

## NEO-DARWINISM AND SOCIETY

DR. JOHN N. MOORE

*Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan*

### Introduction

At a time when many scholars still write in optimistic manner regarding Western civilization (and even possible accommodations with Communistic States), other scholars write about the dissolution of Western civilization as if there was once a Western tradition of a more or less fixed and complete body of belief and practice.

One such chronicler of changes in Western culture would be the late Professor Richard Weaver of the University of Chicago, who expressed himself on the dissolution of the West in 1948 in his book entitled, *Ideas Have Consequences*. On his first page Weaver wrote:

In considering the world to which these matters are addressed, I have been chiefly impressed by the difficulty of getting certain initial facts admitted. This difficulty is due in part to the widely prevailing Whig theory of history, with its belief that the most advanced point in time represents the point of highest development, *aided no doubt by theories of evolution* which suggest to the uncritical a kind of necessary passage from simple to complex. Yet the real trouble is found to lie deeper than this. It is the appalling problem, when one comes to actual cases, of getting men to distinguish between better and worse.<sup>1</sup> (Emphasis added)

Thus Weaver stated the position<sup>2</sup> that we must be ever conscious of avoiding the enticing point of view that present conditions are the best conditions, because we have "progressed" so far from previous undesirable, even primitive conditions. In other words, Weaver would call attention to the fact, as he saw matters, that we have not really progressed in Western civilization, and must objectively compare the repeatedly immoral inter-personal relationships of human beings, today, with those of past centuries, and so on back through recorded time, If we are completely honest with ourselves, we must admit that material advancement has far out-stripped spiritual advancement.

Weaver felt there are too few modern thinkers who care to examine their lives. There are too few modern thinkers who will acknowledge the rebuke which comes of admitting that our present state *may be* a fallen state from that of Edenic innocence. Actually one can assert that many, many so-called intelligent men, for at least four centuries, have been their own priest, and their own professor of ethics as well. The con-

sequence has been an anarchy in "intellectual" circles which, today, threatens even that minimum consensus of value demonstrable as necessary for the continued existence of the political State.

Many people seem to be blind to the significance of a change, a profound change, which has occurred in the last four centuries, in man's conception of reality. Many intellectuals, who have not discovered that a world view is the most important aspect of man's ideas, will readily scoff at attempts to profit from experiences of those of the past. Such scoffers quite commonly turn to *argumentum ad hominem* in order to consciously or unconsciously discredit him who would look to the past for guidance in the present or for the future.

Nevertheless, careful analysis brings out the fact that it was the influence of proponents of the doctrine of nominalism which contributed immensely to changes in man's world view, i.e., his conceptions of reality. It must be remembered that the proponents of the doctrine of nominalism insisted that only particulars or individuals exist; and hence, nominalist denied that universals have a real existence. Experience, then, to the nominalist, is *the* source of knowledge.

The impact of nominalism tended to leave universal terms mere names serving our convenience to form labels. Thus the reality perceived by the intellect, or given by revelation, was banished from many intellectual circles. This brought about the practical result of positing that *the* reality is that which is perceived by the senses. In a word, the affirmation of sense perception as that which is real was a turning in the road toward modern empiricism.

But let us follow in skeletal outline Weaver's consideration of this train of circumstances in intellectual circles in the West since the development of nominalism. Changes have proceeded in accordance with perfect logic after the entrance by many thinkers of Western civilization upon a road completely dependent upon the viewpoint of reality which gave rise to modern empiricism. Actually, under this world view of reality, the pursuit of knowledge by observation and experiment as the only source of *real* knowledge became a map to give direction to, and be a basis for, formulation of policies of men. The great difficulties of today no doubt stem in part from this absolutizing of empirical knowledge.

### Train of Circumstances

The denial of universals carries with it the denial of everything transcending experience, such as absolute truth, God, absolute moral values. The denial of everything transcending experience means inevitably the denial of truth entirely. Thus there is no truth toward which we seek, but only the immediate experience of the moment.

With the denial of absolute, objective truth, there is no escape from the relativism of the old Greek adage from Protagoras, "man the measure of all things." By such an adage men are convinced that they might realize themselves more fully in their autonomous intelligence.

The profoundness of such a change of belief made necessary, eventually, changes in every concept of man and there soon emerged a "new" doctrine of nature. Where once man's concept of nature had been regarded as imitating the thoughts of the Creator God, and as imperfect representations of true reality known only by God, nature was looked upon as containing the principles of its own constitution and behavior. From this flowed the whole thesis of natural laws and even nature's God.

It follows that if physical nature is the totality of reality, and if man is of nature, it is impossible to think of man as suffering from constitutional evil or some original sin. Rather the defections of man must now be attributed to his simple ignorance or some kind of societal deprivation. Hence the clear deduction to the corollary of the natural goodness of man.

But there is more, because, if nature is a self-operating mechanism, and man is an intelligent animal adequate to his needs, then next in order is the elevation of man's intelligence. It became quite proper to regard as the highest intellectual vocation those methods whereby man interpreted data supplied by his senses; ergo, the careful study of nature known as science was above all philosophy— *the height* of human intelligence. From this position came the thinking of Hobbes and Locke and eighteenth century materialists and empiricists, who taught that man needed only to reason correctly upon evidence from nature.

By this time the religion of Western civilization began to seem ambiguous in dignity and meaning. One solution to the ambiguity was deism, which makes God the outcome of an intellectual reading of nature. But in denying antecedent truth, this religion left each man to make what he could of the world open to the senses; and "humanized" or "humanistic" religion followed at close marching order in these rapid changes of consequences to the world view based upon reality rooted in the senses alone.

The philosophy of materialism gained ascendancy, and thus men soon found it necessary, in fact imperative, to explain man by his environment. Such an explanation was the work of Charles Darwin and others of the nineteenth century. According to the views of some analysts the very pervasive character of these changes is made manifest by the fact that several other students of nature, such as Alfred Wallace, T. H. Huxley, Asa Gray, Ernest Haeckel, were arriving at similar explanations in the field of biology when Darwin published his *Origin of Species* in 1859.

If man was ensconced firmly in nature, it became necessary at once to question the fundamental character of his motivation. If the question of human origin was decided in favor of scientific materialism, then biological necessity, issuing from the concepts of struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, became the cause of causes. With the acceptance of biological necessity as the basic cause of the moulding of man entirely in consequence of environmental pressures, there follows a logical obligation to extend the same theory of causation to the institutions of man and human society.

Nineteenth century social philosophers were quick to use Darwin's formulations as powerful support for their thesis that human beings act always out of economic incentives. Therefore men like Karl Marx and the French socialists completed the abolishment of freedom of will on the part of the individual. Marx used dialectic materialism to reduce the full pageant of history to the economic endeavors of individuals and classes.

Consequently, man as created in the divine image of God, was replaced by man the wealth-seeking and wealth-consuming animal. The ground was laid for the apparent imminent eclipse of the omnipotent God by the omnipotent political State, under the direction of the elite intellectual few who in their autonomy could control eventually nature, and man in nature.

Fairly recent consequences of change in world view include development of psychological behaviorism and psychoanalysis which deny freedom of will, the very existence of mind, and place in question such elementary means of direction of human conduct as instincts with the possible reduction of all motivation to naturalistic "drives" or "urges" of sexual behavior. Converts to this theory have been fewer in number than for other theories of man in nature but they are only logical extensions of the thinking of those who embrace material causation.

Through means of psychological behaviorism man is left with nothing that transcends his experiences. He has no values and no morals; and his life becomes sheer practice without theory.

Of course modern man secretly hungers for truth, truth that will set him free, but he consoles himself with the thought that life should be experimental. Modern man feels he should try all ideas since he will acknowledge no basis or yard stick by which to evaluate any idea, except trial and error, which is strictly groping in the dark—an essentially *irrational* animal on the loose in nature.

Thus modern man concentrates on action, on doing, on method. He meets his problems with *ad hoc* policies. In net, modern man is pathetically susceptible to making all the mistakes of those who have gone before him simply because he does not know enough history, enough tested principles which approximate absolute truth; in short, transcendent values of the Word of God.

Hence the speechlessness of some men of culture still extant in Western civilization when they are forced to witness the further rending of once transcending values of the worth of human life, full application of talents, sanctity of relations between male and female, and surrender of remnants of freedom of choice in exchange for decision-making by sycophants and self-less calculating machines.

Whether it is the rantings of the political demagogue or the uninhibited college or university student, the man of culture understands what is being done, but he cannot convey his understanding because he cannot convey the idea of sacrilege in the terms of materialism or scientific naturalism. As Weaver says:

His cries of *abeste profani* are not heard by those who in the exhilaration of breaking some restraint feel that they are extending the boundaries of power and of knowledge.

To bring this viewpoint even closer I will quote briefly from a letter which appeared in a posthumously published book in 1964. I refer to Whittaker Chambers's book, *Cold Friday*. Chambers was one intellectual who learned from the professors of his youth the materialistic world view, and then went all the way logically and became a Communist in full identification. Chambers knew of machinations of Communists in this country and was fully yielded to Communist Party discipline for a major part of his life. In writing about extant situations in 1954, he said:

I no longer believe that political solutions are possible for us. I am baffled by the way people still speak of the West as if it were at least a cultural unity against Communism though it is divided not only by a political, but by an invisible cleavage. On one side are the voiceless masses with their own subdivisions and fractures. On the other side is the enlightened, articulate elite which, to one

degree or other, has rejected the religious roots of the civilization—the roots without which it is no longer Western civilization, but a new order of beliefs, attitudes and mandates. In short, this is the order of which Communism is one logical expression, originating not in Russia, but in the culture capitals of the West, reaching Russia by clandestine delivery via the old underground centers in Cracow, Vienna, Berne, Zurich, and Geneva. It is a Western body of belief that now threatens the West from Russia. As a body of Western beliefs, secular and rationalistic, the *intelligentsia of the West* share it, and *are therefore always committed to a secret emotional complicity with Communism* of which they dislike, not the Communism, but only what, by chances of history, Russia has specifically added to it—slave-labor camps, purges, MVD *et al.* And that, not because the Western intellectuals find them unjustifiable, but because they are afraid of being caught in them. If they could have Communism without the brutalities of ruling that the Russian experience bred, they have only marginal objections. Why should they object? What else is socialism but Communism with the claws retracted? (Emphasis added)

(Note: Chambers said retracted claws, *not* removed!)

Chambers put the matter very boldly, very starkly. And now the introduction of this paper can be closed since a backdrop has been provided for that which follows. But before proceeding, an assertion of the main thesis of this paper is in order. It is asserted categorically that presentation of evolution as fact, i.e. as observable, in educational institutions at any level across the surface of this globe has been used by free-thinking scholars to implement a type of indoctrination of the intelligentsia of the various societies of Western Civilization. The purpose of this paper is to develop this thesis with some documentation. Always the discussion of points presented is done against the backdrop provided in the Introduction regarding changes in the view of reality by many scholars of Western civilization.

#### Neo-Darwinism

Objective discourse is completely dependent upon clear definition of terms used. Responsibility for such definition rests in respectable circles of intellectual analysis with the author. Therefore writing from the tradition of getting the facts, that is the tradition of scientific method which I represent in the classroom, I wish to make abundantly clear my meaning of terms, such as Neo-Darwinism, evolution, and call attention to ambiguity of definition of terms.

According to some authors<sup>5</sup> a modern theory of evolutionary causation can be variously termed the *synthetic theory of evolution*, the *biological theory of evolution*, and the *theory of microevolution*. Darwin formulated his ideas on the causation of evolutionary change by using some combination of the concept of natural selection, concepts of Lamarck, and his invention to explain variation, which he discussed under the term pangenesis.

Thus Darwinism, which is the term used to refer loosely to Darwin's formulations by his successors, had to be modified when Gregor Mendel's cogitations on explanations of variation were available around the turn of the century. So for the last fifty to sixty years the terms *Neo-Darwinism*, and even *Modern Synthesis* have been in vogue to refer to organic evolution.

One can write quite properly today of a modern synthesis of ideas because Mendelian genetics and biochemical analysis of DNA and RNA have been added to the natural selection idea of Darwin with the omission of Lamarckian suggestions and Darwin's ideas of pangenesis. The above in this section is intended to point up the fact that modern theory on evolutionary causation is discussed under various terms.

What then is evolution? According to classical meaning and to usage which Darwin finally worked out in his last editions of *Origin of Species* and later publications, evolution is the idea that organisms have come into existence as the result of changes in preexisting organisms.<sup>6</sup> Sometimes evolution is defined as transmutation of species,<sup>7</sup> but this carries the same meaning as the classical sense.

Or the concept of organic evolution may be represented as constituting the position embodied in these three propositions: (1) all living species are descended from different species that have lived in the past; (2) the differences that exist between living species have arisen slowly and gradually over long periods of time; and (3) the causes that have acted in the past to change one species into another continue to act today.<sup>8</sup> Clearly, then evolution involves the change of one species or form into another species or form.

It is true that many biologists will define evolution as any genetic change or modification. This is broad and raises the logical question, how does this definition differ from the meaning of the term variation? Ambiguity does obtain in the writings of some scientists and even in their oral presentations. At least one physical anthropologist admitted in private conversation that he used the terms "variation" and "evolution" in an equivocal manner. That is not the intent of the author of this paper.

*Evolution* shall be change of one form or kind into another form or kind with increasing complexity. *Variation* shall be these changes of hereditary or genetic character which are involved in modification within the limits of species or form. *Mutation* is understood to be the term used to refer to postulated changes of genetic material; the very elements of varietal modification.

#### Historical Interlude

We shall go on to some examination of the relation of the concept of evolution to specific areas of man's intellectual endeavors. But first let us return to the train of circumstances of change in concepts of reality, as drawn from Weaver's discourse in explanation of his title that ideas have consequences.

As that train of circumstance was recited, I think we uncovered a crucial point to the main purpose of this paper on "Neo-Darwinism and Society." That crucial point was the effort by Charles Darwin and so many of his scientific contemporaries to explain man in his environment, to place sense-conscious man in his environment of sensual experience.

From the time of Darwin on to the present, a type of indoctrination was implemented by free-thinking scholars. In fact from Darwin's day to the present an acceleration in the process of such implementation can be identified. As followers of Darwin explained man in his physical environment—as just another animal—just the result of biological processes; then man became fully physical to them. That is, man was subsumed under the philosophy of materialism or positivism. Even his values, morals, and instincts, which Darwin still recognized, were resultants of biological processes.

Men of the mid-nineteenth century had been seeking explanations—explanatory systems—some system without God included. After 1845, great strides were made in formulation of fundamental theories relating to nature and the environment of man. It became a daring philosophical experiment, as Philip P. Wiener points out in his book, *Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism*,<sup>9</sup> to study nature and make it intelligible *without leaning on a providential intelligence*. Man was going to go it *alone*.

Man found theories to provide explanations, on *his terms*, of his environment *and* his society. The theory of organic evolution was *the* theory, which was presented as new, but was really an old, old idea from the Greeks; in fact was a pre-Christian era idea. But nineteenth century materialists had prepared the way for re-acceptance of evolution.

In searching for explanations without God, ideas of "progress," of "development," of "per-

fection,” (and *not* “degeneration,” *not* “regeneration,” *not* “justification by faith”) had reached ascendancy in men’s thoughts, as Scoon brings out in his chapter of the book, *Evolutionary Thought in America*.<sup>10</sup>

Even the very old idea from the Greeks of spontaneous generation was considered; and, today, is used by scientists in a disguised form when they postulate regarding the origin of life. Some spontaneous synthesis of life is inherent in the writings of the Oparin<sup>11</sup> and other men who write about possible protein synthesis in some original organic soup as their thinking partakes of a theory of *total* evolution, including the physical, as well as the biological.

Yes, evolutionary speculation had a popular audience because men were anxious to accept Darwin’s way of seeing the world.<sup>12</sup> Intellectuals wanted to accept the Darwinian world-view. They had been influenced by the social philosopher, Herbert Spencer, who ranged widely in his writings on such subjects as sociology, psychology, biology, and ethics. In his discussion of these subjects, which were immensely interesting to independent, intelligent thinkers of his day, he infused these subjects broadly with evolutionary ideas.

And Thomas Huxley provided a means of compromise with religious people by coining the word: agnosticism (which, somewhere, Engels called a “polite atheism”). Churchmen and believers were willing to compromise so as to be up to date with the latest explanations.<sup>13</sup> To compromise they yielded to the age-old attraction of a religion of justification by works. Justification by works, of course, is the essence of all natural, non-revealed religions and of all perversions of revealed religion. Therefore, such views can be shown to be just the reverse of the teachings of Jesus Christ which are basic to Christianity. Even in the nineteenth century a topsy-turvy world view attracted so-called intelligent thinkers in Western civilization.

One historian, Bert J. Loewenberg,<sup>14</sup> has written as if evolution were a religion. He speaks of evolution being involved in the “conversion” of men of science, and “conversion” of vocal opinion, which suggests that truth is decided by the raising of hands—by taking a vote. Loewenberg refers even to the “infiltration” of evolution into every decision of scholarship. Yet, in 1959, Loewenberg penned this admission, “There were no incontrovertible facts attesting that one variety had been transmuted into another.”<sup>15</sup> What kind of indoctrination occurred in the nineteenth century, which brought about dissemination of ideas, which conceivably are bearing fruit in this generation?

One feels safe in saying that people of Darwin’s day had become accustomed to naturalistic explanations—naturalistic explanatory systems.<sup>16</sup> F. S. C. Northrop<sup>17</sup> has pointed out that Galileo and Newton had mathematized nature, and determinism was widely accepted because of man’s successes in the physical sciences wherein derived laws had come to replace Providence. As evolution was presented as fact, as observable, by Unitarians and free-thinkers, the evolutionary theory underscored an earlier faith in man alone; his acts and deeds being judged in the absence of God. Evolutionism had become then the formula of thought ( the orthodoxy, the *Zeitgeist*, or the *Weltanschauung* ) as surely as fixity of species had dominated earlier thinking.

Scoon<sup>18</sup> shows how extreme application of evolution as fact, as observable, by Ernest Haeckel gave rise to an attempt to disprove three cardinal points of Christianity: the personality of God in Christ, the immortality of the soul, and freedom of will. Without question evolutionist Haeckel forcefully expressed a conviction in atheism. Dutch zoologist Jan Lever has written somewhere that at least three positions are possible in the conscious or unconscious philosophical presuppositions of the consistent evolutionist like Haeckel, or for that matter self-confessed atheist, Sir Julian Huxley. Generally speaking, at the root of the philosophy of evolutionism is a faith:

(a) that God does not exist, which is *atheism*;  
or

(b) that there was only an impersonal first cause, such as an explosion of a giant nucleus, with no further cause affecting the machinery of the world, which is a type of *deism*; or

(c) that nature itself is God, which is *pantheism*.

Each of these belief systems would involve a clear denial of a “personal God,” that is, God in person. The conclusion is most logical that the belief of such as Julian Huxley in the origin of life from lifeless matter is *not* an idea reached inductively. Such a belief quite clearly is a deduction from a “faith;” that is, a faith of atheism.

Yes, evolution was taken for granted as being factual, as being observable, and was used to counter the concept of fixity of species. Fixity of species, involved the idea that there are as many species of plants and animals as appeared in pairs as a result of The Creator’s work. Actually fixity of species is no more than an idea of men of the sixteenth through eighteenth century.

Fixity of the species was not and *is not at all* Biblical. Fixity of species was, and often still is, imputed wrongly to the Bible, because there is no mention at all of species as such in the Bible. Fixity of species is often represented by a row

of straight arrows with arrowheads pointing upward. Since understanding of variation and change of species was the common result of studies of nature and artificial breeding under the influence of Darwin and his successors, then men thought they had destroyed part of the Holy Bible. Yet that Word only relates that each form shall bring forth "after its own kind," with absolutely no mention of evolution. But evolution was an explanatory system which suited the mind of men who wanted to be free of Providence.

The enthusiasm of evolutionists presented the tree of life to men. The tree of life of evolutionists is represented much as a main river and its tributaries—like the Mississippi river—is drawn on a map. Yet such a tree of life, with present forms having some common origin, is really not much more than the old chain of being of the Greeks.

Evolution, when presented as fact, as observable, was based upon the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest which almost every man knew from first-hand experience. Since reality was man's experience, then evolution was accepted as fact. Evolution was accepted as if it was observable because Darwin's massive collection of observations of nature made evolution seem so respectable, so plausible to sensuously oriented men of the nineteenth century.

In a recent publication Loewenberg presents the thesis that Darwinism was accepted fully as fact, as observable in the United States. His booklet, *Darwinism: Reaction or Reform?*<sup>19</sup> recounts permeation of the Darwinian synthesis into every sector of thought. What kind of indoctrination occurred in the United States? The years of 1859 to 1914 were proud years because the new age of science was followed by a new age of man. Because of Darwinism, there was a "new" logic, "new" ethics, "new" psychology, "new" history, "new" philosophy, and "new" morality. These changes in the arena of ideation led to a "new" sociology, "new" anthropology, and "new" economics.

Darwinism was clutched to the bosom of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. These men wrote that Darwin had given them a basis in science, in biology, for their identification of the class struggle in society. They transferred the ideas of struggle for existence and survival of the fittest from biology to society.

In a recent article on "The Concept of Evolution," A. R. Manser<sup>20</sup> makes the point that it is impossible to understand why Darwin influenced the sociological theorists so profoundly, unless attention is given to the fact that Darwin's whole formulation constituted a type of sociology of nature. In fact Manser suggests that perhaps

Darwin should be called "Biology's Karl Marx rather than its Newton." Even now the dogmas of Marx and Engels are taught in Marxian Biology presented to Communist intelligentsia.

### Society

Now some attention should be given to the impact of evolution as fact, as observable, in specific fields of subject matter. Only a brief, sketchy treatment of three examples of consequences of the infiltration of the idea of evolution as factual, as observable, into thinking circles of Western civilization, or more particularly in the United States, can be given. The degree to which infiltration of evolution occurred in the areas of (1) history, (2) economics, and (3) social studies and literature is immense. The impact on formulation of public policy as deduction from a materialistic world-view has been colossal.

### History

As a *first* example of selected indoctrination by historians involving evolution, I want to refer to the work of Charles Beard. His book on an economic interpretation of the U. S. Constitution<sup>21</sup> could well be considered as an application to history of Darwinian concepts of struggle for existence and survival of the fittest. The thesis which Beard expounded was double-barreled:

a. The Constitution was the work of consolidated economic groups who were personally interested in the outcome of their labors.

b. The Constitution was put over in an undemocratic society by undemocratic methods for the express purposes of checking democratic majorities.

Let me note at the outset that Beard admitted that he had *not* done the necessary research and had only put on paper what he expected he would find. Yet his ideas were accepted as fact in 1913, and used to teach teachers who taught others that this country was founded as a result of class warfare. What kind of indoctrination occurred? And how is Beard's thesis understood today? Finally, after some forty or more years, his thesis is understood as not at all true; and with no basis in fact.

Beard's explanation has been carefully studied in regard to one colony after another. Finally the necessary research has been presented for use in academia. What a great deal of harmful indoctrination has occurred, until the book by Forrest McDonald, *We the People*,<sup>22</sup> appeared with careful treatment of land holdings and voting records of each of the thirteen colonies. And then there are the two specific works<sup>23</sup> by Robert Brown and Katherine Brown on similar close analyses of Massachusetts and Virginia. These researchers have destroyed Beard's expectations, and their results are just beginning to surmount

the usual cultural lag in the publication field and the educational classroom.

### Economics

To begin my second example of selected indoctrination by intellectuals who applied evolution to their field, I refer to statements made in the Introduction. After Darwin explained man as a physical being, as animal in nature, the next logical step was the extension of biological causation theory to the institutions of man and human society. This Marx did as he reduced the whole sweep of man's history to the *economic* endeavors of individuals and classes. That Marx and Engels quickly accepted Darwin's formulations upon the reading of his *Origin of Species* is brought out by the following 1959 quotation from *Mainstream*, a journal very favorable to socialistic ideas:

Darwin's *Origin of Species* was an exciting book to Marx and Engels. Here was the most concrete scientific confirmation of dialectics they had yet seen . . . When Marx first read the *Origin* in 1860 he wrote to Engels: 'This is the book which contains the basis in natural history of our view.' And a few weeks later he wrote to Lassalle: 'Darwin's book is very important and serves me as a basis in natural science for the class struggle in history.' . . . . .

One striking difference in the thought of these two giants is that Marxism embraces Darwinism, leaving to biologists the working out of the innumerable controversial details. Darwinism stands apart, seemingly separable from Marxism. Yet it is evident to any objective observer, as it was to Wallace, that a theory of social evolution is required by the theory of biological evolution. And if one takes Darwin's thoroughly materialist stand, such a social science must be solidly against all forms of teleology and idealism. It is a most plausible thesis that as time goes on Marx and Darwin will appear ever closer together to those who study them, because the difference and separateness is trifling compared to all they had in common.<sup>24</sup>

Connections between Darwin, Marx and this country can readily be shown by denoting the impact of adherents of the Fabian Society in England. The Fabian Society was the initial work of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, who strove to implement Marxian theory in England. That Fabian Society members made an impact on the United States is documented in the Veritas Foundation publication, *Keynes at Harvard*,<sup>25</sup> which was sponsored by concerned alumni of Harvard University. Researchers of the Veritas Foundation have found that much of today's

college youth show thinking that reflects the following six premises:

1. The private enterprise system of the United States is full of basic contradictions and fundamental flaws which inevitably will relegate it to the scrap heap.

2. Manufacturers, merchants, bankers and the host of corporate executives of the country are hopelessly reactionary and incapable of understanding the need of the "new order."

3. Thrift, savings, ownership and accumulations of private property are harmful to society and are not socially compatible with the "new order" which is rising out of the ashes of the "old capitalism."

4. Society is composed of classes and these classes are conspicuously banded together to protect their overall group interests.

5. The scope of government must be expanded to stand as a "third force," gradually expropriating or redistributing the wealth of existing capitalists through unrestricted powers of taxation and at the same time preventing the accumulation of any new capital.

6. College and university graduates can insure their personal future by attaching themselves to government bureaucracy, which is destined to expand indefinitely.

This is essentially the philosophy of John Maynard Keynes who was very active in the Fabian Society and came to these shores to convince the then President Franklin D. Roosevelt that the United States should dispense with the gold standard and use printing press paper money. Interestingly enough the exponents of the above type thinking, and members of the Fabian Society do their work under the guise of aiding free enterprise; yet, the shield or coat of arms of the Fabian Society shows a wolf in sheep's clothing. What a deception is represented by such a design! What kind of indoctrination has occurred in the classrooms at Harvard University when the above philosophy has been taught predominantly for about three decades? The reader is referred to *The Failure of the "New Economics"* by Henry Hazlitt<sup>26</sup> and *The Roots of Capitalism* by John Chamberlain,<sup>27</sup> for clear writing on this subject matter area.

### Social Studies and Literature

The *third* example of selected indoctrination by intellectuals involves consequences of accepting evolution as fact, as observable, in such areas of our culture as poetry, novels, drama, social studies, sociology, anthropology, and law. Of course "ideas have consequences," and one can wonder what has been wrought in our educational institutions in this country when one considers the research effort in *Cosmic Optimism* (A Study

of the Interpretation of Evolution by American Poets from Emerson to Robinson) by Frederick W. Conner;<sup>28</sup> in *Darwinism in the English Novel* by Leo, J. Henkin;<sup>29</sup> in *Evolution and Poetic Belief* by Georg Roppen;<sup>30</sup> in *Darwin Among the Poets* by Lionel Stevenson;<sup>31</sup> and finally in *Evolution, Marxian Biology, and the Social Scene* by Conrad Zirkle,<sup>32</sup> a botanist.

The latter book by Zirkle was published in 1958 and merits careful study. The author demonstrates how poetry has been used to make the concepts of evolution, struggle for existence, and survival of the fittest palatable to the cultured intellectual.

In the field of novels, Jack London was most effective and persuasive in winning acceptance of socialism, because he accepted the now discredited theory of inheritance of acquired characteristics by which he justified his socialism. The 1961 unpublished doctoral thesis of R. W. Carlson, "Jack London's Heroes: A Study of Evolutionary Thought"<sup>33</sup> provides detailed perspective, and analysis in depth of London's use of evolutionary outlook and in turn Spencerian, Nietzschean, and Marxian outlook to shape his numerous fictional heroes. Of course the latter three outlooks were founded in each respect on some degree of materialistic, evolutionary world view.

Lastly it can be shown that George Bernard Shaw through his dramatic works was very influential during his lifetime, and still is very instrumental in spreading Marxian biology among the intelligentsia. George Bernard Shaw was an outstanding member of the Fabian Society, and realized better than most other writers that the rationality of the Marxian doctrines depended upon certain biological postulates.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, the main purpose of this paper should be re-stated. This paper was designed to develop a main thesis with some documentation. The main thesis of this paper dealt with the categorical assertion that presentation of evolution as fact, as observable reality, in educational institutions at any level across the surface of this globe has been used by free-thinking scholars to implement selected indoctrination of the intelligentsia of the various societies of Western civilization. For practical reasons brief discussions of points related to this assertion referred primarily to the United States against the backdrop of dissolution of the West as reviewed in the Introduction.

Evolution and the concept of struggle for existence have been instrumental in the hands of biologists, philosophers, educationalists, religionists and many others in accelerating gross changes in Western civilization—as represented in this

country. Evolution and Darwinism were accepted by materialistic thinkers as factual, and observable. Evolutionism even became a religion, an atheistic religion, for some as was pointed out in the instance of Ernest Haeckel and Julian Huxley, at least.

Yet—organic evolution IS NOT FACT, but only a guess. Is it not fraudulent and deceitful to present evolution as factual, as observable? Support for an affirmative answer to this question is clearly brought out by such scientists as G. A. Kerkut in *Implications of Evolution*,<sup>34</sup> David Lack in *Evolutionary Theory and Christian Belief* with sub-title: *The Unresolved Conflict*,<sup>35</sup> and by Henry Morris in *The Twilight of Evolution*.<sup>36</sup>

It can be stated firmly that absolutely no experimental evidence is known for evolution, when evolution is defined as development of one animal form from another (as reptile from amphibian), or one plant form from another, (as angiosperms from cycads).

To teach organic evolution as fact, as observable, is to seriously misrepresent the state of current research. Further, such misrepresentation contributes strongly to selected indoctrination of young, formative minds. Ideas held by scientists relevant to possible animal group relationships have changed from one viewpoint, to another viewpoint, and back again, over the past one hundred years.

Today, biologists are *again* considering (speculating) the possibility of animal forms coming from several or many different origins, rather than all forms traceable back to some single, simple animal origin. That the idea of several origins was entertained even by Charles Darwin is illustrated in a closing passage of his *Origin of Species*: "There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; . . ."<sup>37</sup>

With no difficulty at all one can demonstrate that several points of view (at least monophyletic versus polyphyletic)<sup>38</sup> are discussed in the scientific literature by those scientists willing to speculate on the subject of origins.

Such speculation about origins of living things goes quite beyond the bounds of adequately empirical, experimental scientific work. Scientists are limited properly to the observable and quantifiable. Hence attention to origins partakes necessarily of philosophical discourses based primarily upon circumstantial evidence.

Even so-called laboratory study of evolution is no more than examination of variation *within* one form or kind (such as bacteria, fruit flies, or moths). Evolutionists claim study of evolution in the laboratory only because they are addicted to using the terms "variation" and "evolution" in an *equivocal* manner.



Evolution is *no more than* a guess. Natural selection and evolutionary thought are *only theoretical*. No transmutation across basic kinds is known or demonstrable; and scientist after scientist attests to this situation. Yet, what kind of *selected* indoctrination occurs when teachers, professors, and textbooks writers present evolution and natural selection as factual, as observable?

Finally, we must recognize that the evolutionary philosophy, or Evolutionism, of such free-thinking intellectuals as Ernest Haeckel and Julian Huxley has been "fostered" by highly spurious science. True scientific principles and methods in the hands of true believers in the Word of God clearly expose evolution as very poor science. In point of fact, application of true methods of testability, repeatability and experimental confirmation exposes evolution, when considered in precise meaning of change of one form or kind into another, as not even science. Therefore, true believers in the Word of God have nothing to fear from attacks on Genesis 1 and 2 from evolutionary atheistic philosophers.

But detachment of men and women from evolution, as a faith, is not as important as attachment of all, who will respond, to the Saviour. Most men of Western civilization have lost their way. On his own terms alone, Western man has sought the perfect organization of society by various means. That is, man has tried monarchy, oligarchy, democracy, socialism, fascist dictatorship, communist dictatorship, and even now is considering evolutionary humanism through controlled application of scientific technology. However man's *changing* ways, in each instance tried, have fallen short of preferred promises, and men always falter over their own selfishness, the original sin.

Therefore, Christians would offer devotion to Creationism to those who are lost, because Christ says, "I am the Way." To the mind of man which is steeped in error, Christ says, "I am the Truth," Christians know that Jesus Christ remains *constant* through the ages in offering Salvation to those who answer His call for faithful acceptance. Only with His help can our good works with fellow human beings reach beyond the bounds of limited material dimensions. Only with His help can man be lifted to heights above supposed salvation through crass evolutionary humanism, which proponents offer as a "new" religion in place of worship of *the* God of the Trinity.

#### Notes and References

- Richard M. Weaver, *Ideas Have Consequences*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1948, p. 1.
- The following discourse in the Introduction is based upon pp. 1 thru 7 of the Weaver book mentioned in note #1.
- Weaver, p. 26.
- Whittaker Chambers, *Cold Friday*, Random House, New York, 1964, pp. 225 and 226.
- Natural Science*, Vol. II, Michigan State University Press, Third ( Revised) Edition, 1964, pp. 8-15 and 8-16.
- Natural Science*, p. 7-2.
- Natural Science*, p. 7-4.
- Natural Science*, p. 8-1.
- Philip P. Wiener, *Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1949, pp. 8 and 17.
- Robert Scoon, "The Rise and Impact of Evolutionary Ideas" in *Evolutionary Thought in America*, Stow Pearsons, Editor. George Brazillcr, Inc., New York, 1956, p. 10.
- A. I. Oparin, *The Origin of Life*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1953.
- Roy W. Carlson, "Jack London's Heroes: A Study of Evolutionary Thought." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1961, #61-5265, University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, pp. 3, 27, 45, 46.
- Windsor H. Roberts, "The Reaction of American Protestant Churches to the Darwinian Philosophy, 1860-1900." Published private edition, distributed by The University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, Ill., 1938.
- Bert J. Loewenberg, "Darwinism Comes to America, 1859-1900," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 28, No. 3, December, 1941, pp. 340, 341.
- Bert J. Loewenberg, "The Mosaic of Darwinian Thought," *Victorian Studies* ( Darwin Anniversary Issue ), Vol. III, September, 1959, p. 15. ( See also J. J. Duyvenc' DeWit, "Reflections on the Architecture of the Organic World and the Origin of Man" ( A Critical evaluation of the Transformist Principle), *Philosophic Reformata*, 29e Jaargang 1964. )
- Loewenberg, 1941, pp. 347-357.
- F. S. C. Northrop, "Evolution in Its Relation to the Philosophy of Nature and the Philosophy of Culture" in *Persons of note* #10.
- Scoon, p. 35.
- Bert J. Loewenberg, *Darwinism: Reaction or Reform?* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1964, pp. 1 and 15.
- A. R. Manser, "The Concept of Evolution," *Philosophy*, Jan., 1965, pp. 21, 30.
- Charles A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1913.
- Forrest McDonald, *We The People*. ( The Economic Origins of the Constitution). The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1958.
- Robert E. Brown, *Middle Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N. Y., 1955; Robert E. and Katherine Brown, *Virginia 1705-1786: Democracy or Aristocracy?* Michigan State University Press, East Lansing, Michigan, 1964.
- H. Selsam, "Charles Darwin and Karl Marx," *Mainstream*, Vol. 12, No. 6, June, 1959, pp. 28 and 36.
- Veritas Foundation Staff Study, *Keynes at Harvard* "Economic Deception as a Political Credo." Veritas Foundation, West Sayville, New York, 1960. ( See also Veritas Foundation Staff Study, *The Great Deceit* ( Social Pseudo-Sciences). Veritas Foundation, West Sayville, New York, 1964; Anne Fremantle, *This Little Band of Prophets: The British Fabian.s*.

- #MT 266, Mentor Book, The New American Library, New York, 1960; and Sister M. Margaret Patricia McCarran, *Fabianism in the Political Life of Britain, 1919-1931*. The Heritage Foundation, Inc., Chicago, Ill., 1954.)
26. Henry Hazlitt, *The Failure of the "New Economics" "An Analysis of the Keynesian Fallacies."* D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., New York, 1959.
  27. John Chamberlain, *The Roots of Capitalism*. D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., Princeton, New Jersey, 1959.
  28. Frederick W. Conner, *Cosmic Optimism ( A Study of the Interpretation of Evolution by American Poets from Emerson to Robinson)*. University of Florida Press, Gainesville, Florida, 1949.
  29. Leo J. Henkin, *Darwinism in the English Novel*. Corporate Press, Inc., New York City, 1940.
  30. Georg Roppen, *Evolution and Poetic Belief*. Oslo University Press, Oslo, Norway, 1956.
  31. Lionel Stevenson, *Darwin Among the Poets*. Russell and Russell, New York, 1963.
  32. Conway Zirkle, *Evolution, Marxian Biology, and the Social Scene*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1958.
  33. Carlson, *op. cit.*, 1961
  34. G. A. Kerkut, *Implications of Evolution*. Pergamon Press, New York, 1960.
  35. David Lack, *Evolutionary Theory and Christian Belief (The Unresolved Conflict)*. Methuen and Co., Ltd., 36 Essex Street, Strand, London, England, 1961.
  36. Henry Morris, *The Twilight of Evolution*. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1963.
  37. Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*. The Modern Library Edition, p. 374.
  38. Even at the turn of the century examples of scientists supporting the idea of multiple origins can be found; in particular,

... the assumption of monophyletic evolution of the whole kingdom of organic life is a delightful dream without any scientific support ... it is impossible to trace back the chief types of the animal kingdom to one primitive form ... Von Wettstein among the botanists, and, more particularly, Steinmann, Koken, and Diener among the palaeontologists, have recently come forward as champions of the theory of polyphyletic evolution." pp. 15, 16 *Problem of Evolution* by Erich Wasmann, entomologist. Kegan, Paul, Trench, Truber and Co., London, 1909.

Then, in 1935, Heribert Nilsson, botanist, concluded:

"It is obvious that the investigations of the last three decades into the problem of the origin of species have not been able to show that a variational material capable of competition in the struggle for existence is formed by mutation

We are forced to this conclusion that *the theory of evolution has not been verified by experimental investigations of the origin of species.*" (Emphasis added by Nilsson) in journal *Hereditas*, Vol. 20, 1935, p. 236.

But such thinking (speculating) has accelerated in the last decade as shown in the following eight quotations:

... although evolution finds wide tacit acceptance . . . , many people gravely doubt the validity of many of the more particular arguments by which it is customarily sustained . . .

while it may be justified to believe that evolution affords a reasonable explanation of the facts of nature, it is not justifiable to maintain that no other explanation is possible or permissible." *Features of Evolution in the Flowering Plants* by Ronald Good, botanist. Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1956, pp. 1, 2.

"The surface of the land, the weathered superficial layers of the crust of the Earth, shallow continental basins and lagoons of the ocean, were the arenas in which life came into being on our planet *in the form of a multifarious host of germs.*" R. L. Berg, biochemist, in *The Origin of Life on the Earth* by A. I. Oparin and others, Pergamon Press, New York, 1959, p. 171. (Emphasis added)

"The difficulty of placing viruses, bacteria, certain 'algae,' sponges, and so on, in a fitting place in any taxonomic scheme based on a monophyletic hypothesis may stem from the possibility that the discontinuities are real and represent the existence of separate lines of descent from independent instances of neobiogenesis (establishment of primitive organisms) at different times in the history of the earth down to the present." John Keosian, biochemist, in *Science*, Vol. 131, 19 February, 1960, p. 482.

"It is worth paying serious attention to the concept that the invertebrates are polyphyletic. . . . One thing that does seem reasonably clear is that many of the groups such as the Amphibia, Reptilia and Mammalia appear to be polyphyletic grades of organization . . . On the other hand there is the theory that all the living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form . . . the evidence that supports it is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider it as anything more than a working hypothesis." *Implications of Evolution* by G. A. Kerkut, physiologist, Pergamon Press, New York, 1960, pp. 152, 153, 157.

"The palaeontological record as we know it today includes many examples of polyphyletic or parallel evolution in which the development of similar morphological features has been achieved in two or more independent lines." Loris S. Russell, paleontologist, in *Evolution: Its Science and Doctrine* edited by Thomas W. M. Cameron, University of Toronto Press, 1960, p. 10.

After quoting another researcher that as far back as fossil material is found, the conifers, ginkos, and Taxales are distinct and clearly differentiated from one another, Henry N. Andrews, botanist, adds,

"I am inclined to go a little farther than this and proffer the opinion that the ginkophytes will ultimately be shown to have evolved as a distinct and independent line of seed plants." in *Studies in Paleobotany*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1961, p. 315. ( See also his statements on separate and independent origin of most other major groups of plants on pp. 159, 312, and 398-402. )

"It is suggested that the major groups of animals arose polyphyletically, over a period of time, from a geographically widespread variety of prozoan eobionts which were evolving to explore the variety possible within a limited physico-chemical framework." J. R. Nursall, zoologist, in *Evolution*, Vol. 16, March, 1962, p.

122. (See also his proposed polyphyletic or multiple origins scheme in diagram form on p. 121.)

"The great diversity of tracheophytes in Devonian times makes it tempting to believe that the Tracheophyta were polyphyletic, because even as early as that time the lycopod, spensopsid, and fern lines were distinct. Workers adhering to the polyphyletic point of view argue that because these lines are distinct as far back as

they are known, they must have had independent sources. Other considerations, however, make it appear less likely that more than one group of ancestors are involved . . . Probably the most convincing piece of evidence in favor of monophyly is the nature of the life cycles of the tracheophytes." *Morphology and Evolution of Fossil Plants* by Theodore Delevoryas, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1962, pp. 21, 22.