

The Henry Morris
SIGNATURE COLLECTION

THE
LONG WAR
AGAINST GOD



First printing: January 2000
Eleventh printing: May 2019

Copyright © 1989, 2000 by Henry Morris. All rights reserved.
No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations in articles and reviews.
For information write:

Master Books®, P.O. Box 726, Green Forest, AR 72638

Master Books® is a division of the New Leaf Publishing Group, Inc.

ISBN: 978-1-68344-175-5

Digital ISBN: 978-1-61458-703-3

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 00-100214

Cover design by Felicia Joyce Designs, LLC

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture is from the King James Version of the Bible.

Please consider requesting that a copy of this volume be purchased by your local library system.

Printed in the United States of America

Please visit our website for other great titles:
www.masterbooks.com

For information regarding author interviews, please contact the publicity department at (870) 438-5288.



This book is lovingly dedicated
to my youngest son,
Dr. Andrew H. Morris,
(1949–1989),
a faithful soldier
and casualty
in the long war.

Acknowledgments

I wish to especially thank Dr. David Jeremiah, president of Christian Heritage College, pastor of Scott Memorial Baptist Church (El Cajon, California), and well-known radio and conference speaker, for reading the manuscript and writing the foreword.

In addition, a number of key creationist scholars have reviewed the manuscript and made many helpful suggestions, which I appreciate very much. These include the following:

L. Russell Bush III, Th.D., Vice President for Academic Affairs, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina

Kenneth B. Cumming, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate School, Institute for Creation Research

John D. Morris, Ph.D., Administrative Vice President, Institute for Creation Research

Ker C. Thompson, Ph.D., Head of Science Division, Bryan College, Dayton, Tennessee

Richard B. Bliss, Ed.D., Head of Curriculum Division, Institute for Creation Research

John R. Meyer, Ph.D., Head of Science Division, Baptist Bible College, Clarks Summit, Pennsylvania

Finally, I thank Mrs. Mary Ruth Smith, who typed the manuscript.

Contents

Foreword	7
Introduction.....	11
1. The Evolutionary Basis of Modern Thought.....	13
Evolution — the World's View	
Evolution and the Science of Life	
The Origin and History of the Earth	
Evolution and the Physical Sciences	
Human Behavior in the Light of Evolution	
Evolution and Society	
Even the Humanities!	
Evolutionary Education and the Schools	
2. Political Evolutionism — Right and Left.....	63
The Tragedy of Social Darwinism	
The Preservation of Favored Races	
Militarism, Imperialism, and the White Man's Burden	
Hitler — Evolution in Full Flower	
The Evolutionary Morass of Communism	
3. Evolutionist Religion and Morals.....	119
Evolution and the Christian Church	
Evangelical Compromise	
The Religion of Atheism/Humanism	
Pantheism and the New Age	
The Demise of Christian Morality	
The Devaluation of Life	
Drugs, Crime, and Evolutionism	

4. The Dark Nursery of Darwinism.....	201
The Unnatural Selection of Charles Darwin	
The Mysterious Role of Charles Lyell	
Wallace and the Spirit World	
Doctors of Revolution	
The Great Chain of Being	
5. The Conflict of the Ages	263
Evolution Underground	
Philosophy and Vain Deceit	
God and the Nations	
Cunningly Devised Fables	
Mother of Harlots	
Father of Lies	
6. The Everlasting Gospel.....	351
“When They Knew God . . .”	
The Inescapable Witness	
Into All the World	
The High God	
Resurrection of the Creator	
Creation — the Foundation of All Truth	
Foundation of True Christianity	
He Shall Overcome	
Subject Index	445
Name Index	453
Scripture Index.....	461

Foreword

In my college and seminary days, I had seen the name Henry Morris on a number of books that were assigned for collateral reading, but I did not meet him until I moved to San Diego in the fall of 1981 to become the senior pastor of the Scott Memorial Baptist Church and the president of Christian Heritage College. At that time, the Institute for Creation Research shared an administrative office building with the church and the college, and my office was just a few doors from his.

Henry Morris was one of the first to invite me to lunch after my arrival. My initial impression of him was twofold: listening to him pray led me to believe that he was a godly man; listening to him talk convinced me that he was passionately committed to biblical and scientific creationism. Dr. Morris loved all of God's Word, but he has made a special study of the vital importance of the early chapters of Genesis, as well as other Scriptures dealing with creation. I had always been a thoroughgoing creationist, but I had never placed that truth at the center of the Christian message. I knew that Henry was

sincere in his crusade, but I wondered if perhaps his perspective had been clouded by a narrow focus of study over the years.

Today I know better! My mind has been changed by the influence of Dr. Morris's books. I am now convinced that all significant problems of society are the children of an ignorant or indifferent attitude toward creationism. And if there were any remaining doubts, this book has put them finally and emphatically to rest.

The Long War Against God is the most comprehensive treatment of a single important subject that I have ever seen. To read this book carefully is to receive a uniquely significant, in-depth perspective on the origin and operation of our world.

Many layers of error have been built on the faulty foundation of evolutionism. Humanism is the natural result. If God is not central in all our thinking, then man must be. Atheism is humanism's twin brother, and consistent evolutionists cannot logically believe in the personal God of the Bible, the God who is the Creator of all life. Abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia are logical behaviors for those who have so easily disposed of the image of God in the eternal soul of man. The concept of a resurrected body and eternal life is also a casualty of this evil philosophy.

The average person neither knows nor cares much about the error of evolution, and yet his or her life is constantly being influenced by it. Pornography, adultery, divorce, homosexuality, premarital sex, the destruction of the nuclear family — all are weeds that have grown from Satan's big lie about the universe. We are now on the verge of adopting full-fledged animalism in human practice — promiscuity, vandalism, hedonism, even incipient cannibalism. Even the Holocaust is "explained" by evolution. Hitler's extermination of the Jews grew out of his desire to speed up the evolutionary process.

When one views the carnage of the evolutionary dogma, it is hard to explain its wide acceptance and influence. How did belief in Darwinism become so widespread when it was developed mainly by an apostate divinity student (Darwin), a lawyer (Lyell), an agriculturist (Hutton), a journalist (Chambers), and other non-scientists? Dr. Morris documents the fact that the idea of evolution did not originate with Darwin. Evolutionism is basic in ancient and modern ethnic religions and in all forms of pantheism. Naturalist Alfred Russel Wallace admitted that he received the basic tenets of the Darwinian form of this heresy while in an occult trance in a Malaysian jungle. It does not take a theologian to figure out the identity of the revealer. Satan and his evolutionary gospel hate God as the Creator, Christ as the Savior, and the Bible as the Word of God. Modern evolutionism is simply the continuation of Satan's long war against God.

I believe that this volume ought to be read by every pastor and educator in our Christian schools, and all Christians serious about their faith and the problems of society. I pray that it will serve to slow the advance of the cancerous doctrine of evolution.

The result of a lifetime of dedicated study, *The Long War Against God* is a classic presentation by my friend and fellow warrior.

— David Jeremiah, BS, ThM, DD

Introduction

This book is bound to be controversial, but I believe its message is urgently needed by the rising generation. The many crises and deadly dangers of our time can only grow worse if we do not recognize their basic cause. I believe we can show that this is nothing less than the long-continued rebellion of men and women against God.

The denial of God — rejecting the reality of supernatural creation and the Creator's sovereign rule of the world — has always been the root cause of every human problem. This evolutionary, humanistic, pantheistic — even atheistic — worldview has taken many different forms over the ages, varying with the time and culture, but it has always been there in one guise or another, to turn the minds and hearts of people away from their Maker. There has indeed been an age-long war against God. It has been going on from the beginning of time and will increase in intensity in these last days.

I have tried to document this theme as thoroughly as possible in a book of this size. Evolutionists of all stripes will surely oppose and ridicule my presentation, but that is to

be expected, considering the very nature of the controversy. Nevertheless, the facts speak for themselves, and I believe that open-minded readers will be convinced.

If the theme is valid, as I strongly believe the facts of history and true science demonstrate, nothing can be more important than for men and women of the new generation to repudiate the old, tired evolutionary humanism of their teachers and other opinion makers of the establishment. It is imperative that they return in faith to the God who created them — the personal, omnipotent, loving, saving God of the Bible. Therefore, I hope each reader will patiently and carefully follow with me through the pages of this book, which represents the considered and firm conviction of almost 50 years of active study and participation in the conflict.

In the first three chapters, I have tried to document the pervasively harmful influence of evolutionism in the thought and life of the world for the century since Darwin. Next I have devoted two chapters to tracing the history of this warfare through all the ages of the world before Darwin. Then, in the final chapter, I have outlined the history of the battle *for* God and His plan, including His sure and final victory in the age to come.

The history of this long, long war is intensely fascinating in itself. But it is also tremendously important for a true understanding of the present world situation, as we make preparation for the climactic future that is almost upon us.

Chapter 1

The Evolutionary Basis of Modern Thought

An unprecedented confusion is now permeating the modern world. Everything has seemingly been turned upside-down, and the older standards of right and wrong have been almost completely interchanged. Observe the symptoms: huge nuclear arsenals in the great nations, developing nuclear capabilities in many smaller nations, the imminent AIDS pandemic, chemical and biological weapons ready to be unleashed, the unknown dangers of genetic engineering looming ahead, the terrors and conflicts generated by world communism (not to mention Nazism, racism, imperialism, and other evil systems), the wide resurgence of paganism and occultism, the inexorable spread of the cancerous drug culture, giant crime syndicates in the capitalist nations, pan-Arabic aggression in the Islamic nations, and a

worldwide breakdown of personal and governmental morality. It is no wonder that there is everywhere “upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity . . .” (Luke 21:25). Surely the world has gone mad!

Ideas and theories usually have visible consequences. Effects have causes. I propose to show in this book that there is an underlying idea behind these consequences and that this idea, though it goes by many names — naturalism, materialism, etc. — is basically nothing else than the almost sacrosanct doctrine of evolution. Furthermore, this situation is nothing new, but indeed has been the underlying cause of most of the major problems of the world throughout human history. If this statement seems extreme, I can only ask you to defer judgment until you see the evidence.

I am not speaking here only of Darwinism, nor even of biological evolution in general, but of evolution as a total philosophy that purports to explain the origin and development of all things by natural properties and processes in a closed universe, one with no involvement by any external supernatural Creator. In this sense, evolutionism is essentially synonymous with naturalism or materialism, with the space-time-matter cosmos regarded as the ultimate reality out of which everything, from elementary particles to complex human beings, has evolved.

In arguing that evolutionary thinking is the root cause of the major harmful systems and practices in the world, I am not suggesting that any particular person who believes in evolution is therefore “evil” or immoral. The only issue is the evolutionary philosophy itself, not the people who believe it. I realize that many kind, sensitive people believe in evolution. The fact is, regardless of whether or not evolution has been misunderstood or misapplied, it really has been made the pseudo-scientific rationale for all kinds of evil doctrines and influences in the world. And people need to know this!

Most people regard evolution as merely a biological theory of no great consequence in their lives, having no idea of its tremendous importance as the philosophy underlying all the evils of the world. Even many Christians regard evolution as nothing more than God's method of creation, utterly ignoring its completely anti-biblical and even anti-theistic character.

In this chapter, however, I only want to show that evolutionary theory does indeed dominate modern thought in virtually every field — every discipline of study, every level of education, and every area of practice. This fact in itself indicates the tremendous responsibility that evolutionism must assume for present world conditions.

Evolution — the World's View

The fact that this globalistic view of evolution is held by the leading evolutionists themselves — the ones who know the most about their theory and its implications — should be (though it is not) well known by now. For instance, Sir Julian Huxley, grandson of Thomas Huxley (Darwin's "bulldog") and brother of Aldous Huxley (leading atheist philosopher and patriarch of the modern drug culture) and arguably the leading evolutionist of the 20th century, stressed the ubiquitous influence of evolutionism in the following words:

The concept of evolution was soon extended into other than biological fields. Inorganic subjects such as the life-history of stars and the formation of the chemical elements on the one hand, and on the other hand subjects like linguistics, social anthropology, and comparative law and religion, began to be studied from an evolutionary angle, until today we are enabled to see evolution as a universal and all-pervading process.¹

1. J.R. Newman, editor, *What Is Science?* "Evolution and Genetics," by Julian Huxley (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), p. 272.

When he wrote these words, Sir Julian had already served as UNESCO's first director-general and had established its basic tone and philosophy, which served also to guide the United Nations organization itself during its formative years. In that connection, he wrote:

It is essential for UNESCO to adopt an evolutionary approach. . . . The general philosophy of UNESCO should, it seems, be a scientific world humanism, global in extent and evolutionary in background. . . . Thus the struggle for existence that underlies natural selection is increasingly replaced by conscious selection, a struggle between ideas and values in consciousness.²

That is, evolution was not only the basis for all explanation in the sciences and in past history, but should now also be the guide for future, controlled developments in human societies.

Perhaps next in importance to Huxley among 20th-century evolutionists was the geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky, originally from the USSR, then later on the faculties at Columbia University, Stanford, Rockefeller Institute, and the University of California at Davis. He also stressed evolution as the complete worldview:

Evolution comprises all the stages of the development of the universe: the cosmic, biological, and human or cultural developments. Attempts to restrict the concept of evolution to biology are gratuitous.

2. Julian Huxley, "A New World Vision," *The Humanist* 39 (March/April 1979): p. 35–36. This paper was originally written as Huxley's proposed framework for UNESCO, but was not released publicly until many years later. UNESCO is the acronym for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Life is a product of the evolution of inorganic nature, and man is a product of the evolution of life.³

Of almost equal importance to Huxley and Dobzhansky in the modern evolutionary scene is the Harvard scientist Ernst Mayr. With relation to the worldview nature of evolution, Mayr has written:

Man's worldview today is dominated by the knowledge that the universe, the stars, the earth, and all living things have evolved through a long history that was not foreordained or programmed.⁴

I am taking a new look at the Darwinian revolution of 1859, perhaps the most fundamental of all intellectual revolutions in the history of mankind. It not only eliminated man's anthropocentrism, but affected every metaphysical and ethical concept, if consistently applied.⁵

These three men (Huxley, Dobzhansky, and Mayr) dominated modern evolutionary thought through at least the first two-thirds of the 20th century. Along with George Gaylord Simpson, G. Ledyard Stebbins, and others (all of whom agreed with them on the ubiquitous application of naturalistic evolution in every field of thought), they developed the system known as neo-Darwinism, emphasizing gradual evolutionary changes in populations by chance mutations and natural selection. Although this particular system is currently under challenge by "punctuatedism" or "revolutionary evolution," it has exerted profound influence on almost everyone

3. Theodosius Dobzhansky, "Changing Man," *Science* 155 (Jan. 27, 1967): p. 409.

4. Ernst Mayr, "Evolution," *Scientific American* 239 (Sept. 1978): p. 47.

5. Ernst Mayr, "The Nature of the Darwinian Revolution," *Science* 176 (June 2, 1972): p. 981.

for three generations, and is still the dominant view in most textbooks and curricula.

If the leaders of evolutionary thought have regarded evolution as their complete worldview, it is not surprising that this is also the dogma taught by their followers. Typical is the following summary by one of the nation's top ecologists, in a national Sigma Xi lecture:

If the leaders of evolutionary thought have regarded evolution as their complete worldview, it is not surprising that this is also the dogma taught by their followers.

Most enlightened persons now accept as a fact that everything in the cosmos — from heavenly bodies to human beings — has developed and continues to develop through evolutionary processes. The great religions of the West have come to accept a historical view of creation. Evolutionary concepts are applied also to social institutions and to the arts. Indeed, most political parties, as well as schools of theology, sociology, history, or arts, teach these concepts and make them the basis of their doctrines.⁶

That such ideas are not limited to biologists is made clear in the following statement from the former head of physics at MIT, also then president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences:

The evolutionary history of the world, from the “big bang” to the present universe, is a series of gradual steps from the simple to the complicated, from the unordered to the organized, from the formless

6. Rene Dubos, “Humanistic Biology,” *American Scientist* 53 (March 1965): p. 6.

gas of elementary particles to the morphy atoms and molecules and further to the still more structured liquids and solids, and finally to the sophisticated living organisms.⁷

George Wald, Nobel Prize winner at Harvard, specializing in bio-optics, stresses that evolution has occurred even among the most elementary particles of the cosmos:

Back of the spontaneous generation of life under other conditions than now obtain upon this planet, there occurred a spontaneous generation of elements of the kind that still goes on in the stars; and back of that I suppose a spontaneous generation of elementary particles under circumstances still to be fathomed, that ended in giving them the properties that alone make possible the universe we know.⁸

Modern astrophysicists, in fact, are currently speculating that the universe itself spontaneously evolved out of nothing! — “In this picture, the universe came into existence as a fluctuation in the quantum-mechanical vacuum. Such a hypothesis leads to a view of creation in which the entire universe is an accident. In Tryon’s words, ‘Our universe is simply one of those things which happen from time to time.’ ”⁹

There is obviously no need for God in any portion of this comprehensive modern evolutionary scenario. The evolutionists quoted above are all writing within either an atheistic or pantheistic frame of reference and apparently reflecting their own beliefs. If everything from the universe itself to man has

7. Victor F. Weisskopf, “The Frontiers and Limits of Science,” *American Scientist* 65 (July–Aug. 1977): p. 409.

8. George Wald, “Fitness in the Universe: Choices and Necessities,” *Origins of Life* 5 (1974): p. 26.

9. James Trefil, “The Accidental Universe,” *Science Digest* 92 (June 1984): p. 101.

evolved by natural processes from primeval chaos (or perhaps nothingness!) into their present complex forms and relationships, God becomes quite redundant.

There are a number of evolutionists, of course, who are theists, rather than atheists or pantheists. Theistic evolutionists are almost always followers, rather than leaders, of evolutionary thought, but they also acknowledge evolution as basic in all fields. One of these is Stanley Beck, an entomologist at the University of Wisconsin, and faculty adviser to a religious group at that institution. He says:

Twentieth century biology rests on a foundation of evolutionary concepts. . . . The evolutionary basis is also apparent in peripheral independent fields such as chemistry, geology, physics, and astronomy. No central scientific concept is more firmly established in our thinking, our methods, and our interpretations than that of evolution.¹⁰

Similarly, a professor of history at Calvin College (a denominational college sponsored by the Christian Reformed Church) and himself a witness for the evolution side at the 1981 Arkansas creation law trial, admits:

In any case, creation scientists are correct in perceiving that in modern culture “evolution” often involves far more than biology. The basic ideologies of the civilization, including its entire moral structure, are at issue. Evolution is sometimes the key mythological element in a philosophy that functions as a virtual religion.¹¹

10. Stanley D. Beck, “Natural Science and Creationist Theology” *Bioscience* 32 (Oct. 1982): p. 738.

11. George M. Marsden, “Creation Versus Evolution: No Middle Ground,” *Nature* 305 (Oct. 13, 1983): p. 574.

Probably the most famous of all theistic evolutionists, an active paleontologist as well as a Roman Catholic priest, was Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. To him, evolution was not only a worldview; it was almost synonymous with God, as is evident from the following quotation:

[Evolution] is a general postulate to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must henceforward bow and which they must satisfy in order to be thinkable and true. Evolution is a light which illuminates all facts, a trajectory which all lines of thought must follow.¹²

Teilhard's voluminous writings in this vein are important not so much for their quasi-scientific and philosophical content (he has even been implicated by a number of his fellow evolutionists as one of the perpetrators of the infamous Piltdown Man hoax!) as for the tremendous number of his followers, especially in the so-called New Age movement. He was on excellent terms with many leading evolutionary scientists during the first half of the 20th century and has exerted a profound influence on modern thought.

In fact, it would be hard to find any real leaders in modern evolutionary thought who did not and do not regard evolution as their worldview — indeed, to all intents and purposes, their “religion” and philosophy of life and meaning. It would easily be possible to produce much more documentation to this effect, but the above should suffice to establish the point beyond question. Evolution is not merely a biological theory of little significance. It is a worldview — the worldview diametrically opposing the Christian world-

12. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, as cited by Francisco Ayala in “‘Nothing in Biology Makes Sense Except in the Light of Evolution’: Theodosius Dobzhansky, 1900–1975,” *Journal of Heredity* 68, no. 3 (1977): p. 3. This eulogy to Dobzhansky (who was a pantheist even though a church member at his death) noted that spiritually he was a de Chardin disciple.

view. Therefore, Christians ignore it or compromise with it at great peril!

Evolution and the Science of Life

The discussion in the foregoing section has necessarily been rather general. Let us now examine a little more fully the direct impact of evolutionary thinking in various major disciplines. Interestingly enough, the actual impact of evolutionary thinking has been felt more in the social sciences and humanities, but this is largely because of the widely promoted belief that evolution has been “proven” by the natural sciences. The fact is, however, that although the natural sciences are commonly interpreted in an evolutionary framework, no one has ever observed real evolution take place, not even in any of the life sciences, let alone the earth sciences or the physical sciences. True science is supposed to be observable, measurable, and repeatable. Evolution, however, even if it were true, is too slow to observe or measure and has consisted of unique, non-repeatable events of the past. It is therefore outside the scope of genuine science and has certainly not been *proven* by science.

Nevertheless, all of these sciences *assume* evolution and diligently seek to interpret all their data in an evolutionary context. This is especially the case in the biological sciences. Ever since Darwin, it has been argued that “nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution,” as Dobzhansky frequently was quoted as saying. It is almost funny to read and hear evolutionary biologists repeating their litany: “We know evolution is true, even though we don’t know how it works, and have never seen it happen!”

Almost four decades ago, for example, the University of California geneticist Richard Goldschmidt, now recognized as a chief forerunner of modern punctuationism, was saying:

Evolution of the animal and plant world is considered by all those entitled to judgment to be a fact

for which no further proof is needed. But in spite of nearly a century of work and discussion there is still no unanimity in regard to the details of the means of evolution.¹³

The last sentence in this quote is a classic understatement. Now, with a new generation of biologists still researching evolutionary mechanisms, there is far less unanimity than at any time since Darwin on not just the details but the entire question of mechanism. One biologist observed, "Today we are less confident and the whole subject is in the most exciting ferment. Evolution is . . . nagged from within by the troubling complexities of genetic and developmental mechanisms and new questions about the central mystery — speciation itself."¹⁴

The above evaluation was written by a professor of biology and dean of the graduate school at Yale University. If the formation of new species is still the central mystery of biology 130 years after Darwin's famous book *The Origin of Species* supposedly had solved the problem, one wonders why evolutionary biologists still persist in believing in evolution at all. Where is the evidence?

Well, today's leading evolutionary spokesman, Dr. Stephen Jay Gould, of Harvard University, has given us the answer: "Indeed, to make the statement even stronger, imperfections are the primary proofs that evolution has occurred, since optimal designs erase all signposts of history."¹⁵ This is an amazing admission. Dr. Gould is the chief advocate of "punctuated equilibrium," the modern form of evolutionary saltationism, the notion that new species form suddenly rather than gradually. Gould is bitterly resentful of creationists, frequently calling

13. R.B. Goldschmidt, "Evolution, as Viewed by One Geneticist," *American Scientist* 40 (Jan. 1952): p. 84.

14. Keith S. Thomson, "The Meanings of Evolution," *American Scientist* 70 (Sept./Oct. 1982): p. 529.

15. Stephen J. Gould, "The Panda's Thumb of Technology," *Natural History* 96 (Jan. 1987): p. 14.

them “yahoos” and other choice terms of ridicule, insisting that evolution is a proven fact of science that no rational person should question.

Yet the best evidence he can offer is that of *imperfections!* The fact that there are some structures in animals that Gould considers “imperfect,” such as the panda’s thumb, is supposed to prove that God could not have designed them — thus, there is no God, and evolution is true! This is arrogant, since Gould merely assumes he knows all about the purpose of these structures. It is almost irrelevant, since the fact that an originally perfect structure deteriorates with time says nothing at all about how it was produced in the first place.

Be that as it may, there is no doubt that the biological sciences today are almost everywhere interpreted and taught in an evolutionary context. There is no scientific proof that vertically upward evolution occurs today, has ever occurred in the past, or is even possible at all, yet it is widely promoted as a proven fact.

The Origin and History of the Earth

The same is true in the earth sciences, especially those bearing on history (geology, archaeology, paleontology, etc.). In spite of the fact that real history, documented by written records, covers only the past few thousand years (since the first dynasty of Egypt, say, or the first king lists in Sumeria), evolutionists inevitably allege that the earth is several billion years old (the current “official” figure is 4.6 billion) and that the early hominids began to evolve from their nonhuman ancestors several million years ago. All such age estimates, of course, have to be based on a number of unprovable assumptions, since actual records have existed only since the invention of the calendar and some form of written language.

The assumptions that are necessary in formulating an earth history are nicely summarized in the following classical

geology textbook treatment: “Lyell [that is, Charles Lyell, the father of historical geology] was imbued with a conviction that present causes solely have operated in the past. More than that, he insisted that they have always acted at the same rate.”¹⁶

That is the famous Lyellian principle of *uniformitarianism* (“the present is the key to the past”). It is nothing but the old philosophy of naturalism, as applied to the study of earth history. Uniformitarianism by itself, however, does not provide a *history*, but only the naturalistic framework within which that history is assumed to have taken place. Since the types of rocks, minerals in the rocks, structural features of the rocks, and all other physical features are the same in every geological “age,” uniformitarianism must be combined with some other principle if the earth sciences are to give a coherent record of chronology and development. For example: “Historic geology relies chiefly on paleontology, the study of fossil organisms. . . . The geologist utilizes knowledge of organic evolution, as preserved in the fossil record, to identify and correlate the lithic records of ancient time.”¹⁷

Thus, naturalistic evolution, or evolutionary uniformitarianism, provides the basic interpretive framework for the earth sciences as well as the life sciences. The key is the fossil record, which supposedly provides the means of identifying the geological ages when the sedimentary rocks containing them were first laid down. That this procedure has not changed since the above was written (or, for that matter, since the days of Lyell and Darwin) is confirmed by the following:

No paleontologist worthy of the name would ever date his fossils by the strata in which they are found. . . . Ever since William Smith at the beginning of the 19th century, fossils have been and still are the best

16. O.D. von Engeln and K.E. Caster, *Geology* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952), p. 25.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 423.

and most accurate method of dating and correlating the rocks in which they occur.¹⁸

Note also the following affirmation of this principle by two outstanding geologists, one in continental Europe, one in the United States:

The only chronometric scale applicable in geologic history for the stratigraphic classification of rocks and for dating geologic events exactly is furnished by the fossils. Owing to the irreversibility of evolution, they offer an unambiguous time-scale for relative age determinations and for worldwide correlations of rocks.¹⁹

Merely in their role as distinctive rock constituents, fossils have furnished, through their record of the evolution of life on this planet, an amazingly effective key to the relative positioning of strata in widely separated regions and from continent to continent.²⁰

This is the fundamental principle upon which modern evolutionary geology still rests.

Such authorities have made it very clear that the supposed record of evolution in the fossil remains of plants and animals, all interpreted in terms of naturalistic formation by normal sedimentary processes of the rocks containing them, is the basic premise in the study of the earth sciences, particularly in

18. Derek Ager, "Fossil Frustrations," *New Scientist* 100 (Nov. 10, 1983): p. 425. Dr. Ager, head of the geology department at Swansea University, Wales, is a past president of the British Geological Association.

19. O.H. Schindewolf, "Comments on Some Stratigraphic Terms," *American Journal of Science* 255 (June 1957): p. 394. Schindewolf, Europe's foremost paleontologist, long anticipated modern punctuationism in paleontology.

20. Hollis D. Hedberg, "The Stratigraphic Panorama," *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America* 72 (April 1961): p. 499; Dr. Hedberg's presidential address at the society's annual meeting.

relation to earth history. Just as in biology, however, evolution and uniformity have simply been *assumed*, not proved! The only real evidences we have of the past go back only the few thousand years of so-called recorded history.

Furthermore, even though the fossil record is interpreted in terms of evolution, there is no evidence of evolution in the fossils themselves, for they all fit neatly into the families, orders, phyla, and other categories of the same classification system used for present-day plants and animals, and these are not evolving! Of course, there are many extinctions revealed in the fossils (e.g., the dinosaurs), but extinction is the polar opposite of evolution! In fact, there have been thousands of species' extinctions during human history, but no new species have evolved. Evolution seems to be going in the wrong direction!

The most significant feature about the fossil record is the utter absence of any true evolutionary transitional forms. Leading paleontologist S.M. Stanley, of John Hopkins, writes, "The known fossil record fails to document a single example of phyletic evolution accomplishing a major morphological transition."²¹ He adds elsewhere: "Evolution happens rapidly in small, localized populations, so we're not likely to see it in the fossil record."²²

Remember also, as Ager has pointed out, that the fossils are not "dated" by the rock strata where they are found. Instead, the rocks are dated by the fossils, on the basis of the stage of evolution they supposedly represent. Thus, without the unproved assumption of evolution, there is not any objective basis for the whole system of geological ages.

In fact, the uniformitarian premise, which — along with evolution — has guided historical interpretations in the earth

21. Steven M. Stanley, *Macroevolution: Pattern and Process* (San Francisco, CA: W.M. Freeman, 1979), p. 39.

22. Steven M. Stanley, "Resetting the Evolutionary Timetable," interview by Neil A. Campbell, *Bioscience* 36 (Dec. 1986): p. 725.

sciences ever since Lyell and Darwin, is itself now being rejected by modern geologists.

Furthermore, much of Lyell's uniformitarianism, specifically his ideas on identity of ancient and modern causes, gradualism, and constancy of rate, has been explicitly refuted by the definitive modern sources as well as by an overwhelming preponderance of evidence that, as substantive theories, his ideas on these matters were simply wrong.²³

In fact, Derek Ager and many other "neo-catastrophist" geologists are now arguing that every geologic formation was produced rapidly and catastrophically, rather than gradually and uniformly. Ager observes, "In other words, the history of any one part of the earth, like the life of a soldier, consists of long periods of boredom and short periods of terror."²⁴

In summary, the earth sciences no less than the life sciences are interpreted and taught everywhere today on the premise of evolution and uniformity. Nevertheless, the real scientific evidence in both domains of science is firmly opposed to evolution. The study of biology shows no evidence whatever of evolution occurring in the present, and the study of geology/paleontology shows no evidence that it ever occurred in the past. Yet most scientists in these fields continue their dogmatic faith in the alleged fact of evolution.

Evolution and the Physical Sciences

Not to be outdone, evolutionists in the physical sciences (especially physics, chemistry, and astronomy) have developed even more fantastic explanations for the evolution of the

23. James H. Shea, "Twelve Fallacies of Uniformitarianism," *Geology* 10 (Sept. 1982): p. 456. Dr. Shea is editor of the *Journal of Geological Education*.

24. Derek Ager, *The Nature of the Stratigraphical Record* (New York: John Wiley, 1981), p. 106–107.

universe, the elements, the stellar heavens, complex molecules, and finally life. The actual evidences supporting these evolutionary speculations, however, are even more illusory than those supporting biological evolution, since they are based on the most indirect sorts of observations.

As noted in the previous section, the present consensus suggests that the entire cosmos suddenly evolved out of nothing, first as an infinitesimal particle of space/time, which proceeded rapidly through an inflationary stage, then through an incredibly hot "big bang," followed by universal expansion into its present form.

In the first moments of the big bang, so the story goes, all the elementary particles of matter evolved, then the simplest of the chemical elements, hydrogen. The energy of the primeval explosion was also able to develop helium, but the heavier elements had to await the evolution of the first stars and their disintegration into supernova explosions. In the meantime, many stars and galaxies somehow evolved from the expanding hydrogen, accumulating by unknown evolutionary pressure into galactic clusters.

The heavier elements generated from supernovas may evolve into planetary systems (although the planets of our own solar system are the only ones actually observed in the universe), and then the complex molecules evolving on some planets may somehow evolve into living cells (but no life forms have yet been observed anywhere in the universe except on earth).

This remarkable pre-biological evolutionary scenario is actually believed in varying degrees by great numbers of PhD astronomers, biochemists, mathematical physicists, and others in the physical sciences. Its "evidence," however, is entirely mathematical, since none of these evolutionary stages have ever been observed, nor could they ever be reproduced in the laboratory.

As far as the origin from non-living chemicals of the first form of life is concerned, the idea that this could have happened by natural processes is completely fanciful, even though schoolchildren everywhere are taught that this happened in the primeval oceanic soup about four billion years ago. The fascinating comments of Sir Fred Hoyle are relevant in this connection:

I don't know how long it is going to be before astronomers generally recognize that the combinatorial arrangement of not even one among the many thousands of biopolymers on which life depends could have been arrived at by natural processes here on the earth. Astronomers will have a little difficulty at understanding this because they will be assured by biologists that it is not so, the biologists having been assured in their turn by others that it is not so. The "others" are a group of persons who believe, quite openly, in mathematical miracles. They advocate the belief that tucked away in nature, outside of normal physics, there is a law which performs miracles (provided the miracles are in the aid of biology). This curious situation sits oddly on a profession that for long has been dedicated to coming up with logical explanations of biblical miracles. . . . It is quite otherwise, however, with the modern mathematical miracle workers, who are always to be found living in the twilight fringes of thermodynamics.²⁵

25. Fred Hoyle, "The Big Bang in Astronomy," *New Scientist* 92 (Nov. 19, 1981): p. 526. Sir Fred has long been recognized as one of the world's top mathematical astrophysicists, author of many books and originator of the once-revered but now abandoned steady state theory of the origin of the universe. An original and unintimidated thinker, he has in recent years incurred the wrath of the scientific establishment because of an increasingly anti-evolutionary attitude.

Sir Fred's reference to thermodynamics is very appropriate. Though every stage of the prebiotic evolutionary scenario goes squarely against the second law of thermodynamics, the assumption is that somehow a "naturalistic miracle" makes this all right. And if miracles are necessary to generate the biopolymers on which life depends, try to comprehend the mathematical marvels by which our modern generation of mathematical astrophysicists can create a universe out of nothing, and then stars and galactic clusters and planets out of hydrogen.

As long as people have been observing the stars, no one has ever seen a star evolve from anything. The stars have always looked exactly as they do now, except for the occasional nova or supernova, which are stars disintegrating — not evolving. Yet these modern miracle workers have developed an extremely complex scheme of nuclear and cosmic evolution, comprehensible only to specialists but imposed on the intimidated public as "scientific fact."

In an important review article, Steven Wienberg, a leading astrophysicist, makes a number of important admissions to this effect:

Among the most important relics are the structures we see in the sky: many stars are grouped into clusters, the clusters themselves along with loose stars like our sun are grouped into galaxies, and the galaxies themselves are grouped into clusters of galaxies. A second great disappointment of astrophysics has been that we still do not have a clear and detailed understanding of how these structures were formed. We do not even know whether the smaller structures formed first and then coalesced into the larger ones, or whether the larger structures formed first and then broke up into smaller ones. . . . It is also a bit disturbing that all these estimates of the ages and compositions of the

stars rest on elaborate calculations of what is going on inside them, but all that we observe is that light emitted from their surfaces.²⁶

The contradiction is between the concept of an evolving universe and the famous second law of thermodynamics. Along with the first law (mass-energy conservation), it constitutes the best-proved and most universal laws of science, and is summarized in these words by the famous British astronomer Paul Davies:

For the past century, scientists have discussed the question of cosmological order in the context of the laws of thermodynamics. According to the second law, the Universe is inexorably degenerating, sliding irreversibly towards a state of maximum entropy, or chaos. Yet the facts flatly contradict this image of a dying Universe. Far from sliding *toward* a featureless state, the Universe is progressing *from* featurelessness to states of greater organization and complexity. This cosmic progress defines a global arrow of time that points the opposite way to the thermodynamic arrow.²⁷

Apparently Davies himself does not believe in a personal God, but he has used the term *miracle* to describe the unknown factors that presumably have overcome the second law to produce increased complexity. He speaks of the “‘miracle’ of life,”²⁸ for example, and the “miracle of the big bang.”²⁹ His explanation

26. Steven Weinberg, “Origins,” *Science* 230 (Oct. 4, 1985): p. 16.

27. Paul Davies, “The Creative Cosmos,” *New Scientist* 116 (Dec. 17, 1987): p. 41–42. Dr. Davies is professor of theoretical physics at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 44.

29. Paul Davies, “Universe in Reverse: Can Time Run Backwards?” *Second Look* (Sept. 1979): p. 27.

of these phenomena is neither that of supernatural creation nor the standard equivocations of the scientific establishment. Like a number of other New Age scientists, he tries to think in terms of complex systems, networks, and non-linear periodicities that somehow might generate order out of chaos.

In recent years, in fact, a number of scientists in various fields have tried to develop theories that might explain how to overcome the second law of thermodynamics and bring higher complexity out of lower. These theories are highly speculative, however, and do not really solve any of the problems of evolution at all, either at the level of the primeval big bang or at that of forming more complex species out of lower. So far as all scientific *observations* go, the second law is still universal in its effects, and the only way a more complex system of any kind can be produced is by an input of specific creative intelligence and directed energy, never by mere chaotically pulsating fields, as modern “self-organization” theoreticians seem to think.

Davies suggests, for example, that a showpiece of self-organization is “the astonishing ability of an embryo to develop from a single strand of DNA, via an exquisitely well-orchestrated sequence of formative steps, into an exceedingly complex organism.”³⁰

How is it that such a brilliant scientist as Davies can believe that this marvelous process is an example of chaos generating order? Does he really think that the intricately complex genetic code, as well as the other complex energy-directing programs in the simplest living cell, somehow organized themselves in the primeval chaos of chemical elements to produce the first DNA molecule and all the necessary accessories for the first and simplest living system?

The same types of questions apply to every other supposed evolutionary step in pre-biological evolution — and also in biological evolution, for that matter. The universe is

30. Davies, “The Creative Cosmos,” p. 42.

not “progressing from featurelessness to states of greater organization and complexity,” as Davies and other evolutionary mathematicians fantasize. It is running down — at every observable level — toward chaos, as stipulated by the scientific laws of thermodynamics. Local and temporary increases in complexity are only possible when driven by designed programs and directed energies, neither of which is possessed by the purely speculative notion of vertically upward evolution.

Yet cosmic evolution, stellar evolution, and chemical evolution are all taught as fact today in the physical sciences, and further speculation in these fields is continually being funded by massive grants of tax money. All the hard data in the earth sciences show it did not occur in the past, and all the genuine data in the physical sciences show it is not possible at all. Nevertheless, evolution is almost universally accepted as a fact in all the natural sciences.

Creationists do not reject the actual, factual data of any of these sciences. They are all legitimate sciences (the founding fathers of which, incidentally, were almost all creationists!), and they have contributed immeasurably to our knowledge about God’s created world and

Creationists do not reject the actual, factual data of any of these sciences.

our ability to use its resources for man’s benefit. All of the real data of these sciences can be understood much better in the context of creationism. It is the evolutionary framework in which they are taught and the evolutionary premises upon which they are built that ought to be rejected by true Christians — in fact, by all genuine theists as well as true scientists.

Human Behavior in the Light of Evolution

There is probably no academic field of study and application more thoroughly saturated with evolutionary thinking

than psychology and the other fields dealing with human behavior. Ever since Darwin — and especially since Freud — psychologists have assumed that man is merely an evolved animal and have evaluated his behavior problems on an animalistic basis. Experiments with monkeys or other animals (even with insects) are used for guidance in dealing with human problems.

This approach is wrong because man is not an “animal.” He did not evolve from other life forms but was created in the image of God, with an eternal soul. Ironically, “psychology” means “study of the soul,” but modern psychologists do not even believe in the soul.

Sigmund Freud is generally considered to be the founder of modern psychology. Although many of his ideas are no longer accepted by psychologists of the present day, he has surely exerted more influence over the theory and practice in this field than any other single individual. It has always been known that Freud was an ardent follower of Darwin, but this has been even more emphasized by the recent discovery of certain papers left by him. D. Goleman writes:

In a 1915 paper, Freud demonstrates his preoccupation with evolution. Immersed in the theories of Darwin and of Lamarck, who believed acquired traits could be inherited, Freud concluded that mental disorders were the vestiges of behavior that had been appropriate in earlier stages of evolution.³¹

This latter notion is itself a vestige of the infamous “recapitulation theory” of the ardent Darwinian racist Ernst Haeckel, the philosophical forerunner of Adolf Hitler in Germany. Goleman continues, “The evolutionary idea that Freud relied on most heavily in the manuscript is the maxim that ‘ontogeny

31. Daniel Goleman, “Lost Paper Shows Freud’s Effort to Link Analysis and Evolution,” *New York Times*, Feb. 10, 1987, p. 19.

recapitulates phylogeny,' that is, that the development of the individual recapitulates the evolution of the entire species."³²

The bitter fruit of the recapitulation theory (long since discredited scientifically) continued to grow in many areas of society, and we shall return to it in other connections later. In this connection here, however, since Lamarckianism, Darwinism, and Haeckelism are all dead wrong scientifically, it cannot be surprising that Freudian methods of psychoanalysis and treatment of supposed mental disorders are not only wrong but commonly harmful as well.

In fact, most modern psychologists have now disavowed Freud, even though they have built on his foundation. They, of course, still operate completely within an evolutionary framework, regarding man as merely an evolved animal, with animal problems and animal solutions. A large majority are atheists or pantheists, whether J.B. Watson with his behaviorism, B.F. Skinner with his humanistic psychology (neo-behaviorism), Carl Rogers, Jung, Adler, or a host of other leaders in the counseling field.

In fact, so committed to evolutionism are most modern psychologists and philosophers (with whom they have a close kinship) that they now tend to regard biblical Christianity itself — especially creationism — as a form of mental disorder. In fact, any form of religion is considered by many evolutionists to be unhealthy, a vestige of sociological pressures in the animal societies from which they claim humans developed. Dr. Edward Wilson of Harvard, a leader in this kind of study, has said:

When we understand the evolutionary sources, the adaptive meaning, and the genetic history of the religious impulse, I suspect that fatal blow will have been dealt to religious dogmatism, and yet it

32. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

will simultaneously disclose a human history and a set of mental phenomena so complex as to serve as a permanent source of wonder.³³

It surely would be a cause of “wonder” that the complex human brain and its “mental phenomena” have somehow evolved out of the “socio-biological” relationships in animal societies, as Wilson believes. His attitude (as a one-time Southern Baptist turned evolutionary entomologist) toward biblical Christianity is as follows: “Bitter experience has taught us that fundamentalist religion . . . in its aggressive form is one of the unmitigated evils of the world.”³⁴

Wilson regrets that fundamentalism “cannot be quickly replaced by benign skepticism and a purely humanistic worldview, even among educated and well-meaning people” and would obviously be in favor of any measures that would eradicate this “unmitigated evil,” a goal he believes is currently precluded by the strength of “dogmatic religions and religion-like political ideologies.” But he does hold out hope and an effective weapon to his fellow atheists: “Liberal theology can serve as a buffer.”³⁵

It is not surprising that “liberal” churches and other religious institutions are more and more turning away from genuine biblical studies and theology, and becoming more and more enamored of psychology and counseling. This is even true of evangelical institutions. Increasing proportions of seminary students are majoring in counseling, and there are no doubt a number of excellent Christian counselors and

33. Edward O. Wilson, “Toward a Humanistic Biology,” *The Humanist* 42 (Sept./Oct. 1982): p. 56.

34. Edward O. Wilson, “The Relation of Science to Theology,” *Zygon* (Sept./Dec. 1980). This paper was presented at a conference co-sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Institute of Religion in an Age of Science.

35. *Ibid.*

psychologists today. The field as a whole, however, is saturated with evolutionary thinking.

The general attitude of leaders in the behavioral sciences toward Christianity is indicated still further by the following pronouncements (both emanating from Canada):

That people in our age can believe that they have had a personal encounter with God, that they could believe that they have experienced conversion through a “mystical experience of God,” so that they are born again in the Holy Spirit, is something that attests to human irrationality and a lack of a sense of reality.³⁶

I want you to entertain the hypothesis that Christian doctrine, the existential soother par excellence, is incompatible with the principles of sound mental health and contributes more to the genesis of human suffering than to its alleviation. . . . In my view, all religions are inhuman anachronisms, but here I am only dealing with Christianity and, more specifically, with the noxious nature of Christian doctrine at the personal and interpersonal levels.³⁷

From the perspective of the Bible, of course, arrogant pseudo-intellectuals such as these are the ones who are mentally ill. “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools” (Rom. 1:22). It surely does seem, at least to those who eschew counseling from unregenerate humanists, that psychologists, psychiatrists, and philosophers exhibit far more personal problems in their own lives than their numbers warrant. Some in

36. Kai Nielsen, “Religiosity and Powerlessness,” *The Humanist* 37 (May/June 1977): p. 46. Nielsen is professor of philosophy at the University of Calgary.

37. Wendell W. Watters, “Christianity and Mental Health,” *The Humanist* 47 (Nov./Dec. 1987): p. 5. Watters is clinical professor of psychiatry at McMaster University.

their own profession have noted this phenomenon. One observer writes:

The average psychiatrist has more power to do harm in the lives of individuals than most religious leaders on Earth. . . . Moreover, it would be hard to find a more unhappy lot than those clustered in the mental health field. Especially among psychiatrists, suicide, depression, drug addiction, and alcoholism are notoriously rife. Among non-medical mental health professionals, the situation doesn't seem much better. Not only are many mental health professionals unhappy but they do not live ethically inspired lives. Too many, for example, prostrate themselves before the psychiatric establishment.³⁸

The author of this evaluation, Peter Breggin, is a practicing psychiatrist and is evidently a humanist himself, so his opinion carries special weight. If he is right, anyone who would go get psychological or psychiatric counseling, as the cliché puts it, “ought to have his head examined”!

The Bible, on the other hand, is filled with practical wisdom for daily living in every aspect of life. It has worked in the lives of uncounted millions for thousands of years. A truly *biblical* system of psychology and counseling is being developed and practiced by a few Christian specialists in these fields, and this holds great promise. On the whole, however, the whole area of the behavior sciences today is thoroughly dominated by evolutionary humanism, and this has resulted in incalculable harm.

Human behavior problems do not stem from an animal ancestry, as Freud and most others in these fields have alleged, but from *sin* — from rebellion against God and His Word.

38. Peter R. Breggin, “Mental Health Versus Religion,” *The Humanist* 47 (Nov./Dec. 1987): p. 13.

Men and women are not mere animalistic assemblages of biological components. Each person has an eternal soul, destined for heaven or hell, and this must be of primary consideration in any successful psychological formula.

There are evidently some personality disorders, however, that have a direct physical cause, genetic or chemical. These should be treated medically or physiologically, rather than psychologically. The field of Bible-based Christian psychiatry is important and promising in this connection.

Even here, however, a word of caution is in order. Although some notable specialists *do* believe in the soul, it is not necessarily the biblical doctrine. Sir John Eccles, for example, was an outstanding research psychiatrist, winner of a Nobel Prize in 1963, and he was strongly committed to the concept of immortality of the soul. “Eccles strongly defends the ancient religious belief that human beings consist of a mysterious compound of physical matter and intangible spirit.”³⁹ Well and good — so far. But read further:

Eccles is not the only world-famous scientist taking a controversial new look at the ancient mind-body conundrum. From Berkeley to Paris, and from London to Princeton, prominent scientists from fields as diverse as neurophysiology and quantum physics are coming out of the closet and admitting they believe in the possibility, at least, of such unscientific entities as the immortal human spirit and divine creation.⁴⁰

Eccles did believe in the “divine creation” of each “immortal spirit,” but in a pantheistic context, not in the biblical sense. This “new look at the ancient mind-body conundrum” is not new at all. Sir John and certain scientists at Princeton, Berkeley,

39. John Gliedman, “Scientists in Search of the Soul,” *Science Digest* 90 (July 1982): p. 77.

40. *Ibid.*

and other institutions are giving a scientific perspective to the so-called New Age movement, which is as active in the psychological professions as anywhere. But all of this, in essence, is a revival of ancient intellectual pantheism.

Breggin has also commented on this: "At annual and regional meetings of the Association for Humanistic Psychology, we are more likely to find yoga sessions and Sufi dancing than psychotherapy seminars. The latest fad is reducing the science of physics to metaphysics and spirituality."⁴¹

In summary, modern psychology and other behavioral sciences are firmly based in evolutionary humanism. A growing number of its practitioners are involved in New Age pantheism, although most are evidently still committed to old-fashioned evolutionary atheism. In either case, evolutionism provides the pseudo-scientific base and framework of interpretation.

Evolution and Society

The social sciences, no less than the behavioral sciences, are firmly committed to evolutionism as their intellectual rationale. For that matter, psychology itself is often considered a social science, since human societies are made up of human individuals. Sociology, therefore, is essentially the study of group psychology.

As noted previously, one of the current fads in evolutionary thinking is that of "sociobiology," as developed and promoted especially by the followers of Edward O. Wilson, professor of entomology at Harvard University. The results of Wilson's studies of the "social insects," in particular, have been applied to human societies. This is evolutionism with a vengeance! But let Wilson himself explain:

From the viewpoint of the biological sciences, sociobiology is very orthodox, because it has been

41. Breggin, "Mental Health Versus Religion," p. 12.

based cautiously on population genetics, ecology, and evolutionary theory and is a new amalgam or body of evolutionary theory. . . . Above all, sociobiology is the scientific discipline most congenial to humanism.⁴²

It is worth noting, incidentally, that the origin of these complex insect societies (ants, bees, etc.), which sociobiologists consider so instructive for human sociology, is utterly mysterious. Pierre Grasse, certainly one of the most knowledgeable of all evolutionary biologists, frankly admits: "We are in the dark concerning the origin of insects."⁴³ Even if we could rationally attribute the structure of human societies to an origin in the insect world (which is absurd!), this would not help, since we have no idea how *these* arose. Yet most social scientists persist in trying to solve human societal problems by appeal to evolutionary theory. No wonder human societies are in such a mess!

Sociobiology represents one of the most recent applications of evolutionism to the social sciences. However, these disciplines (which include not only sociology as such but also such derivative fields as economics, social psychology, cultural anthropology, political science, and others) have been dominated by evolutionary thinking since their very beginnings. Most authorities identify the French positivist/atheist August Comte as the father of sociology in the modern sense.

Comte died in 1857 at the relatively young age of 59 and had been insane for a time, even attempting suicide on one occasion. He was profoundly egotistic, claiming not only to have invented the true science of society, which he insisted

42. Wilson, "Toward a Humanistic Biology," 42, p. 41.

43. Pierre P. Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms* (New York: Academic, 1977), p. 30.

followed the same kinds of laws as the “positive” sciences of physics and chemistry, but also to have formulated what he called the true religion of humanity. Comte’s political system envisioned an all-powerful state enforcing these supposed laws, and his positivistic philosophy had great influence on both Karl Marx and Herbert Spencer. His scientific philosophy was structured around the pre-Darwinian evolutionary concept known as the Great Chain of Being.

Herbert Spencer is generally reputed as second in importance only to Comte in the founding of modern sociology. Both Marx and Spencer also became profoundly committed to Darwinism. It is ironic that these two bitterly anti-Christian philosophers, both followers of Comte and both promoters of Darwin, became the founders of two sociological systems that have been competing ever since. Marx was the father of the left-wing sociological system known as “communism,” while Spencer became the main founder of the right-wing sociological system known ever since as “social Darwinism.”

The sociological and political systems proposed by Comte and Spencer — not to mention Marx — have been profoundly influential all over the world and, of course, are thoroughly saturated with evolutionary philosophy. Herbert Spencer was almost as effective as Thomas Huxley in promoting Darwinism in England and the United States. He was a doctrinaire evolutionist even before Darwin became one, in fact, and coined the phrase “survival of the fittest” as the famous watchword characterizing Darwinism. Spencer even wrote a biological treatise and could well have laid claim to anticipating Darwin on many points. As one observer commented:

In his own day, which was that of Darwin, too, Spencer was regarded as a giant, and his *Principles*

of Biology was adduced as one of the chief evidences for this high estimation. . . . Spencer's preliminary essays were published some time before *The Origin of Species*.⁴⁴

In any case, Herbert Spencer has long been recognized as the father of modern sociology, especially as it was developed and taught for almost a century in England and America. It has been noted, "Undoubtedly the most potent influences contributing to the rise and development of truly historical sociology were Spencer's theory of cosmic evolution and the Darwinian doctrine of organic evolution and their reactions upon social science."⁴⁵ The author of this evaluation was one of the leading sociologists of the 20th century.

One of the major sociological emphases of the late 19th century, continuing on until about World War II, was the "science" of eugenics:

Darwinism spawned many outshoots. One of these was launched by Darwin's first cousin, Francis Galton.

Obsessed, as were many, by the implications of the "fittest," Galton set out in 1883 to study heredity from a mathematical viewpoint. He named his new science *eugenics*, from a Greek root meaning both "good in birth" and "noble in heredity." His stated goal was to improve the human race, by giving "the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable." His unstated goal was to play God.⁴⁶

44. George Kimball Plochmann, "Darwin or Spencer?" *Science* 130 (Nov. 27, 1959): p. 1452.

45. Harry Elmer Barnes, *Historical Sociology* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948), p. 13.

46. Otto Scott, "Playing God," *Chalcedon Report*, no. 247 (Feb. 1986): p. 1.

The famous (but fallacious) stories of the dismal genetic heredity of the “Jukes and Kallikaks” were conveyed to generations of schoolchildren all across the country (including this writer) until the pseudo-science of eugenics fell out of favor when Adolf Hitler applied it so viciously in Germany. “Scientific” racism was quite common, in fact, among practically all the leading sociologists and anthropologists of the West before Hitler gave it such a bad name with his programs for promoting Aryan/Teutonic racial supremacy.

The evolutionary basis of racism, however, as well as that of communism, Nazism, and laissez-faire capitalism, will be discussed and documented more fully in the next chapter. For the moment, simply be aware that the social sciences, from their very beginnings, have been polluted by evolutionism.

Even the Humanities!

Scholars dedicated to promoting what they call a true “liberal arts” education often decry any great emphasis on science and the technical professions in the nation’s schools and colleges. They speak of a clash between the “two cultures,” arguing that young people should be taught more of how to live than how to make a living, with the implication that this can be accomplished by more dedication to the humanities (literature, history, linguistics, philosophy, ethics, law, classics) and the fine arts (music, art, dance).

The fact is, however, that these disciplines are also permeated with evolutionary humanism and becoming more so all the time. In fact, the very term *humanities* is almost synonymous today with *humanism*, as popularly understood. Modern humanism is based squarely on evolutionism, of course, though not necessarily Darwinian evolution. Humanist Paul Kurtz writes: “Humanism is a philosophical, religious, and moral point of view as old as human civilization itself. It has its roots in classical China, Greece, and Rome; it is expressed

in the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, in the scientific revolution, and in the twentieth century.”⁴⁷

It is significant that practically all the literature studied in high school and college classrooms today is humanistic in tone. For example, the supposedly exemplary literary collection known as “The Great Books of the Western World” could just as well be called “The Great Humanistic Books of the Western World.” The listing contains almost none of the great Christian classics nor any of the great volumes of biblical exposition or Christian apologetics, but is replete with all the great classics of humanistic thought and purpose. The books that touch on religion at all tend to promote either paganism or deism or, at best, unitarianism and Christian liberalism. Many, of course, are overtly evolutionistic, including Darwin’s *On The Origin of Species*.

Many liberal arts scholars would contend that studies in the humanities and fine arts produce graduates who are “cultured” and “sensitive,” but this is not necessarily so. In a key address given over 30 years ago by June Goodfield (a scholar working in both science and the humanities) to a combined meeting of the American Association for Advancement of Science and the Phi Beta Kappa Society (devoted to scholarship in the humanities), the following cogent observations were made:

In the attempt to humanize ourselves, to enhance our ethical and moral sensibilities, people have often appealed to the humanities to do it for us, almost as

47. Paul Kurtz, preface to the re-publication of *Humanist Manifestos I and II*; booklet distributed by the American Humanist Association, Buffalo, New York. *Humanist Manifesto I*, first issued in 1933, when the American Humanist Association was incorporated in Illinois, contains the famous “Tenets of Humanism,” the first two of which are statements of faith in cosmic and human evolution, as the foundational premises of humanism. *Humanist Manifesto II*, published 40 years later (1973), reaffirmed the completely naturalistic basis of humanism.

to an ideology. The redemptive power of the humanities to produce an enlarged consciousness, to make us aware of the reality of the human predicament, and to enlarge our sympathies has been an important theme in Wordsworth, in Shelley, and in many twentieth-century writers. I am skeptical about this assumption. People can be extraordinarily sensitive to music and poetry and not necessarily apply this sensitivity to their daily lives. George Steiner . . . has reminded us that people returned from a day's work as guards in the concentration camps and then put Mozart on their gramophones. . . . We must not delude ourselves into believing that words and university courses are a substitute for human hearts and human actions.⁴⁸

Dr. Goodfield also made the following rather plaintive plea in concluding her address: "Now is very much the right time — is it not? — when we may use old-fashioned words such as 'morality' and 'honor' without being sneered at."⁴⁹ Judging from the rapidly increasing decadence and amorality of modern literature in the last three decades — not to mention increasing commitments to atheism in the general intellectual establishments — her words produced little effect.

Not only in literature, but also in history and the other humanities — especially philosophy — evolutionary humanism reigns supreme today. The increasingly radical, almost nihilistic character of modern art and music is of great concern everywhere.

Consider also the fields of ethics and law. These fields, relating so directly to the principles that ought to guide human attitudes and actions, were long governed primarily (at least in Western civilization) by biblical standards and precepts.

48. June Goodfield, "Humanity in Science," *Key Reporter* (Phi Beta Kappa, Summer 1957): p. 3.

49. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

The original colonies of the United States, in particular, were founded mainly by men and women seeking freedom to practice biblical religion as they understood it. These principles lie strongly in the background of the writing of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, especially the Bill of Rights.

Our nation's original schools and colleges were founded for the very purpose of promulgating and transmitting to future generations these timeless moral, ethical, and spiritual guidelines for thought and action. Almost all historians and other scholars have agreed on these facts — until very recently, when revisionism in history has suddenly come in vogue. The Bible and its principles have certainly been the foundational framework for law and ethics in the past.

Not so today! Morals and ethics — and thus law as well — are considered to be products of evolution. Therefore, morality and ethics must continue to evolve in accord with the changing social environment, and so must the law and even the interpretation of the Constitution. With respect to the principles of ethics, here is the dictum of two leading thinkers, philosopher Michael Ruse and biologist Edward O. Wilson: “Attempts to link evolution and ethics first sprang up in the middle of the last century, as people turned to alternative foundations in response to what they perceived as the collapse of Christianity.”⁵⁰

These authors are certainly not the first to expound evolutionary theories of ethics. Thomas Huxley wrote a famous essay on this subject back in the early days of Darwin-mania.⁵¹ So did John Dewey, the noted architect of American

50. Michael Ruse and Edward O. Wilson, “Evolution and Ethics,” *New Scientist* 208 (Oct. 17, 1985): p. 50. Dr. Ruse is professor of philosophy at a Canadian university, a very prolific writer and defender of neo-Darwinism. Dr. Wilson, the previously discussed founder of sociobiology, is at Harvard.

51. Thomas Henry Huxley, “Evolution and Ethics,” 1894.

public education, at the turn of the century.⁵² The eminent British anthropologist Sir Arthur Keith wrote an entire book on the subject just after World War II.⁵³ Many others have expounded the same theme, so that it is now commonly taught just about everywhere that man's moral nature, no less than his physiological structure, is the product of blind evolution. Ruse and Wilson comment:

Morality, or more strictly our belief in morality, is merely an adaptation put in place to further our reproductive ends. . . . Ethics is seen to have a solid foundation, not in divine guidance, but in the shared qualities of human nature and the desperate need for reciprocity.⁵⁴

Just how all this may have happened has been the object of some remarkable evolutionary fantasizing. Note the following just-so stories, invented by other atheistic scholars:

This truly "old-time religion" developed at the end of the last Ice Age, when the tribe was the largest human grouping maintaining any degree of coherence. The religion of the Old Testament is a cultural fossil held over from the Pleistocene Epoch, and it reflects an atmosphere of intense intergroup competition. Petrified like the bones in a paleontologist's cabinet, the greatest ideas of the Ice Age still can be found on display between Genesis and Malachi.⁵⁵

52. John Dewey, "Evolution and Ethics," *The Monist* 8 (1897–1901), later republished in *Scientific Monthly* (Feb. 1954): p. 66.

53. Arthur Keith, *Evolution and Ethics* (New York: Putnam, 1947).

54. Ruse and Wilson, "Evolution and Ethics," p. 51–52.

55. Frank R. Zindler, "Religion, Hypnosis and Music: An Evolutionary Perspective," *American Atheist* 26 (Oct. 1984): p. 22. Zindler is former chairman of the science division at the Fulton-Montgomery campus of the State University of New York.

For what religious man came eventually to think of as “conscience” is simply the faculty that enabled his hominid ancestors to inhibit their programmed responses to stimuli in the interests of some longer-term advantage. “Guilt” is the unease that accompanies and sometimes motivates that control, and “god” is the idealist projection of the conscience in moral terms.⁵⁶

Perhaps the most distressing evidence of the dominance of modern life and thought by evolutionism, however, is the fact that modern institutional Christianity itself has largely accepted evolution and reinterpreted the Bible and theology to fit it. Departments of philosophy and religion in secular universities have largely become completely humanistic, either atheistic or pantheistic. In Christian colleges and seminaries, especially in the mainline denominations, theistic evolution is all but universally accepted, with the early chapters of Genesis dismissed as spiritual allegories. This undermining of Christianity’s foundations in Genesis has inevitably led to “liberalization” of the rest of the Bible in many of these institutions, explaining away the miracles of the Bible and the traditional authorship of its 66 books.

As far as Christianity was concerned, the advent of the theory of evolution and the elimination of traditional theological thinking was catastrophic. The suggestion that life and man are the result of chance is incompatible with the biblical assertion of their being the direct result of intelligent creative activity. Despite the attempt by liberal theology to disguise the point, the fact is that no biblically derived religion can really

56. John M. Allegro, “Divine Discontent,” *American Atheist* 28 (Sept. 1986): p. 26. Allegro is best known as a member of the Dead Sea Scrolls editing team.

be compromised with the fundamental assertion of Darwinian theory. Chance and design are antithetical concepts, and the decline in religious belief can probably be attributed more to the propagation and advocacy by the intellectual and scientific community of the Darwinian version of evolution than to any other single factor.⁵⁷

The general apostasy of institutional Christianity is further documented in chapter 3, and it could easily be shown that this is primarily because of the belief by theologians that science had “proved” evolution. Once the historicity of Genesis is abandoned in a church or school (and this is what evolution requires), it is inevitable that the whole structure of supernatural Christianity will eventually collapse in the teachings of that institution.

The seminaries and colleges of the major denominations (Catholic, Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Reformed, Congregations, Disciples, etc.) have almost all been committed to evolution for many, many years, some since soon after publication of Darwin’s *Origin* in 1859. Nevertheless, in almost all of these denominations there are still significant numbers of creationists among their members; these have, in some cases, even started creationist schools of their own. The latter, however, are never recognized by the denominational hierarchies but are invariably opposed by them.

Today, many of the schools of the smaller, evangelical denominations, as well as many of the originally sound non-denominational schools, are again in the process of compromising with evolution, thus beginning again the oft-traveled slide down into apostasy. Some have descended into full-fledged

57. Michael Denton, *Evolution — A Theory in Crisis* (London: Burnett Books, 1985), p. 66. Denton, an Australian researcher in molecular genetics, is not a creationist but has an incisively critical understanding of evolutionism.

theistic evolution; some are still at the day-age theory or gap theory stage; others are trying to ignore the whole issue. But all are in real danger of eventual apostasy unless they return soon to true creationist convictions.

The sad truth is that all the humanities — including ethics and religion — are today saturated with evolutionary humanism, even in most ostensibly Christian schools. This is a truly amazing latter-day phenomenon, especially in view of the complete absence of any real scientific evidence for evolution. (There is an explanation for this situation, but it must be deferred until chapter 6.)

Evolutionary Education and the Schools

Not only is the content of modern education (natural sciences, social sciences, humanities) dominated by evolutionism, but so is its very philosophy and even its methodology. The absolute reign of evolution in America's public schools is one of the most remarkable phenomena of modern life. The socialist Jeremy Rifkin acknowledges this: "Evolutionary theory has been enshrined as the centerpiece of our educational system, and elaborate walls have been erected around it to protect it from unnecessary abuse."⁵⁸

It was not always like this. It is well known that the original schools and colleges of this country were all church-related, firmly committed to the Bible as the Word of God. The very first school was in the Jamestown colony, taught by a pastor and ship chaplain. Similar church-controlled community schools were soon established in all the colonies.

The same was true of the nation's first colleges. Harvard, Yale, Brown, Princeton, Dartmouth, Pennsylvania, and others were established primarily to promote and transmit true education in the context of biblical Christianity to future generations. Gradually, however, deism and unitarianism infiltrated

58. Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny* (New York: Viking, 1983), p. 112.

the colonies, especially in New England, undermining the supernatural aspects of Christianity, even though there was still a commitment to the concept of a personal transcendent God who had created all things in the beginning. Pre-Darwinian evolutionism also made its impact, especially the idea of “long ages.” This belief of the ancient pagan religions was re-introduced into England by Hutton, Playfair, and Lyell and was soon being promoted in this country, even by such creationist geologists as Agassiz, Silliman, and Dana. Also, the famous “nebular hypothesis” for the evolutionary origin of the solar system, introduced in continental Europe by Kant and LaPlace, made numerous American converts, including the leading Christian biologist Asa Gray, who would soon become Darwin’s main propagandist in the United States.

In *Creation by Natural Law*, Ronald Numbers demonstrates that the scientific and religious establishments had accepted a naturalistic theory of the origin of the solar system decades before the *Origin of Species*.

Acceptance of the nebular hypothesis had become sufficiently entrenched that Asa Gray, appealing for Darwinian evolution in the 1860s, pointed to the hypothesis as an analogy in organic development for the organic development of species. . . .

The nebular hypothesis was one element in a growing scientific culture in which secular naturalism broadly prepared the way for Darwinism.⁵⁹

Nevertheless, because of the strong Christian and biblical tradition in America, evolutionism did not capture the schools

59. Ronald C. Tobey, “New Ideas in America” (review of *Creation by Natural Law* by Ronald L. Numbers, University of Washington Press, 1977), *Science* 197 (Sept. 2, 1977): p. 977. Dr. Numbers is professor of the history of science and medicine at the University of Wisconsin.

here as rapidly as it did in England. Horace Mann, a Unitarian legislator in Massachusetts, had been able to get the first public schools established in 1837, and other states quickly followed. However, these public schools themselves continued to teach creationism and other Christian truths for many years.

There is no need to discuss in detail the various steps by which our schools were all gradually taken over by evolutionary humanism. This has been done with compelling clarity by others.⁶⁰ The end result has been that — apart from miraculous divine intervention — the public schools, as well as all the secular colleges and universities, have been irretrievably lost.

The latter were the first to go. Perhaps the key event was the appointment of Charles W. Eliot as president of Harvard University in 1869, a post he retained for 40 years. Eliot not only was a prominent Unitarian, but had spent several years in Europe studying science and educational philosophy, returning a convinced evolutionist. He appointed John Fiske, another prominent Unitarian, to teach science and history at Harvard, specifically to introduce and popularize evolutionism in the Harvard curriculum. This goal was also furthered by the evolutionary teachings of the aforementioned Asa Gray in botany, also at Harvard. Gray, a Presbyterian, made this transition easier by espousing theistic evolution as a valid option for Christians.

As America's leading university, Harvard became the example to others, and almost the entire university world quickly followed her down the evolutionary trail. The extension of evolutionary dominance to the public schools, however, required first that the teachers in these schools also become committed to evolutionism, and this took much longer to accomplish.

60. Particular reference might be made to two books by Samuel L. Blumenfeld, *Is Public Education Necessary?* (Greenwich, CN: Devin-Adair Co., 1981), 286 p.; and *NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education* (Boise, ID: Paradigm, 1984), 284 p.

During the period from 1838 to 1845, Horace Mann, with the aid of many powerful Unitarian colleagues in Massachusetts, was able to establish a number of "normal schools" for the training of that state's public school teachers. These were copied in other states, and it was not long before each state exercised much control over the education of virtually all its children, through its state university and its various teacher-training colleges.

It was not until the 20th century, however, that the educators really gained a high degree of control over curricular content and textbooks. Until then, American schools were mostly still rural establishments, with locally elected school boards and textbooks, especially famous McGuffey Readers that were still fundamentally sound.

The formation of teachers' associations in the various states led in 1857 to the establishment of the National Education Association (NEA), which has now become probably the most powerful labor union in the country. Its membership includes not only teachers but also administrators, book publishers, suppliers, and, in fact, anyone interested in advancing the goals of the association, which are now at least as much political as educational.

The influence of Massachusetts — particularly Harvard University — has permeated public education ever since its beginnings. Mann and his fellow Unitarians, later followed by Eliot, Fiske, and others, were all profoundly influenced by the Prussian school system and Hegelian philosophy. The former was highly centralized and government controlled. The latter was pantheistic and humanistic, though still somewhat idealistic.

When Darwinism took over, about 1870, the metaphysical idealism of Hegel was soon replaced by blatant materialism and even atheism in the colleges and universities and among the leadership in the teachers' colleges and educational hierarchies — even if not yet among the teachers and textbooks.

There were many key people involved in the eventual complete takeover by the evolutionary humanists, but the most important of all, undoubtedly, was John Dewey. Born in 1859 (the year Darwin published his *Origin*), Dewey had a long and profoundly influential career. Under the tutelage of ardent evolutionist James Hall at John Hopkins University, he also became profoundly committed to evolutionism — biologically, psychologically, and sociologically. Dewey's greatest influence was as head of the uniquely influential teachers' colleges at the University of Chicago and (especially) at Columbia University. From these and other institutions influenced by them have come many of the key leaders in the educational establishment throughout most of the 20th century.

John Dewey is generally conceded to be the chief founder and promulgator of the “progressive education movement,” which has profoundly changed education not only in America but also in many other countries. One observer has commented:

An absolute faith in science became the driving force behind the progressives. . . . The most important idea that would influence the educators was that of evolution — the notion that man, through a process of natural selection, had evolved to his present state from a common animal ancestry. Evolution was as sharp a break with the Biblical view of creation as anyone could make, and it was quickly picked up by those anxious to disprove the validity of orthodox religion.⁶¹

The underlying assumption of progressive education was that the child is simply an evolved animal and must be trained as such — not as an individual created in God's image with tremendous potential as an individual. A child was considered

61. Samuel L. Blumenfeld, *NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education* (Boise, ID: Paradigm, 1984), p. 43.

but one member in a group and therefore must be trained collectively to fit into his or her appropriate place in society. Dewey studied Russia's educational system extensively and was a socialist himself, as well as a materialistic pantheist.

To some degree the progressive education philosophy espoused by Dewey — like the behavior psychology based on animal experimentation that he also espoused — has failed and is repudiated today. Nevertheless, its evolutionistic base is more strongly entrenched than ever in our public schools.

Although the progressive-education movement was being promoted and consolidated during the early 1900s, this was delayed by the interruption of World War I and then by the fundamentalist revival accompanying and following the war. It was then greatly encouraged in the aftermath of the Tennessee Scopes Trial of 1925, when the university world, the education hierarchy, and the thoroughly indoctrinated journalists of the day, in a scenario carefully orchestrated by the American Civil Liberties Union, managed to make the creationist fundamentalists and their spokesman, William Jennings Bryan, look ignorant and foolish.

The Great Depression that began in 1929 seemed to play into the hands of Dewey and his socialist colleagues, along with the Rooseveltian New Deal that followed. It was during some of these years (1925–1935) that I was attending the public schools of Texas. At the time, the Bible and prayer were still acceptable components of education; patriotism was stressed in history and literature; and there was strong emphasis on the basics of reading (including phonics and spelling), writing (including good penmanship), and mathematics. But there was also an implied general acceptance of evolution, an undercurrent of socialism in civics, and a mishmash of elective courses and option activities. At the time, no doubt, the Texas schools had not moved as far toward “progressive education” as those in more liberal states. Even there and then, however,

evolutionism was assumed, either overtly or covertly, throughout the curriculum.

John Dewey and like-minded evolutionists founded the American Humanist Association in 1933, and he became its first president. The Tenets of Humanism — largely either written or approved by him — were published that same year and have since become the unofficial framework of teaching in just about all public schools. The already-mentioned Humanist Manifestos I and II (1933, 1973) both stress evolution as the basis of humanism and decry creationism and biblical fundamentalism. (See footnote 47 in this chapter.) Still a third manifesto, called a Secular Humanist Declaration, was drafted by Dr. Paul Kurtz, a professor at the State University of New York at Buffalo, and published in the first issue of *Free Inquiry*, edited by Dr. Kurtz, in October 1980. Signers included such prominent scholars as Isaac Asimov (probably the most prolific science writer of this century and current president of the American Humanist Association), behavioral psychologist B.F. Skinner, philosopher Kai Nielsen, situation-ethics theologian Joseph Fletcher, and Albert Ellis, Ernest Nagel, Sidney Hook, and numerous others of equal influence.

Drafted in response to the recent revival of creationism and biblical fundamentalism, the 1980 declaration fulminated against the “reappearance of dogmatic authoritarian religions.” *The New York Times* summarized its tone as follows: “Reflecting elements of two earlier humanist manifestos, in 1933 and 1973, the declaration depicts supernatural religion and divine revelation as enemies of the rational process that leads to progress.”⁶²

To all intents and purposes, these humanistic-evolutionary tenets have become the state-supported religion of our

62. Kenneth A. Briggs, “Secular Humanists Attack a Rise in Fundamentalism,” *New York Times*, Oct. 1980.

public schools everywhere. Anything hinting at biblical and/or Christian values — especially the foundational doctrine of supernatural creation — is systematically excluded, under continuing pressure from the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Humanist Association, the Nation Educational Association, and the intellectual and educational establishments in general. This trend is firmly supported by the radical-liberal news media everywhere.

The humanists themselves acknowledge that their system is essentially “religious.” The following statement was featured prominently on the back cover of a recent issue of the AHA magazine, *The Humanist*:

Humanism does not include the idea of a God and as such is considered a philosophy rather than a religion. In a way it is an alternative to all religions. However, whether or not one looks to humanism as a religion or a philosophy to live by or a way of life is, we believe, largely a matter of personal temperament and preference. Those caught up by its religious aspects know that it provides a vibrant, satisfying faith. Those who think of it as a philosophy find it both reasonable and adequate.⁶³

This “religious” system of secular humanism or evolutionary humanism is certainly unconstitutional (as a state-endorsed religion). Yet, by *excluding* other religions — especially the religion of creationism and biblical Christianity on which our nation and its schools were originally founded — and exclusively teaching the concepts in the Tenets of Humanism, this system has indeed become the legally enforced, *de facto* state religion. Humanism is promulgated throughout our public

63. Lloyd Morain, “How Do Humanists Define Their Beliefs?” *The Humanist* 47 (Sept./Oct. 1987): back cover. The author was a former editor of *The Humanist*.

schools exactly as envisioned by Dewey and his predecessors, associates, and followers long ago.

The religious nature of evolution is evident not only from the complete lack of scientific evidence supporting its precepts, but also from the viciously emotional defenses that the modern creationist revival has engendered. Over 40 anti-creationist books and hundreds of anti-creationist articles have been published in recent years. Almost all are highly sarcastic and emotional, exhibiting a complete lack of understanding of the creationist arguments and evidences, and *never* citing any real evidence for evolution.

The crowning blow is that the courts have supported this evolutionary takeover of the public schools. This is not really too surprising, however, for the law schools for over a generation have also taught evolution, including the evolution of the law and the Constitution. The trend of interpreting the United States Constitution, in accord with evolving social policy rather than the intentions of the “founding fathers” and the original states, either began or was accelerated by the widely read legal analyses and opinions of Oliver Wendell Holmes, who was an associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court from 1902 until his death in 1935. According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Holmes “uniformly favored a liberal interpretation of the constitution and his opinions have been conspicuous for their literary style and epigrammatic force.” Like his father, the famous poet, Associate Justice Holmes was a so-called free thinker who was opposed to traditional biblical Christianity, and his influence on subsequent courts has undoubtedly been most significant.

In any case, whenever any attempt to get creationism back into the public schools — even on a strictly scientific, two-model basis — has reached the courts, it has invariably been rebuffed. This has happened in Tennessee, Indiana, California, New York, Arkansas, Florida, Arizona, Louisiana, and other states.

The Louisiana “creation law” itself finally reached the U.S. Supreme Court in 1987, and there the concept of supernatural creation has received an apparently conclusive and final rejection. Speaking for the 7-2 majority, Justice Brennan said, “The preeminent purpose for the Louisiana legislature was clearly to advance the religious viewpoint that a supernatural being created humankind.” The law was thrown out primarily on this basis — that belief in a supernatural God is nothing but a “religious viewpoint” and, as such, is to be excluded from our public institutions. To all intents and purposes, the Court’s decision officially designates the United States of America to be, like Communist Russia, an atheistic nation, at least as far as the education of the young in public schools is concerned. Evolution is now the law of the land!

But evolution is not even a testable scientific hypothesis, let alone a scientific *law*! This is truly an amazing development in a nation founded upon belief in the God of the Bible.

A British teacher of science, not a creationist, summarizes the situation in his country (and it would be an even more appropriate summary in America) as follows:

For some time, it has seemed to me that our current methods of teaching Darwinism are suspiciously similar to indoctrination.⁶⁴

The Darwinist can always make a plausible reconstruction of what took place during the supposed evolution of a species. Any difficulties in reconciling a given kind of natural selection with a particular phase of evolution can be removed by the judicious choice of a correlated character.⁶⁵

64. G.H. Harper, “Darwinism and Indoctrination,” *School Science Review* 59 (Dec. 1977): p. 258.

65. *Ibid.*, p. 265.

Looked at in this way, the teacher of Darwin's theory corresponds with the latter, since he undoubtedly is concerned to put across the conclusion that natural selection causes evolution, while *he cannot be concerned to any great extent with real evidence, because there isn't any.*⁶⁶

The thesis of this chapter — namely, that evolutionism permeates and dominates modern thought in every field — could be expanded and further documented at great length if necessary, but most readers will agree that the point has been made quite compellingly already. That being the case, it inevitably follows that evolutionary thought is basically responsible for the lethally ominous political developments and the chaotic moral and social disintegrations that have been accelerating everywhere in recent decades. These cause-and-effect relationships will be demonstrated in the next two chapters.

66. Ibid. Italics are mine.