemporary evolutionary biology, but his intellectual legacy resists simple classification. While he is often framed as a hardline defender of empirical science and naturalism, the structure of his contributions reveals a more ambivalent posture—one that is deeply philosophical, even as it disavows philosophy. This essay argues that Dawkins' enduring influence derives not from experimental discoveries or novel data, but from his role as a conceptual architect: a theorist who reshapes how we think about genes, selection, and organismal design. Through close examination of his major works, public statements, and the epistemic frameworks he deploys, I suggest that Dawkins' authority operates through what might be termed a "rhetorical empiricism"—a stance that foregrounds science while covertly engaging in metaphysical and conceptual argumentation. The central irony is that Dawkins embodies a form of philosophy he explicitly rejects: a speculative, systematizing, and normatively charged philosophy of biology.

Keywords: Richard Dawkins; Philosophy of Biology; Conceptual Framing; Rhetorical Empiricism; Scientific Authority; Gene-Centered Evolution; The Selfish Gene; Metaphor in Science; Units of Selection; Evolutionary Theory

Introduction

Richard Dawkins occupies a paradoxical place in the intellectual landscape of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. On the one hand, he is lauded as one of biology's most visible and influential popularizers: the author of widely read books, the inventor of accessible metaphors (e.g., the selfish gene), and a combative spokesman for science in public culture. On the other hand, the actual content of his contributions to evolutionary theory reveals a very different kind of labour: not experimental, not empirical in the narrow sense, but profoundly conceptual.

This distinction matters. While Dawkins often invokes the authority of empirical science, his most lasting interventions take the form of theoretical reorientation. What *The Selfish Gene* (1976) offered was not new data or experimental insight, but a novel way of parsing existing facts—an ontological and epistemological reframing of the units of selection, couched

in persuasive prose and arresting metaphor. That reframing, I will argue, is philosophical in nature. Yet Dawkins has consistently derided the philosophical tradition as irrelevant, or worse, a hindrance to scientific progress (2006). This disavowal has not prevented him from deploying its tools, nor from occupying precisely the role that philosophy of science is designed to elucidate.

This essay makes three central claims. First, that Dawkins' core contributions to evolutionary biology are not empirical but conceptual, operating within the tradition of philosophy of biology. Second, that Dawkins performs a kind of philosophy without acknowledgment—deploying its methods while repudiating its legitimacy. And third, that his public authority derives from this unacknowledged hybridity: he speaks as a scientist while acting as a philosopher, and in doing so, constructs an epistemic posture that is rhetorically potent, institutionally powerful, and intellectually ambiguous.

To pursue this argument, I divide the essay into three major sections. The first examines the conceptual architecture of Dawkins' major works, situating them within broader debates in philosophy of science. The second interrogates his explicit and implicit critiques of philosophy, exploring the tensions between his rhetorical stance and his methodological commitments. The third considers the nature of scientific authority itself, asking how Dawkins' hybrid posture allows him to claim a kind of legitimacy unavailable to either scientists or philosophers alone. The conclusion reflects on the broader stakes of this hybridity, particularly in an era when the boundaries between disciplines are increasingly contested and performative.

1. Conceptual, Not Empirical

Dawkins' reputation rests on books that are conceptually arresting, not empirically generative. This is a critical distinction. Unlike figures such as E.O. Wilson, who grounded theoretical claims in decades of fieldwork and data, Dawkins offers a kind of theoretical imagination—a lens through which to reinterpret what others have observed. In this sense, Dawkins is less a field biologist than a metaphysician of adaptation: a theorist whose main instrument is the thought experiment, and whose principal data are analogical.

The locus classicus of this orientation is *The Selfish Gene* (1976), which reframes evolutionary dynamics not around the organism or species, but around the gene as the primary unit of selection. This perspective did not arise in a vacuum. Gene-centered accounts had already circulated within theoretical biology, notably in the work of George C. Williams (1966) and W.D. Hamilton (1964), whose models of inclusive fitness and kin selection laid the groundwork for a shift in explanatory locus. What Dawkins added was rhetorical clarity and ontological boldness: the notion that genes "use" organisms as vehicles, or "survival machines," in order to propagate themselves.

This was not a scientific discovery in the conventional sense. No new genetic mechanism was identified, no previously unknown data unearthed. Instead, Dawkins restructured the grammar of explanation. He reified the gene as an intentional agent—not biologically, but metaphorically—and thereby shifted the discourse from molecular machinery to memetic narrative. In doing so, he initiated what one might call a reconceptualization of agency in

biology: from organisms acting on behalf of themselves to genes acting through them.[1]

In the philosophy of science, such shifts are categorized as *conceptual reengineering*: the restructuring of explanatory frameworks that enable new kinds of inference without introducing new empirical entities (Godfrey-Smith, 2009).

The gene-centric view is paradigmatic of this process. It renders intelligible certain empirical regularities—e.g., the apparent altruism of sterile workers in eusocial species—not by introducing new facts, but by altering which facts count as explanatorily fundamental.

Such reframings fall within what philosophers like Mitchell (2003) describe as "integrative pluralism"—a reconfiguration of scientific narratives not by replacing data but by reconciling multiple explanatory modes. Similarly, Sober's analysis of selection units (1984) shows how theoretical coherence often trumps direct empirical demonstration in evolutionary biology. Dawkins operates in this space: prioritizing explanatory reach over experimental grounding.

A similar pattern emerges in *The Extended Phenotype* (1982), where Dawkins proposes that the phenotypic effects of a gene are not limited to the body of the organism but extend into the environment: a beaver dam, a spider web, or even a manipulated host organism. This is not an empirical finding in itself; it is an ontological claim about what counts as a phenotype. And once again, its import lies in how it reorganizes explanatory scope, not in any new observations.

The function of these moves is philosophical: to reclassify, to reconstrue, to reframe. In other words, Dawkins' signature contributions are not hypotheses but heuristics. They provide no predictions in the Popperian sense, but they generate conceptual clarity and theoretical elegance. Such work is indispensable to science—but it belongs more squarely within the remit of philosophy of biology than experimental research.

This is not to diminish the significance of Dawkins' contributions. Conceptual innovation is often more enduring than empirical novelty, particularly in sciences where the data are well-established and the need is for interpretive synthesis. What is at stake, however, is a matter of intellectual honesty: to recognize the kind of labour being performed, and to situate it in the correct disciplinary frame. By this standard, Dawkins is a philosopher—though one who wears the badge of biologist as both shield and sword.

2. Philosophy Without Acknowledgement

The tension between Dawkins' conceptual sophistication and his rhetorical disdain for philosophy is not merely ironic—it is constitutive of his intellectual persona. He performs philosophy while disavowing it, drawing on conceptual tools whose lineage he repudiates. This posture is not just a matter of personal preference or disciplinary chauvinism; it reflects a deeper ambivalence about the epistemic roles of science and philosophy in public discourse.

Dawkins has, on multiple occasions, expressed open contempt for philosophy. In *The God Delusion* (2006), he describes philosophical argument as largely obsolete in the face of scientific progress. He dismisses metaphysics as "armchair speculation" and contrasts

[1]This shift mirrors what Dennett (*Darwin's Dangerous Idea*, 1995) describes as a "strange inversion of reasoning"—attributing purposiveness to non-teleological processes by reconfiguring agency at the molecular level.

it unfavorably with the empirical rigor of natural science. His interviews and essays are replete with caricatures of philosophers as obscurantists, preoccupied with word games and irrelevant abstractions. The implication is clear: philosophy is at best parasitic, at worst an impediment to truth.[2]

Yet this view is undermined by Dawkins' own practice. His writing routinely engages with questions that are quintessentially philosophical: What constitutes a unit of selection? What counts as intentionality in evolution? What are the limits of reductionism? In answering these, Dawkins does not conduct experiments—he constructs arguments. He delineates conceptual boundaries, proposes ontological revisions, and advances normative claims about explanatory virtues. These are not empirical maneuvers; they are philosophical ones.

Indeed, his intellectual performance is a textbook case of what Hacking (1983) called "representing and intervening": shaping what is seen as real through the apparatus of explanation. But unlike Hacking, who explores the mutual reinforcement between scientific language and intervention, Dawkins presents his interventions as purely empirical, avoiding the reflexivity that philosophical analysis demands. Longino (2002) emphasizes how such rhetorical moves function to shore up epistemic authority by narrowing the domain of legitimate critique—a tendency Dawkins exemplifies.

Consider his treatment of teleology. In rejecting "purpose" in evolution, Dawkins is not merely stating a scientific fact—he is advancing a metaphysical stance about the nature of causation and explanation. His arguments against intelligent design rest not on new data, but on philosophical distinctions between types of order, intentionality, and mechanism. Similarly, in his endorsement of reductionism, Dawkins enters into long-standing debates about levels of explanation, the autonomy of scientific disciplines, and the viability of emergent properties—debates that are not resolved by data, but by argumentative coherence (Dupré, 2001; Sterelny, 1996).

Moreover, his hostility to philosophy seems selectively applied. When defending atheism, Dawkins routinely appeals to arguments whose structure is philosophical: appeals to parsimony (Occam's Razor), critiques of metaphysical dualism, and rejections of moral realism. Indeed, the very title *The God Delusion* is a conceptual provocation that invites metaphysical dispute. One does not disprove God by sequencing genomes. One argues—philosophically—about coherence, necessity, and the burden of proof.

This inconsistency reveals a deeper anxiety: that the authority of science may be contaminated by its entanglement with philosophical reasoning. Dawkins' rhetorical posture, then, functions as a kind of prophylaxis. By disavowing philosophy, he safeguards the perception of scientific purity. He invokes the rhetoric of empiricism to immunize his conceptual work against charges of speculation. In effect, he performs philosophy under the sign of science—a move that amplifies his authority while eliding the sources of his own reasoning.[3]

Whether this is a conscious strategy or epistemic drift is unclear. At times, Dawkins appears genuinely unaware of the philosophical scaffolding his claims require; at others, his

[2]To be fair, the frustrations of some scientists are not without cause. Philosophy has, at times, burdened science with excess abstraction, opaque jargon, and disciplinary self-importance. The legacy of positivist purges and intra-philosophical feuds has done little to endear it to working biologists. Dawkins, then, may be reacting not only to caricatures—but to a real, if uneven, disciplinary history.

[3]This move echoes the critique in feminist epistemology that scientists often efface the interpretive labour behind their authority (cf. Longino, 2002), thereby sustaining a myth of neutral empiricism.

rhetorical confidence suggests a strategic narrowing of scope. In either case, the disavowal is functional: it sustains the illusion that science speaks without mediation.

But, whether conscious or not, this is a dangerous strategy. It distorts public understanding of both science and philosophy, suggesting that all legitimate insight flows from data alone, and that conceptual analysis is either derivative or dispensable. It also misrepresents the history of science, which has always relied on philosophical scaffolding: from Newton's *Principia* to Darwin's use of analogical reasoning, to contemporary debates about models and mechanisms in systems biology.

By refusing to acknowledge philosophy as a legitimate partner in inquiry, Dawkins obscures the very methods he employs. He benefits from the authority of science while drawing on the techniques of another discipline—without attribution. This is not merely an oversight; it is an epistemic performance. And like all performances, it reflects institutional pressures, disciplinary boundaries, and the politics of expertise.

3. The Illusion of Empirical Authority

Central to Dawkins' intellectual persona is the image of the "hard scientist"—a figure who speaks not from speculative abstraction but from the firm ground of empirical reality. This identity has been carefully cultivated: in interviews, debates, and polemical writings, Dawkins presents himself as a defender of scientific naturalism, armed with the epistemic authority of biology. Yet this posture obscures a crucial fact: Dawkins has made no empirical discoveries in the conventional sense. He has conducted no major fieldwork, developed no experimental protocols, and published no data-driven findings that have reshaped the biological sciences. His authority arises not from observation, but from articulation.

This discrepancy is not in itself problematic. Many important figures in science—Theodosius Dobzhansky, Ernst Mayr, and Stephen Jay Gould among them—have played primarily synthetic or theoretical roles. The issue with Dawkins is that he denies the conceptual nature of his own contributions, preferring instead to mask them under the rubric of scientific empiricism. This misidentification has consequences: it bolsters a public image of science as self-evident and unassailable, while concealing the interpretive frameworks that structure its presentation.

In contrast to Dawkins, consider the case of E.O. Wilson. Wilson's authority rested on decades of empirical research into ant behavior and sociobiology, much of which was painstakingly documented through observation and experiment. When Wilson theorized about the biological basis of social behavior, he did so from a platform grounded in laboratory and field expertise. Dawkins, by contrast, theorizes from inherited data and published literature. His contribution lies in the synthesis, reframing, and metaphysical gloss he provides—not in the collection or testing of data.

This becomes particularly salient when evaluating Dawkins' rhetorical style. His language routinely invokes the empiricist ethos: claims are presented as facts, analogies are deployed as if they were evidence, and counterarguments are dismissed as sentimental or obscurantist. Yet beneath this veneer lies a distinct philosophical architecture—one that depends not on falsifiability, but on ontological presuppositions. His famous claim that "we are survival machines—robot vehicles blindly programmed to preserve the selfish molecules known as

genes" (1976) is not an empirical proposition. It is a metaphysical claim dressed in biological garb.

Kitcher (2001) has argued that scientific authority is as much a social achievement as an epistemic one: it involves cultivating trust, coherence, and public resonance. Dawkins' strength lies precisely in this nexus. He commands deference not through empirical novelty but through narrative mastery, thereby constructing a worldview that appears inevitable rather than interpretive.

Such statements derive their power not from experimental validation, but from their explanatory coherence and rhetorical force. They offer a worldview—a picture of life that is at once mechanistic, purposeless, and genetically deterministic. This is not biology per se; it is a narrative about biology, with all the normative implications that narrative entails. As Dupré (2001) and Godfrey-Smith (2009) have argued, the gene-centered view of evolution is a perspective, not a discovery. It interprets known phenomena through a particular conceptual lens, privileging certain causal pathways over others.

What is masked in Dawkins' presentation is the contingency of that lens. By speaking as though only one interpretation is scientifically legitimate, he collapses the space of conceptual pluralism into a single epistemic frame. This renders invisible the debates within evolutionary theory—over multilevel selection, developmental plasticity, niche construction, and other models that resist the gene-centric orthodoxy (Sterelny, 1996; Okasha, 2006). In this way, Dawkins' empirical posture serves a regulatory function: it narrows discourse, polices dissent, and installs one conceptual schema as the exclusive language of evolutionary explanation.

There is a lesson here about the nature of authority in science. Authority is not conferred solely by data, but by the capacity to frame data within compelling narratives. Dawkins excels at this. His genius lies not in measurement, but in metaphor. He crafts explanatory architectures that shape how others think, not what they know.[4] In this respect, he functions less as a biologist and more as a public epistemologist: someone who mediates the boundary between technical knowledge and its social meanings.

To acknowledge this is not to diminish his contribution. It is to name it accurately—and to recognize the costs of mislabeling conceptual labour as empirical science. For when conceptual work masquerades as data, it forecloses critique. It becomes insulated from the very kind of reflective analysis that philosophy provides. Dawkins' authority, then, is real—but it is an authority of articulation, not of experiment. And to the extent that it rests on the illusion of empirical legitimacy, it demands demystification.

Conclusion

Richard Dawkins is often celebrated as a paragon of scientific clarity—a communicator of biological truths, a defender of naturalism, a scourge of superstition. Yet behind this public image lies a deeper intellectual tension: the disjunction between Dawkins' rhetorical empiricism and the philosophical nature of his most significant contributions. What he offers is not data, but direction; not findings, but frameworks. He is not a bench biologist, but a

[4]The distinction between shaping thought and presenting knowledge is central to rhetorical studies of science (see Prelli, 1989). Dawkins exemplifies the genre of what Alan Gross calls "the scientific sublime."

conceptual architect whose influence stems from his ability to reconfigure how evolutionary processes are understood.

This, in itself, is not a critique. Conceptual labour is foundational to science. Theories must be framed, models interpreted, and explanations justified. What distinguishes Dawkins is not that he performs this labour, but that he denies its philosophical character. In doing so, he masks the interpretive scaffolding of his own work, presenting contingent ontologies as empirical necessities. He does not simply argue; he naturalizes his arguments. This move grants him authority while rendering alternative frameworks invisible.

The cost of this disavowal is twofold. First, it impoverishes public understanding of science by promoting a myth of data-driven objectivity that elides the role of conceptual mediation. Second, it marginalizes philosophy at the very moment when its tools are most needed—when biologists debate units of selection, explanatory pluralism, and the limits of reductionism. By treating philosophy as dispensable, Dawkins obscures the philosophical assumptions embedded in his own claims.

In this sense, Dawkins exemplifies a broader epistemic phenomenon: the scientist-philosopher who performs conceptual labour under the banner of empiricism. His authority depends on this hybridity—on occupying the space between explanation and rhetoric, between science and its public performance. To understand Dawkins, then, is not simply to read his books, but to attend to the posture they enact: one that elevates theoretical imagination while denying its philosophical roots.

This dynamic—where rhetorical empiricism masks philosophical construction—is not unique to Dawkins. It exemplifies a broader pattern in contemporary science, where figures who shape public understanding of knowledge disavow the conceptual labour that underpins it (Longino, 2002; Kitcher, 2001). Acknowledging this would not weaken the authority of science, but strengthen its transparency. As Mitchell (2003) reminds us, robust inquiry often emerges not from singular paradigms, but from the interplay of perspectives.

A more honest accounting would place Dawkins in the tradition he disavows. He is, in effect, a philosopher of biology—one whose influence lies in his capacity to reframe, reclassify, and reconceive. That he does so while deriding the very tools he employs is not just ironic.[5] It is a missed opportunity: for dialogue, for intellectual clarity, and for a more accurate understanding of how scientific ideas shape, and are shaped by, the conceptual scaffolds that sustain them.[6]

[5]The public role of science in the late modern West often mirrors that of theology: not just explaining the world, but authorizing it. Dawkins, in this sense, may be less a philosopher-in-denial than a priest of secular clarity.

[6]A broader version of this claim appears in Hacking's analysis of "styles of reasoning," wherein classification schemes both enable and constrain what counts as a fact (Hacking, 1992).

References

Dawkins, R. (1976). *The selfish gene*. Oxford University Press.

Dawkins, R. (2006). *The god delusion*. Bantam Press.

Dennett, D. C. (1995). *Darwin's dangerous idea: Evolution and the meanings of life*. Simon & Schuster.

Dupré, J. (1993). *The disorder of things: Metaphysical foundations of the disunity of science*. Harvard University Press.

Dupré, J. (2001). *Human nature and the limits of science*. Oxford University Press.

Godfrey-Smith, P. (2003). *Theory and reality: An introduction to the philosophy of science*. University of Chicago Press.

Godfrey-Smith, P. (2009). *Darwinian populations and natural selection*. Oxford University Press.

Hamilton, W. D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behaviour. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *7*(1), 1–52.

Hacking, I. (1983). *Representing and intervening: Introductory topics in the philosophy of natural science*. Cambridge University Press.

Hacking, I. (1992). The self-vindication of the laboratory sciences. In A. Pickering (Ed.), *Science as practice and culture* (pp. 29–64). University of Chicago Press.

Kitcher, P. (2001). *Science, truth, and democracy*. Oxford University Press.

Longino, H. E. (2002). *The fate of knowledge*. Princeton University Press.

Mitchell, S. D. (2003). *Biological complexity and integrative pluralism*. Cambridge University Press.

Okasha, S. (2006). *Evolution and the levels of selection*. Oxford University Press.

Prelli, L. J. (1989). *A rhetoric of science: Inventing scientific discourse*. University of South Carolina Press.

Sober, E. (1984). *The nature of selection: Evolutionary theory in philosophical focus*. University of Chicago Press.

Sterelny, K. (1996). *Evolutionary biology: Conceptual foundations*. Oxford University Press.

Williams, G. C. (1966). *Adaptation and natural selection: A critique of some current evolutionary thought*. Princeton University Press.