

# **THE EFFECT OF EVOLUTION ON MODERN BEHAVIOR**

by

**F. Furman Kearley, Ph.D.**

## **Copyright © Apologetics Press**

All rights reserved. This document may be printed or stored on computer media, on the condition that it will not be republished in print, on-line (including reposting on any personal Web sites, corporate Web sites, organizational Web sites, electronic bulletin boards, etc.), or on computer media, and will not be used for any commercial purposes. Further, it must be copied with source statements (publisher, author, title, bibliographic references, etc.), and must include this paragraph granting limited rights for copying and reproduction, along with the name and address of the publisher and owner of these rights, as listed below. Except for those exclusions mentioned above, and brief quotations in articles or critical reviews, or distribution for educational purposes (including students in classes), no part of this document may be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher.

**Apologetics Press, Inc.**  
230 Landmark Drive  
Montgomery, AL 36117 U.S.A.  
334/272-8558  
800/234-8558



**[www.ApologeticsPress.org](http://www.ApologeticsPress.org)**

# **THE EFFECT OF EVOLUTION ON MODERN BEHAVIOR**

by

**F. Furman Kearley, Ph.D.**

## **“FRUIT TEST”**

Jesus said, “By their fruits you shall know them” (Matthew 6:16). There never has been devised a better test for the validity of anything than the “fruit test.” If the tree produces good, nutritious, healthful fruit, then let it stand and help it grow; but if it produces rotten fruit, cut it down—for why should it waste the space in the field or the nourishment of the soil.

Likewise, if a philosophical system—a system of belief—produces harmful, destructive practices by human beings, then this system of belief should be abandoned; but if a system of belief produces love, kindness, helpfulness, compassion and other such desirable fruits, then this system of belief should be encouraged and supported.

## **PURPOSE AND COMPLEXITY OF THIS STUDY**

The purpose of this study is to consider the fruit of the theory of evolution. The answer will be sought to the question: “What effect has the theory of evolution had on modern behavior?” Has evolution contributed significantly to the improvement of modern behavior, or has it been the source of many behavioral problems?

This study is far too complex to present specific conclusions, each having suggestions and references to match, showing exactly how I have reached these conclusions. There are several reasons why this is the case. First, there have been no controlled experiments whereby a purely evolutionary society and behavior in it can be compared with a purely Christian society and behavior in it. These two philosophies have been at work along with a mixture of other philosophical systems such as Catholicism, Protestantism, Fascism, Communism, and many others. It is difficult, therefore, to lay all good at one door and all bad at another in the absence of a controlled experiment. Second, due to the aforementioned problem, it is necessary to examine the pure philosophical system and to project the logical consequences of such a system if it were applied consistently. Proponents of a system often cannot see, or refuse to see, the logical con-

sequences of their own system. Finally, the material discussing the influence of evolution is so varied and so voluminous that the task of evaluating it is quite difficult.

### **EVOLUTION: A TURNING POINT**

Evolution has had a far more powerful impact on our society and world than most people realize. Vergilius Ferm has observed: “Truly, the year 1859 in which appeared Charles Darwin’s *The Origin of Species*, marks a turning point in western thought” (1939, p. 307). Will Durant, the famous historian and philosopher, stated concerning Darwin and evolution: “It may well be that for posterity his name will stand as a turning point in the intellectual development of our western civilization.... If he was right, men will have to date from 1859 the beginning of modern thought” (1939, p. 22).

Evolution has affected all areas of human study, and the people who lead and direct in these areas. For example, Sir Julian Huxley, the famous British biologist, was a firm believer in total evolution and carried these concepts with him to his important and influential post as the first Director-General of UNESCO, the educational and propaganda arm of the United Nations. His evaluation of the influence and effect of evolution is as follows:

The concept of evolution was soon extended into other than biological fields. In organic subjects such as the life-histories of the 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 (1955, p. 272).

Most informed people readily recognize that evolution has had a profound effect on modern thought. However, the most important question is, “Has that effect been good or bad as far as modern behavior is concerned?”

### **SELFISHNESS—THE FIRST LAW OF LIFE**

Selfishness always has been considered as an evil behavior characteristic, and though the tendency of the flesh is in this direction, no one really likes an obviously selfish person. However, evolution with its basic postulates of “struggle for survival” and “survival of the fittest” makes selfishness or self-preservation the first law of life.

Professor S.J. Holmes, an evolutionist of the University of California, in defining the evolutionary code of ethics admitted that “Darwinism, consistently applied, would measure goodness in terms of survival value.... Fundamentally, therefore, our ethics is Darwinian whether we like it or not. It is only imperfectly so” (1939, p. 121). Thus, evolution, consistently applied, would lead to the destruction of Christianity’s Golden Rule and to the exaltation of the Iron Rule—i.e. that “might makes right.” Indeed, this law has been practiced frequently throughout history. It certainly does not need the encouragement of being adopted as the code of ethics for society. This code would justify cruelty, deceit, lying, murder, and whatever will enable the individual to survive. All too many industrialists, unionists, businessmen, salesmen, consumers, racists, and others now live by the law, “do unto others before they do unto you.” What the world needs now, however, is less selfishness and more love for one’s neighbor—less evolution and more pure Christianity.

### **STRUGGLE, WAR, REVOLUTION—MEANS TO PROGRESS**

The evolutionary concept with its postulates of “survival of the fittest” and “progress of favored races” has served as a philosophical basis for several movements that have affected behavior adversely in the modern world. Among these are Naziism, Fascism, Racism, Communism, religious liberalism and others. To document all of this would require voluminous quotations from writings of the militarists such as Bernhardt, Nietzsche, Hitler, and others.

### **NAZIISM AND MILITARISM**

One authority has composed a good summary of the influence of evolution on Naziism and Militarism as follows:

The doctrine of militarism is the logical extension of the Darwinian code of ethics from the individual to the national or racial level. The full title of Darwin’s famous treatise is, **On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life**. The struggle for existence has been generally accepted as one of the basic principles which have led to the evolution of man. If such be the case, then it is claimed that war, as part of this struggle, is natural and inevitable and that, from a continuance of war, there will ultimately emerge the superman, a race which will dominate the world.

Evolution is thus the foundation stone of the modern philosophy of militarism. Exponents of militarism, such as Bernhardt and Nietzsche, have boldly claimed that from an evolutionary point of view this is the natural law, and that it is therefore biologically normal and right to crush the weaker people of the earth” (Holmes, 1959, p. 80).

As Bernhardi has said: “War is a biological necessity of the first importance.” And again, he has stated: “War gives a biologically just decision. Might is at once the supreme right” (1914). Hitler reiterated this philosophy in his speeches. “The whole of nature” he said, “is a continuous struggle between strength and weakness, an eternal victory of the strong over the weak” (1943, p. 694). But Hitler’s defeat in 1945 demonstrated that this philosophy was a lie, “for by strength shall no man prevail” (1 Samuel 2:9) and “the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong” (Ecclesiastes 9:11).

Professor Will Durant, of the University of California, once remarked that “Nietzsche was the child of Darwin.” The late professor F. Wood Jones of the Royal College of Surgeons commented: “Darwin has gone far towards providing the sinister theories that have let loose the present demons of bloodshed and destruction.” The world wars already have resulted from this teaching (see Holmes, 1959, p. 79). The 20<sup>th</sup> century has witnessed more war, killing, and destruction than all others together. World War II was the direct fruit of evolution applied to human beings. Surburg has observed:

Few people realize that Hitler, in bringing about World War II, merely put into practice what he believed was human evolution. Darwin and Nietzsche were the two philosophers studied by the National Socialists in working out the philosophy set forth in Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*. In this work Hitler asserted that men rose from animals by fighting. It was the contention of the Fuehrer that this struggle, wherein one being feeds on another and the blood of the weaker is the life of the stronger, has continued from time immemorable and must continue until the most highly advanced branch of humanity dominates the whole earth. Who can begin to describe the suffering which came to the sons and daughters of the 20<sup>th</sup> century as a result of the application of various aspects of Darwinism by Hitler and Marx? (1959, p.196).

A partial description of this suffering and depravity is documented in the many volumes containing the evidence presented at the International Military Trials of Nazis—slave labor, concentration camps, involuntary use of human beings as guinea pigs, human selective breeding for the master race, genocide of the Jews, and other horrifying crimes (*International Military Trials: Nuremberg*, 1946). One is shocked at the inhumanity of man toward man. However, if evolution is right, if man is just a superior animal, and if there is no absolute standard of morality, who can say Hitler did “wrong” in attempting to build a “master race”? What a tragedy that ideas sown by the Englishman, Charles Darwin, nearly a century earlier, resulted in such suffering and bloodshed for England as the result of Darwin’s stepchild, Adolph Hitler.

## COMMUNISM

Evolution has been accepted by the Communists and has served as the philosophical basis for their concept of change by revolution and their anti-religious attitude. Marx himself admitted, “Darwin’s book is very important, and serves as a basis in natural science for the class struggle in history (as quoted in Hofstadter, 1955, p. 115). Marx felt his own work to be the exact parallel of Darwin’s, and even wished to dedicate a portion of *Das Kapital* to the author of *The Origin of Species* (see Barzun, 1958, p. 8). Friedrich Engels, Marx’s associate, said, “Just as Darwin discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of evolution in human history” (as quoted in Himmelfarb, 1959, p. 348). Barzun has evaluated Marx’s feeling of debt to Darwin as follows:

It is that, like Darwin, Marx thought he had discovered the law of development. He saw history in stages, as the Darwinists saw geological strata and successive forms of life.... But there are even finer points of comparison. In keeping with the feelings of the age both Marx and Darwin made struggle the means of development (1958 p. 59).

Joseph Stalin made it plain that the basis of the Communists’ anti-religion program was their evolutionary concept and that Communist law protected evolution while it persecuted religion. He said:

The Party cannot be neutral towards religion, and it does conduct anti-religious propaganda against all and every religious prejudice because it stands for science, while religious prejudices run counter to science, because all religion is something opposite to science. Cases such as recently occurred in America in which Darwinists were prosecuted in court [the Scopes trial—FFK], cannot occur here because the Party carries out a policy of the general defense of science. The Party cannot be neutral towards religious prejudices and it will continue to carry on propaganda against these prejudices.... Have we suppressed the reactionary clergy? Yes, we have. The unfortunate thing is that it has not been completely liquidated (n.d., pp. 386-87).

Thus evolution is fixed firmly in the roots of Communism and bears much of the blame for the atrocious behavior of Communism in today’s world. We cannot expect people who believe that they are highly developed animals—that there is thus no absolute standard of right or wrong—to honor their treaties, to speak the truth, or to treat other “animals,” higher or lower, with respect and dignity.

## HUMAN EUGENICS AND BUILDING THE SUPERMAN: RACISM AND NATIONALISM

The practices of racism, nationalism, etc., have been present in society since the dawn of history, and therefore cannot be considered solely as the fruit of evolution. However, Christianity had gone a long way in destroying these evil attitudes until the advent of evolution. Darwin’s theory—which criticized com-

passionate man for helping the weak, sick, etc.—was welcomed by racists, for it provided a new and amoral basis for human eugenics and the development of a “master race.” Darwin observed that civilized men do their utmost “to check the process of elimination” of the weak in the struggle for the survival of the fittest. He stated in *The Descent of Man*:

We build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed and the sick; we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of everyone to the last moment. Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man (1902, pp. 180-181).

Seizing upon this statement, many nationalists, and racists applied the idea of struggle to races. Naturally, every person who tends toward racism thinks that his race is superior and should survive, while the other races are inferior and should be eliminated or made to serve the super race. These thoughts drove Hitler to exalt his race and to enslave and eliminate others. Surburg observed:

Professor Hofstadter has made a special study of the influence of Darwin on American thought. In his book, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, he has shown that Darwinism was one of the chief sources of racism and of belligerent ideology which characterized the last half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Europe and America... (1959, p. 198).

Though World War II crushed the strongest attempt in history to establish racism as the law of life, racism in its worst sense is still with us. And if evolution is right, who is to say that it is wrong for the races to struggle and for the strongest to enslave and eliminate the weaker?

### **HUMAN EUGENICS AND HUMAN EXPERIMENTATION**

Furthermore, the concept of building the “superman” has been, and is being, advocated in far more sophisticated ways than was done by Hitler. Hitler boldly went about the process by enslavement and genocide of the Jews. However, he also practiced, to a limited degree, human selective breeding by having the best male specimens breed with the best female specimens, and then rearing the children under the training of the state. The Nazis also practiced human experimentation.

There are many who advocate these same practices of human selective breeding and human experimentation, but on a voluntary basis rather than an involuntary one as Hitler did. Several years ago, an article appeared in the *Phi Delta Kappan* titled “Evolution in Human Hands.” The author described many of the things that are possible when current humans attempt to forge the nature of future generations. The

article pointed out that with present knowledge and technology, many factors relating to human reproduction are, or soon will be, subject to human manipulation. These include selective breeding, artificial insemination, sperm and ova banks from ideal specimens, external fertilization, artificial implantation in a carrier or surrogate mother, manipulation of genes to eliminate undesirable characteristics (and to implant desirable ones), and many other possibilities. The article also raised some most important questions:

But do men dare assume the cloak of God? It is so frightening a responsibility, like that of the makers of the first nuclear weapons, that we might well draw back in dismay refusing even to look at the prospect.... It is certainly not for the geneticist to decide what evolutionary goals man should seek. It is, however, his moral and social obligation to inform as wide a public as possible regarding what choices may be made, what pitfalls lurk, what outcome may be expected from different courses of action or inaction.... What is necessary for the evolutionist in our present times is to state clearly the various possibilities, in order that with sufficient lead time statesmen and clergy, social scientists and philosophers, men of action and men of dreams may sit down together and debate the nature of their values and choices. What should man be? What man can be, geneticists, the evolutionist, may predict. But what should man be? (Glass, 1969, pp. 506-10).

In order to answer this question, we must turn to the Creator and Director of life—God. However, the evolutionist would have man himself usurp the authority of God and determine the nature and direction that life must take. It one day may be possible for man to develop a super body and a robot brain, or a super computer-type brain with little or no body. But would it be **right** to do so?

Someone might say, “These are new powers and bring new problems. We need new standards to solve the problems.” However, these are not new powers but new degrees of the same old power. Man has had the power of life or death since the days of Cain and Abel. He could nourish life and find favor with God; he could kill it and become a murderer as Cain did. Man today simply is on the verge of having a different dimension of the old power over life or death. Formerly he could mutilate and cripple an already formed being. He could castrate and make a eunuch of a strong man. He could kill. Now, man can perform the same type of operations on sperm and ova. Truly, we must rely on God’s revealed standard for right and wrong just as we always have. Otherwise, there is no standard. Who are statesmen, or social scientists, or philosophers to play God with my life or yours, or the lives of our children or grandchildren? What is all this talk of obligation and duty if there is no God, and we are after all the highest intellectual beings in the Universe? Each man is then a law unto himself.

### **MAN—SPECIAL CREATION OR HIGHEST ANIMAL?**

This whole matter boils down to the most basic difference between evolution and biblical Christianity—is man a special creation of God, or just the most highly developed animal? The influence of evolution can be seen in the fact that people commonly refer to themselves as animals, a concept systematically taught in most public schools. The Bible nowhere speaks of man as a common animal. He always is distinguished from the beasts of the field and the fowl of the air. He is treated systematically as a special creation of God. God holds man responsible for his actions, but animals have no such responsibility.

Evolutionists, Communists, and others view man as an economic animal (Benson, 1955, pp. 14-15). As an animal, his food, shelter, and personal well-being for the period of his existence on Earth are all that matter. U.S. Senator James W. Fulbright, an evolutionist, once made a speech emphasizing that man is an animal. He noted that man “is an animal who has built a civilization” and that men “are not fallen gods but unusually precocious apes (as quoted in Bales, 1968, p. 167).

If men were animals, then men would have no moral responsibility, no duty toward one another. There would be no such thing as right or wrong. Hitler would have been as right as Churchill. He would have been wrong only to the extent that right and wrong are measured in terms of survival value; since he challenged one stronger than he and did not survive, only in this sense was he wrong. The criminal who preys on others is right as long as he can get away with it. But man is not a mere animal. The very fact that he has a conscience—feels and talks about such things as moral responsibility, duty to others, right and wrong, obligation—signifies that he is of a different order than animals. He is a special creation of God and responsible to God for his actions.

### **CRIME AND INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

In contrast, evolution has contributed extensively to the development of the concept that man is the product of his environment, and therefore he is not responsible for his own individual actions; rather, his inherited traits and the environment in which he developed are totally responsible for what he is and what he does. This philosophy came dramatically to the American scene and to the courts of law through the sensational murder of Bobby Franks in Chicago by Nathan Leopold and Richard Loeb and by their evolu-

tionary defense lawyer, Clarence Darrow. He is the same man who a year later, in 1925, defended John Thomas Scopes in the famous “monkey trial.”

Leopold was the son of a retired millionaire who had every advantage life affords. He graduated from the University of Chicago at the age of eighteen. Loeb, likewise rich and precocious (and the son of a multimillionaire vice-president of Sears-Roebuck), graduated from the University of Michigan at the age of seventeen. Previously, they had committed several minor crimes, and then entered into a pact to commit “the perfect crime.” The summer after they graduated, they kidnapped Bobby Franks, murdered him in cold blood, and then tried to collect a ransom. They were caught, and subsequently confessed. Darrow was hired to get them life imprisonment instead of execution.

Darrow knew he could not prove them insane so he threw them on the mercy of the court and tried to prove that no man is responsible for his own individual actions. All his career Darrow was an evolutionary determinist. His biographer said of him: “Each client became not a legal case but a highly complex mechanism, the result of thousands of years of evolution, molded into its specific form by the environment in which it was immediately conditioned and over which it exercised no power” (Stone, 1958, p. 167). Darrow completely denied free will, saying “Scientists have so thoroughly established the theory of evolution, there is no longer any room for such a doctrine as freedom of the will” (as quoted in Stone, p. 167). He based his defense on convincing the court and “the public that Loeb and Leopold were two defective human machines that had somewhere broken down because of heredity or the pressure of external environment” (Stone, p. 243).

Darrow had stated (in his book, *Crime, Its Cause and Treatment*) his belief that man is a machine; inheritance determined what he might be; environment determined what he would be; there was no room for free will. “If there was no free will, there could be no praise or blame; no man was alone responsible for his acts” (as quoted in Stone, p. 244). He told the prisoners at the Cook County Jail in Chicago that people are not “in jail because they deserve to be. They are in jail simply because they cannot avoid it on account of circumstances which are entirely beyond their control and for which they are in no way responsible” (Stone, p. 268). With this line of reasoning he convinced the court and public that these boys

were not responsible for their actions and should no more be hanged than “two boys who had committed irrational acts while in an epileptic seizure” (Stone, p. 258). This philosophy has become a part of the American law classroom, office, and court room.

Today, concerning modern behavior, we hear many cry that looters are not responsible. Why is it that we never hear that white racists are not responsible for their attitudes and behavior? Could it be that this argument alleging no individual responsibility is used only when we want to justify some evil behavior?

Darrow himself could not have believed this doctrine of no free will, else why would he have written, spoken, debated, and made pleas before courts in order to convince people to accept his viewpoint and to change their minds? Furthermore, if Darrow did believe that environment alone was responsible for what people did, he should have worked as hard as he could to eliminate evolution from the environment; for it was the influence of evolution from Darwin through Nietzsche that led Loeb and Leopold to think that they were Nietzsche’s “supermen.” “Everything they did was right for the reason that they had chosen to do it; the lower breeds of humans had been put upon the earth merely for the superman to lead and do with what he would” (Stone, p. 247). Leopold said during the trial, “The killing was an experiment. It is just as easy to justify such a death as it is to justify an entomologist in killing a beetle on a pin” (Stone, p. 258). If evolution in our environment can produce more Loebes, Leopolds, and Hitlers, it ought to be purged from the Earth.

### **ERADICATION OF FAMILY LIFE**

The evolutionary concept has led many to advocate, and some to attempt, altering drastically or completely eradicating family life as we know it. Hitler eradicated family life in his selective breeding experiments. The Communists also have attempted to eradicate family life. They do not hesitate to declare their intentions to abolish the present standards of morality even to the point of abolishing the family relationships which Christians and Americans hold so dear. In the Communist “Manifesto,” their intentions regarding the abolition of the family are plainly stated:

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common and thus, at the most, what the Commu-

nists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women. For the rest, it is self-evident, that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, i.e., of prostitution both public and private (Marx and Engles, 1948, p. 17).

After the Communists came to power in Russia, in some sections they tried to execute the above stated intentions. In order to do this the following decree was set forth:

**“DECREE”**

In view of the social injustice hitherto resulting through legal matrimony, the following decisions concerning distribution of attractive specimens of the fair sex have been taken by the Free Anarchistic Wing of the Saratow Communists:

- Henceforth all private ownership of women—from ages 17-42 is abolished.
- This decree does not embrace women who have already given birth to five children or more.
- The former proprietors (husbands) will enjoy the privilege of utilizing their ex-wives when they are not in circulation.
- All women, referred to in this decree, are to become common property of the nation.
- The distribution of the collectivized women is entrusted to the Club of Saratow Street (Moscow), building of former stock exchange.
- Within three days the women referred to have to report to the above address and be ready for service.
- The execution of this decree is entrusted to the housing committee.
- According to this decree, comrades are only allowed to dispose of the same women three times a week for three hours.
- Each man who claims right of access to socialized women must establish the fact that he belongs to the proletariat.
- He has to pay three per cent of his salary to an established sexual fund.
- Men who do not belong to the proletariat can only obtain access to socialized women on prepayment of a monthly sum of 1,000 rubles.
- The state bank has in every locality at once to open special accounts for the “sexual fund.”
- All socialized women will receive a monthly salary of twenty-eight rubles out of this fund.
- Pregnant women are relieved from their public duties for a duration of four months (three months prior to confinement and one month afterward).
- All infants must, at the age of one month, be handed over to a ‘chreche,’ where they are reared until they are seventeen at the expense of the nation.
- At the birth of twins, the mother is entitled to a gratification of 300 rubles.

- All comrades must submit to weekly sanitation inspection.
- Propagation of venereal disease will be punished.
- Women who have been contaminated may claim a pension and discharge from further services.
- The systematic execution of this decree will be supervised by the Club of Anarchists, the nation.
- Former husbands, who are not satisfied with their ex-wives, are at liberty to discard them without further formality (Brewer, n.d. pp. 39-40).

Dr. H.H. Punke of Auburn University has advocated that “intellectually competent persons” breed but not be charged with child rearing so they can “use their time and energy for other purposes” (1955, p. 98) This philosophy reduces humans to cows and children to calves. Future developments in artificial and selective breeding techniques, including artificial wombs, no doubt will lead to greater destruction of the family.

### **PRAGMATISM**

Evolution was a major factor in developing the philosophy of pragmatism—“whatever works is right.” According to Meiklejohn, “pragmatism is Darwinism applied to human intelligence. It is scientific naturalism as opposed to a theological supernaturalism (1942, p. 124; see also Wiener, 1949).

### **PSYCHOLOGY**

Evolution has greatly influenced the study of psychology especially as it was accepted by Sigmund Freud, William James, Charles H. Judd and others (see Surburg, 1959, pp. 183-186).

### **EDUCATION**

Likewise, as John Dewey, the father of modern education admitted, “The influence of the concept of evolution upon the philosophy of education has been great” (1926, 2:529).

### **GOD CONCEPT**

Evolution has led to the view that the concept of God evolved from the animal concept of veneration for the leader of the herd, to veneration for the “old man” until man created his own “gods.” The modern “God Is Dead” philosophy is strongly rooted in the evolutionary concept (see Wells, 1949, pp. 119-121).

## **COMPARATIVE RELIGION**

Surburg observed: "When the evolutionary theory became widespread, it was proclaimed that all religions were evolutionary products. This meant that no one religion could be considered better than the others. This was being held to invalidate the claim made by the Christian religion of being the only saving faith" (1959, p. 175).

## **MISSIONS**

As the result of the above, evolution has led to the destruction in the liberal denominations of the concept of the salvation of the lost as the motive for the halfway house between biblical Christianity and evolutionary naturalism.

## **FAITH AND INFIDELITY**

The history of the effect of evolution on the faith in God and the Bible has been that the acceptance of evolution by a Christian gradually leads him through theistic evolution to religious liberalism and finally into infidelity. One begins by denying special creation, then he denies the universal Flood, then he naturalizes or allegorizes miracles such as the crossing of the Red Sea or Jonah and the great fish, and then finally he spiritualizes or denies the bodily resurrection of Christ. Having accepted naturalism and denied supernaturalism, then he must deny the providential control of the world by God and the efficacy of prayer. Religious liberalism in the church today is due largely to evolution.

## **NEW MORALITY**

Those advocating the new morality, situation ethics, no absolute standard, pre-marital or extra-marital relations, promiscuity, and other evil-producing philosophies are those who have accepted evolution, "hook, line, and sinker."

## **PROGRESS**

Evolution has led to an unjustified confidence in the inevitable progress of man. Evolutionists at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century predicted that the 20<sup>th</sup> century would see man achieve the highest levels of civilization. Instead, we have seen wars worse than all others in history. We are threatened with nuclear destruction. Man has developed more and more powerful and destructive weapons of war but he has no formula

for peace better than the Golden Rule of Jesus. He has been able to walk on the Moon but he has made his own Earth so nightmarish that he cannot walk safely through his own streets and parks. He has improved prisons physically and made them more homelike, but he has turned his castle into a fortress that must be double locked for him to sleep securely. He is on the verge of building outer space platforms, but he cannot destroy rat-infested ghettos and build decent communities in which all people may live. He is on the verge of making future man what he wants him to be by operations on sperm and ova, but if he does this he likely will create a monster.

The biblical doctrine is proved right by history. Man is a fallen creature. He is inclined toward evil, not totally or wholly, but largely (Romans 7). But thanks be to God that through Jesus Christ our Lord we can be delivered from this sinful flesh. Evolution really is not the ultimate cause of all this evil fruit we have discussed. The sinful flesh—the rebellion of man against God—is the ultimate cause. Evolution merely has served as the philosophical system whereby man may delude himself into thinking that he is independent of God. Let us reject and refute this devilish philosophy and submit ourselves to God.

## REFERENCES

- Barzun, Jacques (1958), *Darwin, Marx, Wagner* (New York: Doubleday).
- Benson, George (1955), "The Communists' Concept of Man as an Economic Animal," *20th Century Christian*, September.
- Brewer, G.C. (n.d.), *Communism and Its Four Horsemen* (Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate).
- Darwin, Charles (1902 edition), *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (London: P.F. Collier and Son).
- Dewey, John (1926), *Evolution, A Cyclopedia of Education*, ed. Paul Monroe (New York: Macmillan).
- Durant, Will (1931), *Great Men of Literature* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude (1959), *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution* (London: Chatto and Windus).
- Ferm, Vergilius (1939), *First Adventure in Philosophy* (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons).
- Bales, J.D. (1968), *Firm Foundation*, March 12.
- Glass, Bentley (1969) "Evolution in Human Hands," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May.
- Hitler, Adolf (1943), *Mein Kampf* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin).
- Hofstadter, Richard (1955), *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press).
- Holmes, S.J. (1939) *Science*, p. 121, as quoted in *Evolution* (1959), (Toronto, Canada: International Christian Crusade), p. 79.
- Huxley, Julian (1955), "Evolution and Genetics," *What Is Science?* (New York: Simon and Schuster).
- International Military Trials: Nuremberg* (1946), (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 8 vols.

Marx and Engles (1948), "Manifesto of the Communist Party," *The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office).

*Marxism and Darwinism* (1912), (Chicago, IL: Charles A. Kerr).

Meiklejohn, Alexander (1942), *Education Between Two Worlds* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

Wiener, P.P. (1949), *Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Punke, H.H. (1955), *The Family and Juvenile Delinquency* (Peabody Journal of Education).

Surburg, Raymond F. (1959), "The Influence of Darwinism," *Darwin, Evolution, and Creation*, ed. Paul A. Zimmerman (St. Louis, MO: Concordia).

Von Bernhardt, F. (1914), *Germany and the Next War* (London: Edward Arnold).

Stalin, Joseph (n.d.), *Leninism* (International Publishers).

Stone, Irvine (1958), *Clarence Darrow for the Defense* (New York: Bantam).

Wells, H.G. (1949), *The Outline of History* (New York: Garden City Books).