6 MILLION AND COUNTING

DARWIN, ATHEISM AND GENOCIDE

THE DARWINIAN CRISIS IN AMERICA

John Henry Egan

6 Million and Counting:

Darwin, Atheism and Genocide

The Darwinian Crisis in America

ISBN: 978-0-9795608-5-9

Third Millennium Press

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 70808

"Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities" – Voltaire

Acknowledgments

Special thanks to Lois Martin for her dynamic editing, Beryl Weisman for editing the original manuscript, George Jackson, Professor of History at Hofstra University for teaching me critical thinking and Dr. Helen Meloy for her insights into Sociology. And to *Life Has Meaning*, whom I met one day on her lonely vigil beside Fairchild Air Force base near Spokane Washington.

Table of Contents

Prologue: Atheism Triumphant

In 2004, Dr. Richard Steinberg Ph.D. was the editor of the peer-reviewed biology journal *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*. Following normal procedures he published an article that suggested Intelligent Design (ID) might better answer the problems associated with the Cambrian Explosion than standard Darwinian mechanics.[i] The Cambrian Explosion is a problem for Darwinism because most of the complicated life forms present today originated then (c. 540 million years ago) and they emerged suddenly as complete forms, *as if they were abruptly created*.[ii] This is especially astounding because nothing more than the single celled animals had previously populated the earth. For publishing this article, Dr. Steinberg lost his job, almost immediately.

Guillermo Gonzalez is an astrophysicist and Assistant Professor in the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Iowa State University. He presented ideas that originated in the 1960's, proposals from some of the greatest astronomers and physicists in history; men like Paul Dirac, Robert H. Dicke, and Fred Hoyle. They suggested that the earth seems to be in a privileged position in the universe, and that the laws of physics look like they are finely and intentionally tuned, specifically to allow human life on earth.[iii] This is an old idea (see *Genesis*), and their modern concept is called Anthromorphism (Greek for, *in human form*). After the Scopes Trial in 1923, and especially after the movie that glorified it,[iv] spiritual views of the universe were effectually outlawed except in churches. The scientific study of the origins of the universe is called Cosmology and it is an obscure discipline. Because

the men who proposed the cosmological principle of Anthropomorphism were renowned and unassailable, they were allowed, at the time, to suggest that some unknown intelligent force intentionally created the Cosmos: Basically very few people were paying any attention. Now however, any mention of possible non-material (spiritual) causes for life and existence is far too close to the current, awfully controversial and threatening principle of Intelligent Design. So Dr. Gonzalez, not being a big name, *was* assailed, and he was denied tenure. In a similar case, Dr. Caroline Crocker taught biology at George Mason University and she merely discussed ID in her class. She too was fired.[v]

Intelligent Design says Darwinian evolution cannot explain the origin of new species, which is just what Darwinism is supposed to do. That's why ID is dangerous and banned in our schools: It menaces the principal scientific theory that governs our materialist Age. But a larger issue is that contrary to what is generally regarded as *the American Way*, we are forced to study Darwin's idea in schools, by law. Many parents in America are frustrated with the public school curriculum that forces their children to learn atheistic science without any alternatives presented. Some of the high school science guidelines are really amazing. Read this one from the official "Statement on Teaching Evolution" in California:

> *Evolutionary theory, indeed all of science, is necessarily silent of religion and neither refutes nor supports the existence of a deity or deities. Accordingly, the National Association of Biology Teachers, an organization of science teachers, endorses the following tenets of science, evolution and biology education: "The diversity of life (i.e., all life) is the outcome of evolution, an unsupervised, impersonal and unpredictable process of temporal descent with genetic modification that is affected by natural selection, chance, historical contingencies, and changing environments."*

Obviously, the above is not *silent on religion*. It says quite clearly that all life is the outcome of mechanistic forces and this has extremely unsettling implications for a majority of our population. Some local school boards have made an effort to incorporate Intelligent Design into their programs because polls show that about 35% of Americans believe in an evolution that proceeds through the hand of God. Reasonable enough you might think and I meet people who imagine this all the time. They create their own spiritual version of Darwinism, contrary to what it really is, an atheistic science. Through cultural conditioning they see evolution as a logical concept, and so they attribute teleological godlike powers to Darwinism that are absolutely not part of the theory. The essence of Darwin's idea is that there are ***no*** spiritual forces at work, not anywhere, ever. Not everyone is clear about this. Support for ID also comes from the 50% who believe solely in divine creation, that is, they reject Darwinism completely as far-fetched and utterly contrary to their own spiritual beliefs. This group doesn't have any doubt that Darwinism and religious belief are incompatible. Put all together, the Darwin doubters are a large group. But we now have a very small minority, about 15% of the population with an atheistic agenda dictating a godless view of life to more than 85 percent of us. This is Atheism triumphant in America. It didn't happen overnight, and it didn't happen by chance.

Nor is this problem confined to biology. All sciences are forced to conform to an atheistic model known as *Metaphysical Naturalism*, which proposes that the universe began with a "Big Bang" or primordial explosion, and without any guidance, electrons and other particles incredibly organized themselves into galaxies, stars, planets, and people. Have you ever seen an explosion organize itself into anything? This is the conceptual problem: The Atheistic metaphysical model is *ridiculous*. We are told that it is true, that the universe is a closed system, governed and propelled entirely by measurable

material forces and that this is the only empirically true thing we know or can know. This is what they call *science*. All the rest of our ideas about life are denigrated by our scientific priest/elite as nothing more than silly, stupid and dangerous superstition.[vi] But Darwin's inspiration, which is the cornerstone of Metaphysical Naturalism, is a theory, which means we don't really know that it's true. In fact, it is impossible to state even one true thing about it, since it is a deduction from the concept of materialism. It is vaporous smoke and mirrors because there's nothing to the origin of species but vague ideas.

However, the troubles are deeper and much more frightening than school curricula problems. There is a crisis in American life right now and it centers not only upon spirituality and materialism but also about torture and the massive imprisonment of millions of Americans. Most of those prisoners, 90% in Federal custody, are in confinement for non-violent offenses, victims of America's hostilities against its own people euphemistically defined as the "War on Drugs." The U.S. nonviolent prisoner population is larger than the populations of Wyoming and Alaska combined! Over 7 million Americans are in lockup, or on probation from incarceration. The 2.3 million citizens actually behind bars are more people than any other country on earth, both in total numbers and in *per capita* figures.[vii] In addition, as a part of "The Global War on Terror" the United States has embarked upon an official policy of torture, and amazingly, more than 1/3 of all Americans support this.[viii] Generally, one third of all Americans also support Darwinism or "evolution" in one form or another and this correlation might not be a coincidence.

Darwinism has become a philosophy of life; one without spiritual foundation and the only thing we can know about it, is its lethality: It is the most dangerous and destructive doctrine in the world today and is responsible for two centuries of cold calculated scientifically organized genocide. This book shows that Darwinism directly led to

the massive and willful murder of 6 million Jews in Europe and the forces that directed this Holocaust were never brought to justice, nor was their crime ever completely acknowledged or understood in historical and *scientific* context. Science directed the Holocaust, just as it now directs the worldwide extermination of indigenous, poor, Muslim, African and Asian people and well as the maintenance of the American prison industry. In order to carry out this captivity and extermination process, the American people themselves need to be restricted from creative thought.

The key building block in this undertaking is mind control. How does a government convince Christian people who once worshiped a God dedicated to Love, to accept torture and the massive imprisonment of innocent people? Some studies say that almost 75% of all Catholics accept some forms of torture while the figure for Evangelical Christians is less, approximately 66%.[ix] Admittedly it is difficult to discern absolute figures from polling numbers but the possibility that majorities of American Christians agree to torture is beyond rational comprehension. Television shows that glorify torture are a key element in this astounding transformation of Christian values. One such show is *24*, created in the wake of the 9-11 attacks. It is the most popular drama in American television and its "hero" Jack Bauer tortures someone every episode. Maybe he shoots the fellow's kneecaps out. Maybe he kills the suspect's family right before his eyes. These were the sorts of heinous crimes the Nazis did to people they called "sub humans." Now we celebrate them as deeds of an American hero. As Jack says, "You are going to tell me what I want to know - it's just a matter of how much you want it to hurt." It's all justified by the "ticking clock" scenario: That some colossal bomb is about to go off in an American city and only American Hero Jack Bauer can save us, and the only way he can do it is through torture. Before 9-11 there were only four incidents of torture in American prime-time television

each year, and the doers were bad guys. Now there are over 100 per year, and the persons behind the awful deeds are American champions.[x] In a bizarre twist of fate as life imitates art, the American government now tells its people that torture works because it "saves lives" even though there is no proof that anyone's torment prevented any crime, anywhere, ever. American politicians no longer tell their citizens what they will do for them; they don't promise any "Great Society" anymore. They know they can't deliver it. We are virtually bankrupt, as loans from the Chinese now pay for the day-to-day operation of American government, including especially the huge payment of welfare retirement benefits that so many millions of Americans use to pay their bills and keep the American economy rolling. The only thing these phony politicians can do nowadays is promise to "protect" us, and ask for the "tools" to do so, meaning constant surveillance, incarceration and torture. In the meantime the Bill of Rights and other freedoms guaranteed in the American Constitution are now a forgotten myth. None dare call it treason however as foreign hostile nations pay our bills and train their troops on American soil to learn how to capture, occupy and defend American cities against its citizens. Amazingly no one blinks an eye about it.[xi]

The Darwinist myth that teaches our youth the notion that the world is a cold, hard and vicious place is part of the mind control that warps our lives every day; in schools, newspapers, television shows, books, and just by the common misconception that brutality is somehow "hard-wired" into our brains by our ape ancestors.[xii] What once was a Christian nation has become a bitter, ferocious and immoral state through 50 years of legally enforced Darwinist education. This is a crime of immense magnitude and the perpetrators are the same folks who once gave us Auschwitz and now Abu Ghraib, Gitmo and hundreds of other 'detention centers" both at home and abroad,

where innocent people are routinely tortured and killed, sometimes for sport.[xiii]

---

[i] Stephen Meyer, "The origin of biological information and the higher taxonomic categories" *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* 117(2):213-239. 2004

[ii] *Simon Conway Morris,* The *Crucible* of *Creation:* The *Burgess Shale and the Rise of Animals* (Oxford University Press, 1998).The Cambrian Explosion also disproves the standard "tree of life" charts that show all life branching out of *one single source*, the supposed original, primeval single cell from which all life emerged. In fact it seems that *all* complex life originated simultaneously, like blades of grass, all suddenly sprouting out at once in a spring morning. *Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must indeed have been created by some omnipotent intelligence.* Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, (Pantheon, New York, 1983), p. 197.

[iii] George Gale, "The Anthropic Principle" *Scientific American*, December 1981, p.154+. *Scientific American* would refuse to publish this article today. Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, (New York, 1983). Brandon Carter, "Large number coincidences and the anthropic principle in cosmology," *Confrontation of cosmological theories with observational data; Proceedings of the Symposium, Krakow, Poland, September 10-12, 1973.* (Dordrecht, D. Reidel Publishing Co., 1974), p. 291-298.

[iv] *Inherit the Wind*, (UA, 1960) instilled in the public's mind the notion that dissenters to Darwin were all Bible punching fanatics, with the Darwinists typified by cool reason and intellect.

[v] "Eden and Evolution" by Shankar Vedantam, *Washington Post*, Sunday, February 5, 2006; W08

[vi] Daniel Clement Dennett, *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*, (Viking, 2006). Also Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion*, (Houghton Mifflin, 2006), and many others by a newly emerged Atheistic elite, who argue that human free will is impossible due to

millions of years worth of evolutionary developments that have our brains "hard-wired," for example Steven Pinker, *The Blank Slate: The Modern Denial of Human Nature* (New York, 2002).

[vii] *Drug War Facts*, 6th edition, Douglas A. McVay, editor. www.drugwarfacts.org. Eric Schlosser, "The Prison-Industrial Complex" *The Atlantic Monthly*, Dec. 1998. "U.S. Department of Justice: The Nation's Prison Population Continues Its Slow Growth; Up 1.9 Percent in 2004." *U.S.Newswire*, 10/23/2005 Contact: Stu Smith of the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 202-307-0784. "New High In U.S. Prison Numbers: Growth Attributed To More Stringent Sentencing Laws," by N.C. Aizenman Washington Post Staff Writer Friday, February 29, 2008, p. A01, More than one in 100 adults in the United States is in jail or prison, an all-time high that is costing state governments nearly $50 billion a year and the federal government $5 billion more, according to a report released yesterday. Also, http://www.nationmaster.com/graph-T/cri_pri_per_cap

[viii] *BBC* poll, October 19, 2006.

[ix] Tom Carney, "Americans, especially Catholics, approve of torture" *National Catholic Reporter*, March 24, 2006.

[x] Jane Mayer, "Whatever It Takes: The politics of the man behind 24," *The New Yorker*, Feb. 19, 2007.

[xi] Nicole Kelley, "Brits overrun town for training exercise" LJWorld.com (Lawrence, Kansas) March 7, 2008. One hundred eighty British major officers, each a battalion commander, were imported to train in American population control exercises. Why are they here? Also, U.S. Northern Command, Canada Command establish new bilateral Civil Assistance Plan, February 14, 2008, a "Civil Assistance Plan" that allows the military from one nation to support the armed forces of the other nation during a civil emergency, without the consent of Congress. Also, Joint Services Training Combat Arms Survey, DD form 3206, asks among other questions: Yes, or no; *"I would fire upon U.S. citizens who refuse or resist confiscation of firearms banned by the United States government."* "I would swear to the following oath: *"I am a United Nations fighting person. I serve in the forces which maintain world peace and every nation's way of life. I swear and affirm to support and defend the Charter of the United Nations and I am prepared to give my life in its defense."* The great majority of US soldiers answered "no" to both questions, hence the provisions to occupy the US with foreign troops in the event of

domestic disturbances. More recently: INDIANAPOLIS, May 28 (UPI) -- *Several Indianapolis locations will serve as a mock battlefield next month as some 2,300 U.S. Marines take part in urban combat training, officials say. The Marines from the 26th Expeditionary Unit based at Camp Lejuene, N.C., are scheduled to arrive by helicopter June 4 and conduct exercises through June 19, The Indianapolis Star reported Wednesday.Col. Mark J. Desens, commander of the unit, says residents living near the training locations will be notified in advance of any "mock raids." Desens says residents "can expect to see helicopters flying overhead, military vehicles on the roads and Marines patrolling on foot. Our aim in Indianapolis is to expose our Marines to realistic scenarios and stresses posed by operating in an actual urban community, thereby increasing their proficiency in built-up areas," Desens wrote in a statement. Landing sites for the Marine helicopters include Eastgate Mall, Brookside Park, Ellenberg Park, Christian Park, Southeastway Park, Bush Stadium and Douglas Park.* Why United States troops need to practice taking American cities by storm is not addressed.

[xii] Mario Beauregard & Denyse O'Leary, *The Spiritual Brain: A Neuroscientist's Case for the Existence of the Soul*, (HarperOne, 2007), pp. 205-217.

xiii See the Academy Award winning documentary film *Taxi to the Dark Side*. An unfortunate Afghani taxi driver was tortured to death even though his American guards knew his was innocent and had no information to give. Also Deborah Davies, *Torture Inc. Americas Brutal Prisons: Savaged by dogs, Electrocuted With Cattle Prods, Burned By Toxic Chemicals, Does such barbaric abuse inside U.S. jails explain the horrors that were committed in Iraq?* BBC Channel 4. Also Jane Mayer, "Annals of Justice. Outsourcing Torture: The secret history of America's "extraordinary rendition" program," *The New Yorker*, Feb. 14, 2005, and Jane Mayer, *The Dark Side: The Inside Story of How The War on Terror Turned into a War on American Ideals* (Random House, 2008). Ibn al-Shaykh al-Libi was tortured and told of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction and links to Al Qaeda. The information was used to justify war with Iraq. He lied. "They were killing me." He said. "I had to tell them something."

Why Are Polar Bears White?

The United States of America is a divided country, beset by an intense cultural conflict, which may one day soon evolve into a shooting civil war like it did 150 years ago. States primarily in the Northeast and on the West Coast; currently referred to as "blue states" in American political jargon, generally have a higher per capita income and spend more money on schools. The folks in the rest of the country, the "red states," earn less and tend to have cultural values aligned to Fundamentalist Christianity. As such, they reject Darwinism, the modern materialistic interpretation of reality. The people in the blue states think red-state citizens are a bunch of know-nothing yokels for thinking that way. Just to be sure, there are laws in the United States that enforce the teaching of Darwinism, and in late 2004 a local school district in Georgia, a red state, was forced to defend itself in court for amending a science textbook by stating:

> *This textbook contains material on evolution. Evolution is a theory, not a fact, regarding the origin of living things. This material should be approached with an open mind, studied carefully and critically considered.*

Nothing could be truer, but incredibly, a federal judge ruled this disclaimer unconstitutional as a violation of the separation of church and state. He was confused into thinking that any doubt about Darwin's idea must be religious in nature. It is not, and last time I looked, Darwin is not mentioned in the US Constitution either. But

the fellow's ideas are force-fed to our students with the full support of the judicial branch of American government.

The essence of Darwinism is that life proceeds *totally* in a mechanical way and utterly without spiritual guidance. It is a Cosmological Philosophy, not a science. Very few people in America understand this clearly, including many professed Darwinists. Polls say only 12 percent identify with and trust Darwinism as it really is and accept, without question, this statement:

> *Human beings have developed over millions of years, but God had no part in this process.*[xiv]

This 12 percent, many of whom are educators or employed by the media, accounts for approximately 25 million people, and most of them trust the theory solely on what they learned in high school and college biology classes or from popular science magazines and television. They tend to attribute rejection of Darwinism to "creationist" groups or simple ignorance. This is not accurate. The majority is justified in their disbelief since no one has ever actually seen Darwinist evolution at work. Many Americans, including federal judges, are hoodwinked by the notion that evolution is an evident truth. But Darwinism remains conjecture and a mystery precisely because the "origin of species" is never observed, has never been observed, and cannot be demonstrated in a laboratory. But science and the media say it's absolutely correct, and average Americans who have questions and reservations about it, are usually shouted down in school board meetings when they discover that their children are being forced by law to learn it. This is a real social problem. Generally, whenever an idea needs to be legally protected, it's probably neither a good idea nor a good regulation. If it's the truth, it will prevail. The truth does not need to be sheltered in an official edict.

Darwinist reasoning makes it all seem trouble-free, and this fools plenty of high school teachers. The following is an example of the evolution of mammals and humans taken from a pop science book. Similar ideas are presented in the classroom.

> *Some of the reptiles in the colder regions began to develop a method of keeping their bodies warm. Their heat output increased when it was cold and their heat loss was cut down when scales became smaller and more pointed, and evolved into fur. Sweating was also an adaptation to regulate the body temperature, a device to cool the body when necessary by evaporation of water. But incidentally the young of these reptiles began to lick the sweat of the mother for nourishment. Certain sweat glands began to secrete a richer and richer secretion, which eventually became milk. Thus the young of these early mammals had a better start in life.*[xv]

This kind of evolution, the large-scale creation of new species from old ones, is called *macroevolution,* and the author makes it sound as easy as buying a new hat. But it is completely unknown if anything like this description ever actually happened, or can happen. Yes, mammals have fur, and reptiles, from which they supposedly evolved, have scales. But scales and fur are not even remotely similar in structure. It is not evident that one evolved into the other. No transitional form exits. It's the same with all the other suppositions in this passage. The Darwinists create an interesting tale about what *might have* happened. These are called "Just So Stories" from Rudyard Kipling's fantasy work by the same name. There is no way to know if any of it ever did happen. The logic is, just connect the dots and *presto*, there you have it: Mammals needed fur; they got it when they needed it because they needed it. It sounds good in a very superficial way and this convinces impressionable students, especially in academic settings that automatically lend social credence to the theory.

There are observable evolutionary effects called *microevolution*, which are slight adaptations generally observed in nature; Darwin's

famous finches or the legendary changed pigmentation in the wings of a group of English moths are examples. Another well-known case in point deals with bacteria that develop immunity to antibiotics. Here, natural selection does insure that most of the bacteria around hospitals have genes that defend them from antibiotics in order to better survive in this hostile environment. But bacteria with the genes that offer this protection already existed before the selective pressure occurred. This is a population shift. The drug resistant bacteria thrive around hospitals while the other ones that don't flourish in nature. *Nothing new was created*. Though these antibiotic bacterial strains are often cited in the popular literature as examples of evolution, we are not dealing with the introduction of a new species or with the creation of new organs. This small-scale evolution, like the beak variations in Darwin's finches, is also known as the mathematical theory because there are some statistical genetic data in it that can be used for analysis. The famous biologist C.H. Waddington had this to say about it:

> *The whole real guts of evolution—which is how do you come to have tigers and horses and things—is outside the mathematical theory.*

What he meant is the never observed macroevolution—how you get horses and tigers out of frogs and crocodiles—is only a deduction based upon the observed effects of microevolution. What is presented as science is actually no more than a presumption, supported by the noticeable facts of apparent adaptation.

It doesn't take a genius to figure out why a polar bear's fur is white. It seems apparent that polar bears have adapted to the ice and snow of their environment and it may have happened through the effects of natural selection: Brown bears, like most mammals, occasionally produce albino offspring. In the polar region, these progeny, through survival of the fittest and reproductive success, eventually evolved a population of white bears. This might be true. But it is not

species creation. Polar bears are exactly the same as brown bears except for their coloring, or technically, their lack of coloring. They can both mate and produce fertile cubs.

All of the changes so far described are called *variations*, meaning that they are not changes in the anatomy of the animal. The clear hairs on the polar bear are anatomically identical to the darker ones on the brown bear. But the Darwinists take this much further and propose that a walking land mammal, able to swim like a polar bear, could become a whale by undergoing a myriad of profound physical changes, such as loss of legs, development of sonar, and a 90-degree rotation of the pelvis, to mention only a few.

This kind of proposal is the nexus of the primary dilemma: How, for example, would a fish evolve into a land-dwelling, air-breathing creature? Its fins would have to turn into legs with powerful new sets of muscles and nerves, while at the same time, it would have to develop lungs for breathing oxygen and completely new kidneys to flush the fluids it now needs to drink from its system. All these changes, and many more, must also happen in a coordinated manner and be beneficial to the creature at every stage of the process, so that natural selection, *acting on the level of the individual organism*, can fix these new genes in the population. Darwinists admit that such changes are so unlikely that we will never see them occur in our lifetime, but over millions of years, they assert, such changes have happened not once, but repeatedly. Because the process is supposed to be slow and gradual, Darwinists think that they are off the hook and do not need to provide examples. They are content to create vivid explanations, like the one cited in the pop science book about reptiles, to show how it could have happened.

But tall tales are not science. If evolution is happening slowly, why don't we see any of it happening now? If random events create new forms, genetic mutations indicative of directional change should

be popping up all the time. As Darwin said, "Why isn't all of nature in flux? Why isn't every species a transitional form?" Good point! If selection and mutation are *the creative force in life*, then you need something to select from. We should see all the false starts that selection has not yet eliminated. We should see this within all species, continually and forever. For Darwinism to actually work, transition would be, and should be the normal state of nature. But we don't see that happening. Instead, nature is remarkably stable, and the fossil record, as we shall see, validates this.

Ordinary people need to know that serious disputes about Darwinism don't just come from fringe scientists and religious fanatics. Basically, the scientific dissenters, including Intelligent Design proponents, don't deny microevolution. They reject the notion that random mutation and selection alone can produce new organs and new species. Distinguished geneticist Richard Goldschmidt issued this famous and still unanswered challenge to Darwinists in 1940:

> *I may challenge the adherents of the strictly Darwinian view, which we are discussing here, to try to explain the evolution of the following features by accumulation and selection of small mutants: hair in mammals, feathers in birds, segmentation of arthropods and vertebrates, the transformation of the gill arches in phylogeny including the aortic arches, muscles, nerves, etc.; further, teeth, shells of mollusks, ectoskeletons, compound eyes, blood circulation, alternation of generations, statocysts, ambulacral system of echinoderms, pedicellaria of the same, cnidocysts, poison apparatus in snakes, whalebone, and, finally, primary chemical differences like hemoglobin vs. hemocyanin, etc. Corresponding examples from plants could be given*[xvi]

Some of Goldschmidt's suggestions are beyond the average reader's ken but we can all get the drift. He isn't asking for any proof as to how teeth or feathers evolved from tiny mutations, just some kind of valid explanation beyond a wave of the hand. He didn't get one, because no one could explain it then and no one can explain it now.

Darwinism is an idea, and you may interpret data according to it, but there's no way to know if any of it is true. And as Goldschmidt correctly challenged, it's not even possible to realistically imagine how it works.

There is a good possibility that Darwinism is absolutely false but it survives all challenges because it is a political and sociological issue vital to the perpetuation of material atheism and monopoly capitalism as an economic system. The United States is secular and stridently militaristic; we have the largest and most powerful military force in world history. And sure, there are plenty of people in America who believe in divine beings and Jesus' essential message, as well as innumerable politicians who want to fleece money and harvest votes from organized Christians, but the government and the educational system are secular. Darwinism fits in precisely because it is an atheistic determination of reality—a history of life devoid of spirituality. As such it is called "science" even though it does not meet the usual scientific criteria. Observations from nature don't support the idea, but it holds sway anyway because it presents a possible way for life to evolve without any sort of God getting in the picture.

Darwinism is now the overriding philosophical principle of our culture and our Age. All our sciences conform to its materialistic design. It is the most important principle of our time because it has completely displaced spirituality and put animals on an equal footing with humanity. Humans, in spite of the fact that they are completely unique, are now often regarded merely as an advanced form of monkey, and a dangerous one at that.

> *The destruction of the natural world is not the result of global capitalism, industrialization, western civilization or any flaw in human institutions but is a consequence of the evolutionary success of an exceptionally rapacious primate.*[xvii]

Thus our civilization often interprets the evolution of the entire world, as well as the advancement of human nature, according to one general idea. Powerful institutional forces reason from this assumption and see, for example, a positive good in massive population decline. Some, like the late oceanographer Jacques Cousteau, argue that only a 90% reduction in human population will save the planet from environmental collapse. Others, like Dr. Henry Kissinger, simply argue with extreme malice that the "depopulation" of the Third World is necessary for the continued security of the United States and its allies[xviii] There are a lot of dead people in that equation, but it doesn't present a problem to those indoctrinated in Darwinist/Eugenic logic. This ethos allows us to accept massive population reduction, to rationalize the evil inherent in the idea, and to make this wickedness intellectually and morally acceptable to ordinarily good people. This sort of iniquity seems commonplace today as we often calmly view mass murder for entertainment. In our minds, the Universe has become a cold and brutal materialistic environment and our society has evolved accordingly. For the last 100 years, the entire world has been at war. The just-closed 20th century was the most violent in history and the new century doesn't appear to be any better. It is no coincidence that the rise of Darwinism to *de facto* state religion has exactly coincided with our civilization's decline into the depths of depravity and unrepentant brutality.

[xiv] Gallup Poll, March 5 2001. Gallop began questioning views of evolution in 1982 and the numbers have remained constant ever since. Also, CBS News poll, Oct. 23, 2005.

[xv] George Gamow, Martynas Ycas, *Mr. Tompkins Inside Himself* (New York: Viking Press, 1967), p. 149.

[xvi] Richard Goldschmidt, *The Material Basis of Evolution* (New Haven: Yale, 1982).

[xvii] John Gray, *Straw Dogs: Thoughts on Humans and Other Animals* (Granta, 2003). Also, Robert Wright, *The Moral Animal: Why We Are the way We Are-The New science of Evolutionary Psychology*, (Vintage, New York, 1994), Frans de Waal, *Our Inner Ape: A Leading Primatologist Explains Why We Are Who We Are*, (Penguin, New York, 2005). For a scathing critique of evolutionary psychology see John Horgan, *The Undiscovered Mind: How the Human Brain Defies Replication, Medication, and Explanation*, (Simon & Schuster, 1999), "Darwin to the Rescue" pp.167-19 and Mario Beauregard, Ph.D & Denyse O'leary *The Spiritual Brain: A Neuroscientist's Case for the Existence of the Soul*, Harper One, 2007.

[xviii] *National Security Memo 200*, April 24, 1974, "Implications of world wide population growth for U.S. security & overseas interests." It states in part "depopulation should be the highest priority of U.S. foreign policy towards the Third World." The latest things are ethnic specific germ warfare weapons: Roy Blake, "Genetic Bullets, Ethnically Specific Bioweapons," *Washington Free Press*, Jan./ Feb. 2000. Robert Lederman, "The Human Genome Project and Eugenics," *North Coast Xpress*, Fall 2000. Greg Bishop, "Ethnic Weapons for Ethnic Cleansing," *Konformist*, March 2000, Terrie Girdner, Karen Parlette, Jennifer Swift, "Human Genome Project Opens the Door to Ethnically Specific Bioweapens," *Project Censored*, April 8, 2003. Corporate news coverage: *Daily Telegraph* (London) 7/7/00, *Agence France Presse* 1/21/99, *The Gazette* (Montreal) A-4, *Baltimore Sun* 1/22/99 A-18, *The Salt Lake City Tribune* 1/27/99 A-13, *The Times Union* (Albany) 2/2/99 D-2.

Science and Genocide

The Second World War was the continuation of a European war that began in 1914 and expanded into a century of perpetual world-wide warfare. The war took many guises and despite innumerable treaties and armistices has continued ever onward. It is now the 21st Century and the human catastrophe persists. Many countries now wage war against foreign enemies, their own people, or both. Since most of the powers involved are heavily populated industrialized nations, the cumulative death toll is the largest in seven thousand years of recorded history.

From the beginning, Germany was one of the nations caught up in the war. During the Second World War phase (1939-1945), its dictator was Adolf Hitler, who also led the country's National Socialist (Nazi) political party. In 1945, after six years of full-scale war, Germany was (again) crushed and the victorious Russian and American armies were seemingly unprepared for what they found—evidence of mass murder in slave labor/death camps replete with gas chambers, crematoria, and piles of emaciated bodies. There shouldn't have been any shock at all. All through the Second World War, information about the death camps was available to anyone in the United States, as these conditions were openly publicized in the media. Two weeks after Germany invaded Poland in 1939, the *New York Times* reported that the Germans planned the "removal" of three million Jews from the country. Nobody cared then or later. If anyone did pay any further attention and looked through small, usually liberal journals, they could find information about the destruction of Europe's Jews,

including fairly accurate and specific information about the various death camps.[xix]

The governments of the United States and its Allies knew full well what was happening to European Jews. They did nothing because they profited from it. Jews were transported to slave labor/concentration camps not just to be murdered, which they were, but also to work in the German armaments industry. This was good for business in the United States. The Americans knew that the vast majority (90%) of German military resources were fighting the communist Red Army. For most of the war, the United States was reasonably content to sustain minimal losses in Europe and harass the Nazi empire indirectly with "strategic bombing" aimed mostly at civilians.[xx] The long-term political plan was to allow the Germans and the Russians to slaughter each other by the millions in a protracted race war and then easily take over. That was how it worked out, and since that time, the United States has ruled the world economically and militarily.

Throughout this war, the lethal work of the death camps continued unabated. It is now generally known that American corporations, such as DuPont, Coca Cola, Ford, General Motors, IBM, ITT, and many others, were invested in or owned German firms that profited from slave labor. Auschwitz, and other camps like it, evolved as the war progressed. When American and British bombers made German corporate life in cities difficult, the Germans moved their plants eastward into Poland to work in conjunction with the newly erected death camps. In an arrangement between government and industry, German corporations such as Mercedes-Benz, Porsche, BMW, and American-owned German firms like Focke-Wulf, were funded by the German government to produce war material with slave labor. Profits soared because military contractors did not have to pay wages to its massive Jewish and Russian prisoner-of-war slave labor workforce.[xxi]

The Nuremberg Military Tribunals established that Auschwitz was financed and owned by the German chemical firm I.G. Farben, a major corporate backer for the German army. Since the German *Reichmark* was a valid international currency, corporate profits were easily converted into dollars and the money repatriated to America through international financial institutions. Millions were killed at Auschwitz, but not before many were first worked to death. This presents complex problems for the International Jewish Community. The fact that Europe rose, practically as a whole, to murder the entire population, including women and children, is a difficult pill to swallow. Jews prefer to see it as the act of "one evil man." They miss the point. The destruction of European Jewry was not just Adolf Hitler's deranged "final solution." Rather, it was the result of Euro-American reliance upon Darwinism to determine history.

Before and during the Second World War, a number of people wished to destroy Jews, Gypsies, and Slavs for biological reasons, a process they termed "racial purification." We call it "ethnic cleansing" now. Hitler was keen on this idea, and wrote about it extensively in his internationally popular book *Mein Kampf*, first published in 1925. However, his idea that a nation state ought to be involved in mass murder for social and biological reasons was not new. The idea originated in England with the publication of *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798) by the Reverend Thomas Malthus and later in *The Origin of Species: The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life,* (1859) by Charles Darwin.[xxii] Malthus and Darwin dramatically altered our conceptual approach to life, and nothing has ever been quite the same since. While Hitler targeted Jews, Reverend Malthus took aim at the poor. In conformity with Calvinist doctrine, he saw the poor as evil and suggested that they be eradicated through active measures by the realm. This was a new idea. Prior to Malthus, governments were not interested in what we now call "social engineer-

ing." The Romans, for example, never worried about what their citizens thought or did in the bedroom or at home, or anywhere for that matter, just as long as they paid their taxes and didn't interfere with the smooth functioning of the state. Malthus, in contrast, cared about what we now define as "social norms." He coined a phrase, "*the struggle for existence*" and wrote that the newly emerged urban poor were a drain upon an otherwise vibrant English society. He suggested that the government, as well as charitable organizations, cease to provide aid and assistance to the poor, since these people would, in the end, be responsible for the destruction of culture. He outlined methods by which the poor could be eliminated. These included withholding medicines, inflicting deadly diseases (germ warfare), and complete neglect. Malthus' ideas came to be the philosophical core for Darwin's book, for Hitler's state-sponsored genocide, and for our present welfare, torture and genocidal policies.[xxiii]

Malthus, in splendid isolation from reality, never understood that medieval people were compelled to move away from farms and rural areas into cities when the industrial revolution took root. This wasn't a voluntary migration made by adventurous souls seeking opportunities in the city, a fiction presented in schools to justify the evolution of consumer cultures. Actually, in medieval society, people had various rights and lived very well. These rights included access to common land and, on that land, rights to fuel, water, and shelter. When the industrial revolution began, England's ruling elite realized that money could be made from grazing sheep and selling wool to mills. Since the leaders didn't legally own the land, they changed the laws. The shift from common law to codified civil law enabled the privileged to enact the Enclosure Acts, which allowed landowners to drive newly disfranchised and now landless serfs off the land and into the cities. When small farms disappeared from the countryside, shops disappeared from the villages. Because there were no patrons, reve-

nue, or employment, villages became depressed areas, and young men and women moved to the cities just to survive. In cities, however, they had no rights to anything but a job, which they were forced to accept through the passage of various Vagrancy Laws.[xxiv] With their structured and efficient agrarian society completely broken down, nothing now protected them from the oppressive laws of the urban jungle.

These events created a new class of people, one we now call "the urban poor." Medieval England had never experienced this type of metropolitan poverty and the Goode Reverend Malthus became very uneasy. His discomfort was acute and caused by the overcrowded industrialized cities he saw teeming with new arrivals every day. And he was also very disturbed about the customs of the new inner-city folks. Malthus never grasped that the streetwalkers who roamed the dark alleys of the mill towns were there in desperation and not by choice. When parents were forced to work 16-hour days, six days a week, they might not rightly know where their daughters were. To correct this "evil," Malthus argued that there were "positive" checks on unwanted population growth, i.e., anything to shorten the natural duration of human life. Death, in his scheme, as well as for Darwin and Hitler, became an empowering and healing beneficial sociological process.[xxv]

A deep thinker, Malthus also used the new science of exponential mathematics to explain how the population growth of the under classes might affect the decline of civilization and the life styles of the rich and famous. This is the only aspect of his disturbing philosophy taught in schools today. He argued that as populations grew rapidly and exponentially, as in 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, etc., land use would accelerate more slowly, arithmetically, as in 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. Therefore, he argued, in an expanding civilization, populations would necessarily grow faster than the potential of the land to support them. However,

modern agricultural techniques, such as crop rotation (1645), cast iron plows (1785), mass production of plows (1783), and the introduction of threshing machines (1790's), were already in use when Malthus wrote his book. As a result, his computations about the relationship between land use and population growth were already irrelevant. Even so, Malthus' assertions are still presented as fact in modern-day schools and literature, and their impact inspires social planning to this day.

Malthus' book was a hit, and it influenced Charles Darwin and Alfred Russell Wallace, two Victorian Englishmen who originated the idea of an evolution of species by means of a "selective" process. They applied Malthus' "struggle for existence" to the animal kingdom and concluded that the unseeing and necessarily cruel and ruthless hand of nature would weed out those unfit for survival. Like Malthus, both Darwin and Wallace saw this process as a positive good for the general population. They believed that if weaker strains were weeded out, the vitality of surviving generations would improve.

Malthus, Darwin, and Wallace didn't invent their ideas in a vacuum. Their concept of *naturalistic evolution* found a receptive audience in England when a new and economically powerful industrialized corporate elite was keen to negate an all-pervasive *Biblical* history. The industrial elite wanted national policy to be rationally determined by their representatives, and their bankers wanted state policy to represent their interests, rather than those of monarchs who, while they often ruled by whimsy, had their nation and family in mind before that of international banking interests. To organize this radical shift in power the moneyed elite moved to limit the power of hereditary monarchs and the religious structures that supported them. This general process continues to this day! To buttress their position and movement, a new science was promoted: *Geology*. This new scientific analysis gave bankers and industrialists

the evidence they needed to dispute belief in the infallible truth of the *Bible* and its God. Of the first 13 members of the *Geological Society of London* (founded in 1807), none were geologists, mainly because there were hardly any geologists around. By 1825, the vast majority of the 637 members were lawyers, doctors, and members of Parliament. They were interested in modern geology because the new science proposed that the Earth was older, far older, than the generally accepted Judeo-Christian age of 6,000 years. In a somewhat complicated political treatise, it was argued that if aspects of Biblical history are false, then all of it was phony, and the elimination of the Divine Right of Kings to rule by the hand of God should naturally follow.

Today, there is a widespread assumption that Charles Darwin's work broke the power of Euro-American theologians. But it was Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* (1831) that first deflated them. Lyell, along with James Hutton (1726-1797), proposed that the history of the Earth was an old and slow stable process, *an evolutionary one*, whereby changes took place through wind, rain, and glaciations, rather than through the sudden, violent, catastrophic upheavals recounted in the Bible.[xxvi] Suddenly after Darwin published, western civilization was presented with an entirely new history. The history of Adam and Eve, the flood with Noah and his ark, and a young Earth was gone, replaced by a new notion, in which the Earth was old, very old. Now humans were no longer divine manifestations, but were evolved from much older forms. Life was not a gift from God, but a natural process that proceeded mechanically without Divine guidance. This shattered the ethical foundations of Euro-American society and led directly and absolutely to the scientifically organized Holocaust of Europe's Jews.

There is also a common misconception that Charles Darwin invented the theory of "natural selection." This is not true. Ideas about selection were already in vogue long before Darwin published.

Another English naturalist, Patrick Matthew, introduced the term in 1831. A study of the Irish famine and genocide in the 1840s show how his ideas were used by Britain's House of Lords to rationalize its attempt to exterminate the Irish people. Debates in Parliament about the Irish famine often made reference to "natural selection" twenty years before Darwin published his now-famous book. The House of Lords elected to "let natural selection take its course," when they voted to withhold food from Ireland, then part of Great Britain. More than a million people died in Ireland's Holocaust.

The European Christian state quickly evolved into what we now call the secular state, one that in practice owes no allegiance to religion or any purpose, other than its own materialistic survival. The alternative history presented by Malthus, Lyell, and Darwin reinforced the opinion that a violent, brutal society was an indispensable and unavoidable consequence of nature. This was drilled into students and the new sciences of geology and evolutionary biology became the linchpins of atheistic Humanism: a study of the accomplishments of humankind and earthly deeds rather than theological speculations about spirit bodies.[xxvii] These sciences eventually evolved into a new "faith" that was more than just a tool of the state. Science and the modern state now stood together and supported one another. If either fell from grace, it could mean the destruction of the other. Thus we see today the enforced teaching of Darwinism in American schools.

It's no accident that modern science developed in Calvinist nations. The leading industrial and commercial powers of the 19th and early 20th centuries were Germany, Great Britain, the United States, the Netherlands, and Sweden, Calvinist nations all. These countries embraced Malthus, Lyell, and Darwin's theories because their ideas generally conformed to a Calvinist theology already in place. The Calvinist/Puritan mentality saw life as a mechanical, selective

process. There was no sense trying to save the poor—they were already doomed to eternal hellfire by the doctrine of predestination. Anyone who wasn't a hardworking, devout, and materially successful Christian was not only condemned to eternal torment with Satan, but was in fact an agent of the Evil One on Earth. Mass murder then became institutionalized, as European nations began to apply the Malthusian/Darwinian ethos to not only their urban poor, but to native peoples in Asia, Africa, and America as well. Europeans had been slaughtering indigenous populations for centuries, but the new history presented a soothing rationale for European barbarism. It wasn't necessary any longer to pretend that full-scale genocide was some unfortunate but necessary consequence of national industrialization and expansion. The new history could be used to justify large-scale exterminations of people as a positive growth-oriented process, good for everyone in the end, including the murdered.

Genocide became an acceptable and rational state policy. When the science of genetics emerged in the 20th century it seemed to offer further mathematical proof that some races and peoples were superior to others due to their genetic makeup. When Nazi death camp doctors were on trial at the Nuremberg war crimes tribunal for their human experiments in sterilization, *euthanasia* (Greek for "good death"), and *eugenics* (Greek=good birth), they protested to the English and Americans, "We got our ideas from you!"[xxviii] And so they did. These were ordinary men charged with the most gruesome murders imaginable. They were all well educated and once they accepted Darwinist evolution, it seemed that all ethical constraints were put aside in the pursuit of racial purification and science. Years of exposure to Malthusian/Darwinist theory made it reasonable to suppose that the natural pace of human evolution could, and should be, increased by conscious human action, and that such efforts would be good, because evolution necessarily results in improvements.

Consistent with this reasoning therefore, it made sense to assign the state a role in directing the evolution of its citizens. With the mistaken idea that the elimination of "inferior" variants might strengthen the race as a whole, they then accepted and gladly implemented Nazi racial ideology.[xxix]

But these ideas were not limited to Nazi Germany. Like the Nazi doctors said, they copied American laws that were designed to insure the "purification" of the white Anglo-Saxon race. American race laws were aimed at the sterilization of people defined as "imbeciles, syphilitics, drunkards, habitual criminals," or anyone local authorities deemed "deviant." The United States Supreme Court ruled in 1927 that these laws were constitutional.[xxx] These ideas die hard: Canada and countries in Scandinavia continued to forcibly sterilize women deemed genetically inferior through the 1970's with Sweden sterilizing 60,000 between 1935-1976.[xxxi] This was all part of a larger *Eugenics* movement, founded by Darwin's cousin, Francis J Galton. Its aim, essentially, was to get rid of people deemed "undesirable" and thus improve the surviving stock. Reminiscent of Malthus, Galton said:

> *What Nature does blindly, slowly and ruthlessly, man may do providently, quickly and kindly.*[xxxii]

Nazi doctors, as well as Hitler, regularly communicated with American raceologists who were proud to have inspired the Nazi eugenic state. The American eugenist, C.M. Goethe, had this to say to California's *Human Betterment Foundation*, which led the nation in sterilizations:

> *You will be interested to know that your work has played a powerful part in shaping the opinions of the group of intellectuals who are behind Hitler in this epoch-making program. Everywhere I sensed that their opinions have been tremendously stimulated by American thought, and particularly by the work of the Human Betterment*

Foundation. I want you…to carry this thought with you for the rest of your life, that you have really jolted into action a great government of 60 million people.[xxxiii]

Six years later, the Nazi government implemented a plan to murder the entire Jewish population of Europe.

[xix] *New York Times*, September 13, 1939. Also, for example, "(The) effect of our silent complicity in the massacre of the Jews" *New Republic*, January 10, 1944. Address of May 2, 1943 on the Jewish massacres; Excerpt. A.A. Berle, *Current History*, June 1943. "European Jews are in a desperate plight" *Christian Century*, September 8, 1943.

[xx] The American and the British went to great lengths to delay an invasion of Western Europe. This included the intentional destruction of the Canadian 2nd Division in the 1942 raid on the French port of Dieppe. The 2nd division suffered 67% casualties, mostly killed and captured, an operation that made the charge of the Light Brigade (33% casualties) seem like a walk in the sun. German Naval Operations noted, "From a political point of view the Dieppe raid was unwise to say the least because it was bound to end in heavy losses without producing any visible results." But, as one Canadian wrote, "We were sent into the raid, in my opinion, largely to prove to our people, the American and the Russians, that a second front just wasn't on. And we proved it." The Earl of Mountbatten, who commanded from the rear, wrote: "Dieppe gave the Allies the precious secret of victory. If I had the same decision to make again, I would do as I did before." Mountbatten's assertion is phony. When the Allies finally invaded in June 1944, they did so with three armies and massive air superiority, rather than elements of one division without support. The American Chief of Staff General Marshall wanted to invade Western Europe in 1942 but was put off by Roosevelt and Churchill. With the bulk of the Luftwaffe in Russia, air superiority over the English Channel, as well as overwhelming naval superiority, was available to the Allies in 1942. For more on Dieppe see Ronald Atkin, Dieppe 1942: *The Jubilee Disaster* (London: Macmillan, 1980). Also the famed Allied strategic bombing offensive was aimed mostly at German civilians. See Larry J. Bidinian, *The Combined Allied Bombing Offensive Against the German Civilian* (Lawrence, Kansas: Colorado Press, 1976). In 1942, prior to any bombing, German industry produced 15,596 aircraft of all types. In 1944, after two

years of strategic bombing, they produced 39,870 aircraft. See Eugene M. Emme, *The Impact of Air Power* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1959), *US Strategic Bombing Survey*, excerpts, pp. 268+. Allied bombing of Rumanian oil production was ineffective and German oil imports only dried up when the Red Army took Ploesti in August 1944, Emme, op. cit. German synthetic oil production increased until Spring, 1944, see Michael Freeman, *Atlas of Nazi Germany*, (New York: Macmillan, 1987), p.174, when the Allies prepared for their own invasion of France, delayed until it looked like the Red Army might overrun all of Germany. In 1943 German armaments production increased threefold, Freeman, *op. cit.,* p. 167.

[xxi] Nuremberg Tribunals, NI-10030 v. VIII Green, pp. 1183-1187, cited in Benjamin B. Ferencz, *Less Than Slaves: Jewish Forced Labor and the Question of Compensation* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1979), p.34. On corporate slave labor see Anthony Sampson, *The Sovereign State of ITT* (New York: Stein and Day, 1973), Josiah E. DuBois, Jr., *The Devil's Chemists: 24 Conspirators of the International Farben Cartel Who Manufacture Wars* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1952), pp. 247-250 for information on the Ford Motor Co. Germany, also, "Die Herren nahmen nur die Kraftigsten," Der Spiegel, #15, April 7, 1986, pp.79+ for Mercedes Benz, then Daimler-Benz use of slave labor. Daimler-Benz offered the death penalty to any worker who misplaced even a screw. See also Howard Watson Ambruster, *Treason's Peace: German Dyes & American Dupes* (New York: Beechhurst Press, 1947), for more on I.G. Farben. The same people who engineered the slave labor/genocide program were rewarded with leadership positions in post-war Germany. See Tom Bower, *Blind Eye To Murder: Britain, America and the Purging of Nazi Germany: A Pledge Betrayed* (Andre Deutsch: London, 1981). Edwin Black, *IBM and The Holocaust: The Strategic Alliance Between Nazi Germany and America's Most Powerful Corporation*, (Crown, 2008).

[xxii] T.R. Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population; or A View of its past and present Effects on Human Happiness; With an Inquiry into our Prospects Respecting the Future Removal or Mitigation of the Evils which it Occasions*, 2 v., Patricia James, ed. (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989), and Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species, A Facsimile of the First Edition* (New York: Atheneum, 1967). Both Malthus and Darwin trace their reasoning to Thomas Hobbes, 1588-1679. Hobbes wrote that human life in "the state of nature" was essentially "nasty, brutish and short." Thus humans would surrender their "natural rights" to a sovereign in a social contract to secure the benefits of civilization. Here we see the first modern philosophical attack upon the notion that monarchs rule by fiat from God. Thomas Hobbes,

Leviathan; or The Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil (sic), (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1946).

[xxiii] John L. Hess, "Malthus Then and Now" *The Nation*, April 18, 1987, p. 496. See also a *New York Times* editorial, "The Right Minimum Wage: $0.00." 1-14-87. Note also that then California governor Ronald Reagan once offered the idea that the poor should be given food laced with botulism when the Symbionese Liberation Army demanded that food be given to the poor as ransom in the Patty Hearst abduction. Also, Allan Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism* (Chicago: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1980), Thomas F. Gossett, *Race: The History of an Idea in America* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1986).

[xxiv] John L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Town Labourer 1760-1832; the New Civilization* (New York, London: Longmans, Green, 1917). Contradicting popular myth, the Hammonds showed that life in industrialized cities was far inferior to medieval life in the countryside.

[xxv] Malthus, *op. cit.*, v. I, pp. 16-24.

[xxvi] Charles Lyell, *Principles of Geology, Being an Attempt to Explain the Former Changes of the Earth's Surface, by Reference to Causes Now in Operation* (London: Murrey, 1830-33). James Hutton, originally introduced Lyell's idea in *Theory of the Earth* (1788), 2 vols., *System of the Earth* (1785), *Theory of the Earth* (1788), *Observation on Granite* (1794) (Darien, Conn., Hafner, 1970). Also, "The Origins of Modern Geological Theory", George Grinnell, *Kronos*, v. I., #4, Winter 1976, pp. 68-76.

[xxvii] The question of "How many angels may sit upon the head of a pin?" is not representative of the stupidities of medieval society but rather an important question for a theological rather than secular society. The question asks, do angels, or spirit bodies generally, occupy physical space? The question only seems ridiculous if one rejects spiritualism outright. In materialist cosmology, a similar question is whether or not neutrinos have mass, or do they actually occupy space? Nobody knows.

[xxviii] Ideas about racial purification were never isolated to Central European fascists. In fact, Nazi doctors accused of war crimes at the

Nuremberg Trials cited American sterilization laws and human experimentation in their defense. For information on the American medical profession and human experimentation see James H. Jones, *Bad Blood: the Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment* (New York: Free Press, 1981), Louis Lasagna, *Special Subjects in Human Experimentation, Experimentation with Human Subjects* (New York: George Brazillier, 1969), p.262.

[xxix] Robert Jay Lipton, *The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide*, (Basic, 1986). Also, Helga Schneider, *Let Me Go*, (Penguin, 2001). A daughter's final visit to the mother who abandoned her in 1941 and joined the Nazi *SS* to gladly work in the death camps.Also, George J. Annas and Michael A. Grodin, *The Nazi Doctors and the Nuremberg Code: Human Rights in Human Experimentation*, (Oxford University Press, 1995).

[xxx] American compulsory sterilization laws aimed at degenerates began in 1907. In different states the categories included criminals, idiots, imbeciles, epileptics, rapists, lunatics, drunkards, drug fiends, syphilitics, moral and sexual perverts, as well as people deemed, "diseased and degenerate." See R.C. Lewontin, Steven Rose, and Leon J. Kamin, *Not In Our Genes* (New York: Pantheon, 1984), pp. 87-88.

[xxxi] "Here of All Places," *Economist*, August 30, 1997, p.36.

[xxxii] Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race*, (Thunder's Mouth Press, New York, 2003), pp.13-19.

[xxxiii] Black, *op.cit.,* p.277.

Darwin's Idea

It would be very productive if we all could engage in free debate about Darwin. We know now that in a professional setting disagreement with Darwin can be dangerous. In a social setting, it's almost impossible to talk to Darwinists unless you are in agreement. Conversation on the topic usually devolves into an argument, and a pretty vicious one at that. Expect to be treated with derision and scorn if you question Darwin in mixed company. Still though, it is necessary to deal with them, because Darwinists control the debate about human origins from the classroom to the newspapers, as well as in all the nature shows on TV and in all the popular science literature. They think they have the answers, even though most professed Darwinists have no more schooling in biology than perhaps a course in high school or college, and often what they know is from popular science magazines such as *Scientific American* and *Discover*.

The last time I spoke to a Darwinist, a college graduate, I told him I thought the theory didn't have any weight. He just grinned and said, "That's because you don't understand Darwin." We talked some more and it turned out he was the one who didn't understand Darwin. He was under the impression that the blanket term "evolution" covered all the bases. It doesn't. He referred me to an article he had read in *National Geographic* that explained everything, very clear. "If only you would read it," he said, "Then you'd understand how evolution works." He didn't know that magazines like *National Geographic* are editorially bound to support Darwin to the point of

absolutely prohibiting alternative discussions—not even contrary letters to the editors are allowed.

"Well" I asked, "what do you think I need to know?" He exhaled in sheer bliss. Now, the moment of opportunity had come. "The flipper of a whale has five digits, just like a human hand!" he exclaimed. "That's called a homology," I said. "But what does it mean?" Hyperventilated, he looked at me like I was a fool. "Why, it means that we share a common ancestor with whales and are related, just as Darwin predicted!" Now that might be true. But actually, it also means both are mammals and share similar characteristics of their class. I tried to point out to him that this was not proof for Darwinist evolution; that any number of events could have produced the similarity, and that the hindlimbs of all mammals were also constructed in the same way. No evolutionist suggests that the fore and hindlimbs evolved from each other as they are not controlled by the same genes and perform different functions.[xxxiv] Yet, if both evolved independently from tiny mutations why did they both evolve in exactly the way? The design seems paramount and universal among mammals. Frustrated, he walked away, then turned back to face me. "It's as plain as day" he said. "The whale and we have a common ancestor, and that's why the flipper and the human hand are constructed practically alike!" I told him again that another explanation could be *archetypes*; that nature has a way of constructing similar organs because the natural world recognizes successful designs. "That's Darwinism," he shouted in triumph. So I asked him to define Darwinism. "It's evolution," he said. "Define evolution," I replied. "Darwinism…" he started to say, but then shook his head in dismay. I looked him in the eye and interjected "Can't you see the circular reasoning? Darwinism is evolution and evolution is Darwinism? It's meaningless." "It's not circular," he said with contempt. "They mean the same thing because they *are* the same thing."

That's where he was dead wrong. He saw "evolution" as being Darwinism, but Darwin's idea is actually a very specific kind of evolution, one that proceeds mechanically by means of genetic mutations and natural selection and this distinction fools many people. Finally, I tried another approach and said, "Tell me one thing that is *true* about Darwin's theory of the origin of species?" He was dumbfounded. He looked to the left and to the right, shook his head, and said, "That's not a fair question." I couldn't help but laugh because sure, it's a very fair question. Had I asked him to tell me one true thing about astronomy or geology, he, being college educated, could have given me a long list of scientific truths. Why couldn't he tell me one true thing about Darwin's theory of evolution? He sat silently for some time, and then leapt up saying, "I know! All things are interrelated!" We weren't going anywhere. All things may be interrelated but that doesn't mean they got that way according to Darwin's idea. I thought about the Darwinist who told me that I only needed to look out the window for all the proof I needed. For her, the theory had become so ingrained that she couldn't even conceive of any other interpretation of reality. Existence itself proved the theory.

Obviously, I still had a lot to learn about talking to Darwinists, primarily because they are not logical. Where, after all, is the logic in a science when no one justly knows whether it is true or not? Where is the logic when believers can't recite one factual thing about what they are defending? The truth is Darwinists don't like to be asked probing questions, especially by those who are critical of their theory and not intimidated by bluster. After all, where is the evidence that whales and humans have a common ancestor? How is it scientifically true that a mouse scurrying about in a field can grow wings and fly or that a fish can naturally turn into a person, given enough time? These propositions may be the essence of Darwinism but are they true?

Many people are at least vaguely familiar with Darwin's one-and-only field expedition to the Galapagos Islands where he formulated his theory. While there, he saw that the islands' finches (a family of birds, generally including the canary and cardinal) varied from one another and from mainland species in a mixture of ways. Darwin reckoned the differences sprang from the birds' geographical separation from one another and through natural selection. Darwin's finches are now classified into 14 species, even though the ground finches and the tree finches are indistinguishable from one another by molecular data and are able to mate. Like the polar and brown bear, variations among finches are morphological, i.e., their colors and beak size and shape may vary but they function the same way and are really not separate species. Renowned Darwinist Ernst Mayr defines species as; "Groups of actually or potentially interbreeding natural populations that are reproductively isolated from other groups." By that definition, a roughly analogous situation among humans would be to classify Asians and equatorial Africans as different species because they are widely separated and generally do not mate with one another. But they can reproduce, and we know that despite the vast differences in physical appearance between Africans and Asians, they are one species. Sociologically, the Darwinists haven't been able to get away with defining physically different humans as separate species, at least not now. They classify animal species solely on the basis of morphology because they feel they can sell this to an unwitting public as evidence for diversification from a common ancestor. But variations are not automatic evidence for evolution. Darwinist evolution requires a creative and unique hereditary element. Something new and original has to appear: *Creation*. The fact that the coloration of some birds differs slightly is not proof for the creation of *new forms*, which is the crux of the Darwinist argument. In the Galapagos, Darwin observed the effects of microevolution or small

changes within a species. From this examination, he *deduced* that macroevolution; the origin of new species and organs was determined in the same way. This was speculation, and it remains so to this day. Why then is Darwin's deduction mandated and enforced by law to be the educational standard for our entire society? That's because *the sociology* of his idea became crucial to a massive atheistic and materialistic conception of the Universe.

This happened gradually. In response to an idea whose time had come, many people developed theories similar to Darwin's, some even before him. In 1851, the book *Social Statistics* was published. Its author, Herbert Spencer, promoted evolutionary ideas *apropos* sociology. Spencer coined the phrase "survival of the fittest" and declared that those people who are the "fittest" would survive through evolution and that it would be better for everyone if those who weren't "fit" disappeared. Herbert Spencer the Malthusian had this to say about the "unfit":

> *The whole effort of nature is to get rid of such, and to make room for better…if they are not sufficiently complete to live, they die, and it is best that they should die. All imperfection must disappear.*[xxxv]

Malthus and now Spencer anticipated the Eugenics movement and its use as a rationale for the various systematically organized Holocausts that continue to plague humankind. Also, as we said, in 1831, well before Darwin, the English naturalist Patrick Matthew had introduced the term, "natural selection." In historical terms, it doesn't matter when these ideas took root; it was the concept of "selection" and "fitness to survive" that captivated the industrial state. The Industrial Revolution was in the midst of a Malthusian upheaval in thought and action. Had Darwin not been there, Alfred Russel Wallace or someone else would have presented the same theory, one impossible to overlook, given the imagined needs of the time.

Shortly after Darwin published, a significant fossil find seemed to indicate his theory was valid. *Archaeopteryx* was a fossilized bird with reptilian features such as teeth and claws, and it looked like a creature in transition from reptile to bird. Since it had feathers, it was immediately assumed that this was an evolutionary link between the great flying dinosaurs and modern birds. However, one modern bird, the *hoatzin*, has claws, and many bird fossils have teeth, so it's not altogether clear that *Archaeopteryx* is a form in transition. It could be just another odd bird, like the reptilian-clawed *hoatzin*. In any case, *Archaeopteryx* provides no evidence for the evolution of feathers, and that's what makes a bird a bird. Darwinists assume, and tell impressionable students that, "feathers must have evolved from scales." Like the imaginary evolution of fur from scales, there is no data to support this at all. Feathers in *Archaeopteryx* appear fully developed, as perfect as the modern form. No transitional phase exists.[xxxvi]

Still, *Archaeopteryx* was, and still is, an argument for the theory and its discovery dismayed and socially defeated the early academic opponents to Darwinism, or *transmutation* as it was called in those days. Brilliant 19th century biologists like Richard Owen, Louis Aggasiz, and Georges Cuvier, among many others, based their objections to Darwin not on religious belief, but upon the facts they saw in nature. Shortly after Darwin published, Owen had this to say about the theory:

> *Is there any one instance proved by observed facts of transmutation? The last ichthyosaurus, by which the genus disappears in chalk, is hardly indistinguishable specifically from the first ichthyosaurus, which abruptly introduces that strange form of sea-lizard in the Lias. The oldest Pterodactyl is as thorough and complete as one of the latest.*[xxxvii]

You can't argue with this. Observation reveals that nature is not in flux, not presently nor in the fossil record, and Owen's remark is as

true today as it was centuries ago. But Owen, who based his objections upon scientific observation, was dismissed as a religious fanatic, as are all dissenters nowadays.

Darwinism then took on a life of its own as industrialization and colonialism began to dominate Europe and North America. Darwin's ideas were promoted for sociological reasons, while others, which at one time had primacy, were discarded. Scientists had already begun to rely upon a concept variously known as "methodological materialism," "empiricism," or "the scientific method." This process demands that all scientific evidence be measurable, and reproducible under experimental conditions. To those in the university system who wished to escape the confines of Christianity, Darwin's idea, as a materialistic conception of the universe, was very appealing. It offered an opportunity to explain a reality that didn't have anything to do with God, the Bible, or religious dogma. Given a choice between dealing with religious dogmatists or developing ideas in an environment of academic freedom, Darwin and his ideas looked very good. With a new sense of freedom, researchers began to "find" evidence to justify Darwinism because after all, it was already known that things change over time in the physical world. Today's media often use the phrase, "change through time," as a general description of Darwinism when it sells the idea, and this seems reasonable to the average person.

But did all current life evolve from a common ancestor in the remote past as the Darwinists assert? Is there continuity in nature? This is still an open question. The leap from non-living matter to life is essentially unimaginable, and modern theories are guesswork.[xxxviii] Fred Hoyle likened the spontaneous emergence of life to a tornado swirling through a junkyard and producing a Boeing 747 airplane. Darwinists long said that the original spontaneous emergence of life from inorganic matter must have taken billions of years. In a sudden

turnabout, the current theory now proposes that life might have begun on Earth as soon as the oceans were sufficiently cool to allow it to happen, or *very* rapidly. One convenient characteristic of Darwinist theory is that it allows believers to interpret evidence in any which way to support its theory. So the new data, which completely overturned the old assumptions, didn't faze Darwinist Carl Sagan at all:

> *Thus the time available for the origin of life seems to have been short, a few hundred million years at the most. Since life originated on the earth, we have additional evidence that the origin of life has a high probability.*[xxxix]

"Since life originated on the earth." How can he know this? Maybe life was introduced to the earth from afar. Anyway, the truth is unknown. But for Darwinists, whatever the facts, they always support the theory because the results are always interpreted according to the theory. The error in this methodology should be obvious. However, to the uncritical reader, Darwinist storytellers like Carl Sagan, Stephen Jay Gould, Michael Ruse, and Richard Dawkins spin a good yarn.[xl] However, a careful reading by anyone not intellectually or emotionally committed to the theory reveals that Darwin's defenders make bold assumptions centered upon pure speculation.

Designed by Euro-Americans, Darwinism became a modern creation myth that placed European society at the center of human evolution. Through mechanical action, this myth purports that; in and around Europe and the Mediterranean Basin, apelike mammalian creatures gradually evolved from reptiles, amphibians, and fish into the human species. These peoples then emerged from the rigors of an Ice Age to develop agriculture, eventually migrating outward towards India, China, and the Americas. This idea, familiar to many of us, took hold in late 19th century England and in central Europe as a

powerful alternative and refreshing break from a stifling religious intransigence.

Now, history sees humankind as only recently emerged onto the world stage, the product of billions of years of random, directionless, evolutionary development. This has evidently confused our civilization as we appear to be dependent upon an absolutely false theory of our origins. Consequently, without accurate historical perspective, we are puzzled about where we came from, how we got here, and where we are going. Euro-Americans responsible for t he development of ideas measure almost all their disciplines to a faulty outline of history suggested by Darwin: These include anthropology (both physical and cultural), archeology, astronomy/cosmology, history, biochemistry, biology, exobiology, molecular biology, sociology, and psychology. This means that virtually every tenet of advanced education may be false. We've taken a wrong turn in the road.

[xxxiv] *"The evolutionary interpretation of homology is clouded even further by the uncomfortable fact that there are many cases of 'homologous like' resemblance which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be explained by descent from a common ancestor. The similar pentadactyl design of vertebrate fore-and hindlimbs provides the classic example."* Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, (Adler & Adler, 1986), p. 151. "*What mechanism can it be that results in the production of homologous organs, the same 'patterns', in spite of their not being controlled by the same genes? I asked this question in 1938, and it has not been answered."* Gavin de Beer, *Homology: An Unsolved Problem*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1971). The question is still not answered.

[xxxv] Cited in Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race*, (Thunder Mouth Press, New York, 2003) p. 12.

[xxxvi] For more on Archaeopteryx see *Adam and Evolution*, op. cit., pp. 220-225. Michael Pitman has this to say about the evolution of feathers: *"All birds have feathers: no other organisms do. Archaeopteryx has feathers. There exists absolutely no evidence for the evolu-*

tion of feathers. The guess that DNA coding for scales `must have' changed to produce feathers is entirely unsubstantiated. No intermediate scale-feather exists" (p. 222). For more on bird forms, which predate Archaeopteryx, see: "Fossil Revisionism (Protoavis Challenge to Archaeopteryx)," *Scientific American*, October 1986, p. 84. Also S. Weisburd, "Oldest Bird and Longest Dinosaur," *Science News*, 130:103, August 16, 1986.

[xxxvii] Richard Owen, "Darwin on the Origin of Species" *Edinburgh Review*, April 1860, 11: 487-532, cited in David L. Hull, *Darwin and his Critics*, (Harvard, 1973), p. 211.

[xxxviii] Garry Hamilton, "Mother Superior" *New Scientist*, vol. 187, no. 2515, pp.26-29. He reports the latest theories, which generally imply; "The first living entity would have been a self replicating molecule." Also, Robert M. Hazen, *Gen-e-sis: The Scientific Quest for Life's Origins*, (Joseph Henry Press, 2005), *Clay Minerals and the Origin of Life*, Graham Cairns-Smith, ed. (Cambridge University Press, 1986), and for hundreds of theoretical papers; *THE ORIGINS AND EARLY EVOLUTION OF LIFE*, *The World Wide Web Home Page for research on the origin and early evolution of life on the Earth*, http://www.chemistry.ucsc.edu/~deamer/home.html

[xxxix] Carl Sagan, *Scientific American*, 1975, 232(5), p. 82.

[xl] Carl Sagan, *The Dragons of Eden: Speculations on the Evolution of Human Intelligence* (New York, 1977), Stephen Jay Gould, *The Panda's Thumb,* (New York, 1980) offers the notion that through evolutionary biology one may comprehend the mind of God. Michael Ruse, *Can a Darwinist be a Christian?* (Cambridge, 2001). A Darwinist can be anything. A more cogent question might be, can a Christian be a Darwinist?

The Mendelian Revolution

Up to the 20th century, there was no proof whatsoever that new species evolved out of old. A turning point came in 1900 with the rediscovery of the work of Gregor Mendel, an Austrian monk who liked to watch peas grow. He made certain suggestions about how *heredity* might work which evolved into the field of genetics. This still hoodwinks a lot of people who think that heredity proves Darwinism. It doesn't, but heredity is always presented as living proof in any beginning biology class. The misconception comes from the notion that Darwinism factually characterizes life and that life literally embodies Darwinism: In the minds of Darwinists, existence and theory are one and the same.

Genetics does explain how Darwinist evolution *might* work. Darwinists need machinery, because they are historically entwined in the philosophy of an unconscious universe that moves according to steadfast, inexorable mechanical laws, an intellectual process formulated by Newton around 1665. With genetics, Darwinists were finally able to produce mathematical formulas to show that their concept of macroevolution by mechanical means was at least, *not impossible*. Theoretical Darwinism, which to this day remains conjecture, presented its ideas within the context of genetics. All that mattered was that a mechanical means be found by which the theory might operate. This was consequential for the acceptance of Darwinism because no one has ever seen, let alone shown proof, that one species could become another by mutation and natural selection.

Theoretical Darwinism became inexorably bound to the hard science of genetics and has been taught accordingly. Consequently, most educated Euro-Americans don't recognize the difference between the two. The logic inherent in Mendelian Genetics and the study of heredity seems to imply that Darwinism is also that logical. It is not. The aura of fact that surrounds the Darwinist model comes from cloaking it in the legitimate science of genetics. Genetics is a hard science because there are chemical bits named genes, there is DNA, there are chromosomes, and there are even pictures of them. However, to simply say that heredity works does not in any way prove Darwinist theory. Even within the context of genetics there are serious problems. For example, ninety nine percent of all genetic hybrids are asexual and incapable of reproducing. Mutations are almost never beneficial to a species, and most of the time mutations are dealt with harshly by nature.[xli]

Most Darwinists argue that evolution proceeds by minute changes in form. These Darwinists, called *Gradualists*, say that the accumulation of minute changes over the course of aeons will construct macroevolution or speciation. Therefore, those mutations that had only minute changes in form would probably be capable of reproducing, as they would not be radically different from their parent species. But there is no evidence that this type of change would produce a *directional shift* toward speciation, e.g., eventually and naturally turning wolves into whales or fish into humans. Recently (2006) the mass media trumpeted the discovery of *Tiktaalik roseae* supposedly a transitional form between fish and land dwelling tetrapods (having four feet).[xlii] The picture of the find shows the fins arrayed as if they were feet, and a reconstruction has the fish supported by its four fins acting as legs with its elongated head protruding upwards, looking more like a Komodo Dragon than a fish. It may be true that this fish eventually evolved into you and me. The question we need to know

is; how did it happen? Can a fish naturally and gradually evolve into something completely different and vastly more complex, through tiny mutations?

The Gradualists argue that the diminutive changes would be advantageous and favorably selected by nature. But is there continuity in nature? Can a ground dwelling rodent grow wings, develop sonar for night vision instead of eyes, and eventually hang upside down in trees to both sleep and reproduce? Yes, say the Gradualists, and the slow accumulation of tiny advantages is the method by which this happens. *This is an interesting idea.* The major problem with it is the lack of evidence. Bats make up 20 per cent of all mammals, so there are a lot of them. They emerge suddenly, fully functional in the fossil record. There is no evidence for their evolution from rodents.

> *Unfortunately, the fossils available only complicate matters. They do not represent transitional morphology between quadrupedal (four-footed) animals and flying bats, and they represent animals nearly as specialized as their modern relatives.*[xliii]

The fact remains that species tend to appear and disappear in the fossil record without any significant evolutionary change, just as Owen observed long ago. Nor do we detect anything like gradualism happening now. Animals and plants, which come into the world, tend to be like their parents. It's as simple as that. Mutations occur rarely, and when they do, they are almost always grotesque alterations in form that offer no survival benefit. Scientists directly manipulating chromosomes and genes in modern genetic engineering laboratories haven't produced a new species, sunflowers notwithstanding.[xliv] As for genetic mutation, certainly hundreds of thousands of fruit flies have been exposed to radioactive bombardment for the express purpose of producing mutations, and the mutations that resulted were generally disfigured. It's true that by selective breeding the fruit

flies in these experiments were made to produce more facial bristles. This is often presented as proof that Darwin's generalization is universally correct. But a fruit fly with a slightly different face is still the same species and not even remotely close to evolving into something else.

Humans have bred plants and animals for centuries. Darwinists often use breeding as a proof that their theory has validity. Sure, the size and appearance of life forms are changed through various breeding methods, but this is not speciation. Breeding consists of mating certain varieties to attain a specific end by *consciously* selecting the most favorable offspring and allowing only them to breed again. Thoroughbred racehorses are an example. The offspring are selected for size and speed. Only the fastest among them are allowed to mate. Even though the horses increase in speed, they remain horses. Also, an increase in size produced by genetic breeding has limits. A bigger and better tasting strawberry may appear, but eventually the strawberry plant becomes infertile—its size increase stops and goes no further.

If natural selection were a dynamic *creative force* in nature, able to manifest new, complex species and organs such as sonar in sea mammals and in bats, human selection would not only do the same but also would do it quickly since the selection would be guided by intelligent action. In nature, mutation and selection are said to be random and without conscious direction. The results of cognizant breeding would be quickly apparent, and new *varieties,* such as in dog breeding, do rapidly appear. But the dogs stay dogs, even after thousands of years of selective breeding. Eventually, if Darwinist theory were correct, new species would inevitably emerge. They don't! If Darwinist theory were an accurate, universal truth, there would be no limits to selective breeding, and you would see that the dogs bred by our ancestors long ago would now be some other

species. That has never even remotely happened. Molecular biologist Michael Denton:

> *Whatever the initial source of its appeal, the concept of the continuity of nature has always suffered the enormous drawback in that at no time throughout the whole history of Western thought…has it been possible to provide any direct observation or empirical evidence in its support. Put simply, no one has ever observed the interconnecting continuum of functional forms linking all known past and present species of life. The concept of the continuity of nature has existed in the minds of men, never in the facts of nature. In a very real sense therefore, advocacy of the doctrine of continuity has always necessitated a retreat from pure empiricism, and contrary to what is widely assumed by evolutionary biologists today, it has always been the anti-evolutionists, not the evolutionists, in the scientific community who have stuck rigidly to the facts and adhered to a more strictly empirical approach.*[xlv]

The idea that species continually evolve by minute changes through genetic mutation and selection is completely far-fetched. The reason this idea has gained widespread acceptance is best understood as a sociological development. The theory is still only conjecture, simply an amazing story about one possible course of history. If the sociological implications were not so severe, we could laugh about it.

[xli] Noted Darwinist and geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky admits: *"A majority of mutations, both those arising in the laboratories and those stored in natural populations, produce deteriorations of viability, hereditary diseases, and monstrosities. Such changes, it would seem, can hardly serve as evolutionary building blocks."* Dobzhansky, *Genetics and the Origin of Species* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1951), p. 73.

[xlii] Neil H. Shubin, Edward B. Daeschler and Farish A. Jenkins, Jr, **"**The pectoral fin of *Tiktaalik roseae* and the origin of the tetrapod limb" *Nature* 440, 764-771 (6 April 2006).

[xliii] Thewissen, J. G. M., and S. K. Babcock (1992), "The Origin of Flight in Bats" *BioScience*, May, v. 42 n. 5, pp. 340-345. Also, Karen E. Sears, Richard R. Behringer, John J. Rasweiler, IV, and Lee A. Niswander, "Development of bat flight: Morphologic and molecular evolution of bat wing digits" *PNAS*, April 25, 2006, vol. 103, no. 17, 6581-6586: To simply cite the discovery of a single gene as the possible reason for the rapid evolution of bats is, as always, purely theoretical. Bats may have evolved through the workings of this gene, but who knows? "*Taken together, these results suggest that a simple change in the spatial expression of a single key genetic regulator of limb development drove the rapid evolutionary elongation of bat wing digits. By linking small changes in molecular patterning to dramatically different phenotypes, we provide a potential explanation for the rapid evolution of bat flight.*" This is hand waving. There is no demonstration, only thoughts.

[xliv] Loren H. Rieseberg, Barry Sinervo, C. Randal Linder, Mark C. Ungerer, Dulce M. Arias, "Role of Gene Interactions in Hybrid Speciation: Evidence from Ancient and Experimental Hybrids" *Science* 272, 1996. The plants in question are sunflowers. The authors recreated, under artificial conditions, the genetic sequences that historically led from H. annus and H. petiolarus to H.anomalus. However, a sunflower is a sunflower is a sunflower. The rapid evolution of the Italian Wall Lizard's cecal valves is not evidence for the introduction or creation of new genes and organs, but rather microevolution as the valves in question were already in the population. Kimberly Johnson, "Lizards Rapidly Evolve After Introduction to Island" *National Geographic*, April 21, 2008.

[xlv] Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, (Adler&Adler, 1986), pp. 353-354.

What is the Evidence for Human Evolution?

Almost everyone has heard the moth story. I learned about it in high school and was impressed: When the soot of the industrial revolution began to blacken and kill the lichens that camouflaged the light gray English peppered moth, this variety began to disappear from the cities and was replaced by a darker brown variety that was better able to camouflage itself under the new environmental conditions. Years later, after laws against smoke and soot restored the old environment, the light gray variety returned. Furthermore, by placing both gray and brown moths on light and dark trees and observing predation (capturing prey as a way to maintain life) by birds, one could demonstrate quantitative differences in survival. For Darwinist educators, this is a big deal: It is billed as "evolution in action" and it sure convinced me.

Now I know that this argument does demonstrate a kind of evolution; but only as a population shift, like when antibiotic resistant bacteria become more numerous in hospitals. The peppered moth did not change form, but rather the general population of moths changed size and location. Both the lighter and darker variations were already alive at the time. Basically, the lighter colored moths moved out of town and began to thrive in the countryside, where they still do. Evidence has emerged that the experiments intended to prove this dramatic case for evolution were rigged.[xlvi] However, even if we accept the story as true, it would make a good case for natural selection and microevolution. Macroevolution, or speciation, is something

much more complex and never actually seen. The confusion lies in the intentional overuse of the word "evolution" to describe any type of change. We can all figure out why a panther's fur is black—the cat hunts in the jungle at night. But whatever selective processes promoted the adaptation of the panther's black fur, it does not address the essential question of how cats, and mammals in general, evolved from reptiles and fish.

Another favorite Darwinist argument is the evolution of the horse. Many texts on evolution contain charts showing the fossil development of the modern horse from a small creature about the size of a dog. Very few people know that these charts do not depict a family tree of the horse at all. Rather, they show a convincing display of forms which are in reality simple arrangements, according to size, of the bones of various mammals that resemble horses.[xlvii] It is not clear that these forms actually evolved from one another. They have been taken from an assortment of continents and time slots and neatly arranged in an order designed to show an evolutionary progression. But this is a deception. In fact, some of the more recent fossils are smaller than the more ancient ones. And even if this were a legitimate example of evolution, the changes, such as size and foot alterations supposed to have taken place over 60 million years, are trivial compared to the modifications necessary to allow land dwelling animals, both reptilian and mammalian, to lose their legs and miraculously evolve back into the sea and become full fledged ocean dwelling creatures in a much shorter period of time. However, for most high school and college students, a progression like the horse is a very convincing proof of the theory. Here is an excerpt from a college text on macroevolution:

> *Can the same processes that shape the seed of mustard weed or change the color of the peppered moth create the differences between elephants and daisies or between butterflies and redwood trees?*

> *Darwin believed so-all he felt that was needed was time, millions of years of slow change. Today almost all evolutionists are, in principle, in general agreement with Darwin's conclusions.*[xlviii]

This may be true, but it is not measurable, because there is no evidence that elephants and daisies have a common ancestor; it is only an assumption. Even if it were true, a sequence of forms does not show how the evolution took place, and that remains the major difficulty. Both the moth and horse stories are social constructions created by Darwinists eager to prove their case. In fact, they don't prove macroevolution at all. No evidence exists for macroevolution. It is only supported by conjectures centered upon the real evidence for microevolution.

Darwinist popularizers often cite human evolution as proof for the fact of evolution. For example, the renowned evolutionary biologist G.G. Simpson wrote,

> *Darwin's point, that man is the product of evolution involving natural selection, has been attacked on emotional grounds, but it was not and is not now honestly questionable on strictly scientific grounds by anyone really familiar with the facts.*[xlix]

Maybe. However, upon closer inspection, the evidence is less than compelling. Where and what is the evidence for human evolution from ape-like ancestors? Zoologist Lord Solly Zuckerman:

> *As I have already implied, students of fossil primates have not been distinguished for caution when working within the logical constraints of their subject. The record is so astonishing that it is legitimate to ask whether much science is yet to be found in this field at all.*[l]

Apes resemble humans, so when evolutionary biologists were looking for the physical beginnings of the human form, they logically

looked at apes. Darwinists were not the first naturalists to note the similarities between apes and humans. The earliest taxonomists also classified apes and humans as primates. The Darwinists took a new path when they proposed that humans descended from apes, or rather, that humans and modern apes are descended from a common ancestor. My college *Physical Anthropology* teacher, Miss Torkov, always and often made that point, as she emphatically pitched the theory and interpreted all the evidence according to it. I didn't have the necessary expertise to question her then, but I know now that the whole theory of human evolution from proto-humans is questionable and that the entire issue of human origins is completely contemplative. Genetic similarities seem to settle the issue but it is possible that genetic similarities don't absolutely mean that species are actually related. Even if the genetic makeup of chimpanzees and humans is 98% alike, also realize that humans and daffodils are 35% genetically similar. With *nematode worms* the genetic similarity is even more astounding: They are not remotely related to humans but share 75% similar DNA![li] What's more, there are an incredible 35 million differences between the chimp genome and the human.[lii]

Genetics is the way that life organizes itself on the cellular level. It becomes proof for Darwinism only because the evidence is always interpreted to confirm the theory. Chimps and humans may share the same genetic make up because that's the best way to construct this kind of mammal. The general structure of life is not necessarily proof for Darwin's theory, although it is presented this way and this has managed to fool some otherwise very discriminating people.

Physically, the evidence for human evolution from ape-like ancestors consists of a limited number of fossil fragments, the sum total of which could be laid out on a regulation-size billiards table. Very few are even nearly complete skeletons. The drawings that purport to show the development of the human form from ape-like ancestors are

in fact reconstructions. This does not mean that two hundred or so fossilized bones were found in a collapsed pile and were restored to their original structure. Rather, a few small fossil fragments—sometimes only a few teeth—were found with the rest of the skeleton filled in by the archaeologist's imagination.

> *To attempt to restore the soft parts is an even more hazardous undertaking. The lips, the eyes, the ears, and the nasal tip leave no clues on the underlying bony parts. You can with equal facility model on a Neanderthaloid skull the features of a chimpanzee or the lineaments of a philosopher. These alleged restorations of ancient types of man have very little if any scientific value and are likely only to mislead the public.*[liii]

They do mislead the public. The closest known relatives of modern humans (*Homo sapiens sapiens*) are the Neanderthal (*Homo sapiens neanderthalis*) and the Cro-Magnon (*Homo sapiens sapiens*). As the names indicate, all three species are classified as human. There is no real difference between any of them. If you gave a Neanderthal a shave and dressed him up in a business suit he'd look like an NFL linebacker. Neanderthal humans supposedly thrived about 50,000 years ago, and it is interesting to note that there actually appears to be a degeneration of the human form from them to us, rather than an evolution. Those fellows were a lot bigger and stronger than most of us, and they had bigger brains too. When Neanderthal (a valley in Germany) bones were discovered in 1859, the general consensus was that this was a primitive human, if human at all. The Neanderthal got the reputation as a dumb brute, hunched over and generally more apelike than a human. This was a social reconstruction based upon the ideas of early anthropologists who approached Neanderthal remains with Darwin's theory as an *a priori* idea: The theory was interpreted to propose that all relics were physically inferior to modern humans. Thus the Neanderthal was reconstructed to appear

simian rather than human. Times have changed and modern research concedes that Neanderthals walked upright and were human beings, whose culture we know next to nothing about. They unquestionably knew how to make and mix better paints; their cave paintings have survived for thirty thousand years or more, while Impressionist paintings from the 19th century, only 150 years ago, are already beginning to fade. The Neanderthals may have lived in a stone age but, if shown how, could most likely drive a tractor-trailer today. I can say this because, during the Second World War, the United States Navy encountered thousands of stone-age people while engaged in a naval war against Japan. The U.S. Navy taught these "primitives" to operate large powered backhoes and tractors in just a few hours.

> *Detailed comparisons of Neanderthal skeletal remains with those of modern humans have shown that there is nothing in Neanderthal anatomy that conclusively indicates locomotor, manipulative, intellectual, or linguistic abilities inferior to those of modern humans.*[liv]

Neanderthals didn't live badly, just differently. They buried their dead with respect, indicated by the inclusion of valuable artifacts with the corpse. They ate well, dining on oysters, salmon, goat, and venison. They had the technical ability to alter their consciousness with a fermented honey drink. They used grains and may have undertaken agriculture. They invented the needle and thread, drank tea, and spiced their dinners with herbs. They made music and didn't live in just any kind of cave, but in big roomy caves, undoubtedly carpeted, with fine southern exposures.[lv] For many people who barely survive today in industrial ghettos like Flint Michigan, life in a Neanderthal cave might be a step up.

The Cro-Magnon too, was not only bigger and stronger than we are but had, on the average, a larger brain. Many Cro-Magnon skulls have a cranial volume of about 1600 cc, compared to 1360 cc for

modern humans.[lvi] There are very few anatomical differences between Neanderthals, Cro-Magnons, and us. The only apparent difference is that modern humans of the Northern European variety have a high forehead which western society finds more physically attractive. The approach to understanding the human form in terms of physical attractiveness is closely aligned with Aryan anthropology, which was quite in vogue in the 20th century in many circles including Nazi Germany. These ideas are still with us today. Euro-American political and military decisions are often based upon racial characteristics. For example, there is a considerable history of nuclear testing in South Pacific islands populated by non-white Polynesians. White Europeans and Americans now generally do not war with each other anymore, but rather jointly attack people of color, such as those living in the Middle East, Asia and Africa. However ones views evolution, it is merely speculation to propose that the development of modern human forms, which include Neanderthal and Cro-Magnon, are connected with any of our supposed ape-like ancestors. It is only a prescribed fact because Darwinist anthropologists say so based upon their theoretical assumptions. Like the family tree for the development of the horse, the charts that purport to show human evolutionary development are simply reconstructions of various ape and human skeletons arranged to best support the theory. It is not a fact that human evolution has been shown beyond a doubt. To simply show a progression of forms from smaller ape-like beings to modern humans is not proof of anything. Human evolution from apes is an idea created by evolutionary biologists to justify the philosophical basis of their science. Evidence that has not conformed to the Darwinists' presuppositions is rejected, while evidence that fits into their scheme is often accepted at face value.

The most famous example of doctoring evidence to fit the theory occurred in 1912. Anthropologists in England found a human skull

with a large brain capacity, yet with an ape-like jaw. The discovery—at the time, a fabulous find—was thought to be at least a million years old. It was called Piltdown Man and was immediately validated by the British scientific community. It perfectly fit certain ideas that were prevalent about human evolution. At the time it was felt that the evolution and development of the human brain would have had to precede the rest of the body's physical evolution. Finding a skull with a large brain capacity along with an ape-like jaw confirmed this theory. Western science generally accepted Piltdown Man as representative of human evolution. It wasn't until four decades later in 1953, after most of the participants were dead, that Piltdown Man was discovered to be a fraud. Evidently, respected researchers had pieced together various human and simian remains, planted them, and returned a year or so later to dig them up and represent them as genuine. The find was accepted at face value, even though it was clearly fraudulent: A dentist investigating the find had noticed that the teeth had been filed down to make them appear human, but his comments were disregarded.[lvii] This was not an isolated incident but rather represents the general trend.

Very disturbing is the general tendency to disregard and thereby suppress all evidence that might negate the essential Darwinist theory of human evolution from ancestral apes. In modern science, it should take only *one* incontrovertible fact to overturn a theory. But this never holds true for Darwinism. Renowned anthropologist Mary Leaky found human footprints in a lava bed dated 3.5 million years old that were examined by superstar paleo-anthropologists Donald Johanson and Tim White.

> *They are like modern human footprints. If one was left in the sand of a California beach today, and a four-year old were asked what it was, he would instantly say that somebody had walked there. He wouldn't*

be able to tell it from a hundred other prints on the beach, nor would you.[lviii]

Current theory holds that bipedal humans didn't exist 3.5 million years ago.

In sum, the 3.5-million-year-old footprint traits at Laetoli site G resemble those of habitually unshod modern humans. None of their features suggest that the Laetoli hominids were less capable bipeds than we are. If the G footprints were not known to be so old, we would readily conclude that they had been made by a member of our genus.[lix]

So theory takes precedence over fact. They are human footprints in ground dated too old for them. Therefore, they can't be what they seem to be. This is how it always works with Darwinist theory, and it is the reason why they can speak about "the fact of evolution." It is fact because conflicting evidence is simply ignored.

More recently, a modern skeleton was found in an 800,000-year-old cave near the Spanish village of Atapuerca. The archeologists had no doubt about the age of the find:

Our expectation of an 800,000-year-old boy was something like Turkana Boy. And what we found was a totally modern face.... We were very surprised when we saw it.[lx]

However, the discovery didn't fit the theory. Faced with this dilemma, they named the remains another species: *Homo antecessor*. It has since been forgotten. The power of the theory prevails.

Most people are still under the illusion that modern science treats the facts of discovery in an empirical manner governed by total objectivity. Thus, an editor in an atheist journal once said in response to a letter of mine:

Darwin claimed that humans had descended from apes. If fossils unearthed since his death had exhibited no such connection, his theory would have been discredited.

Again, the writer and many others do not grasp the significance of the fact that the theory came first and the "finds" followed; they were assembled and always interpreted according to the theory. Fossils that said something different were usually destroyed or ignored. For example, J.D. Whitney, a 19th century archeologist who explored the dug out gold mines turned archeological digs in California, discovered human remains found *in situ*, in 50 million-year-old earth strata! His findings were published in his *The Auriferous Gravels of the Sierra Nevadas* (Harvard, 1880). The skeletons are in the natural history museum at the University of California in Berkeley. Don't try to see them. They are stored in the basement and the university won't let anyone look. In 1899, Dr. William Holmes, Director of the Smithsonian Institute, a confirmed and committed Darwinist, rejected the find because it didn't conform to theory. He had this say about what Whitney discovered:

Perhaps if Professor Whitney had fully appreciated the story of human evolution, as it is understood today, he would have hesitated to announce the conclusions formulated, not withstanding the imposing array of testimony with which he was confronted.[lxi]

This was only forty years after Darwin published. Had Whitney's find been exhibited, it would have turned Darwin's theories upside down. Instead, Director Holmes asked the museum not to consider the physical evidence but to trust and protect the theoretical analysis instead.

The same sorts of misrepresentation promote many Darwinist myths and they have a long history of fabricating evidence or misinterpreting data. Professor Ernst Haeckel was an early popularizer of

Darwin's assumption who had a profound influence upon the development of Nazi racial ideology. He invented the theory of recapitulation, also known as the "biogenetic law," which is summarized by the phrase, "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny." This "law" states that the human embryo goes through all of the ancestral stages of life: single cell, fish, amphibian, primitive mammal, and human. In doctoring the evidence to promote this idea, Haeckel surgically removed the parts of the human embryo that were inconsistent with his theory. Even though Haeckel's scam was revealed in 1908, the concept of recapitulation is still widely accepted and is often presented as fact to beginning and advanced biology students. Most people still accept it as factual. For example, there is a popular notion that the human embryo has gills in one stage of its development. This is not true. Actually, the structures in question, called pharyngeal pouches, become gills in fish and glands in humans because both need organs to breathe oxygen. There are, of course, some similarities between fish and human embryos. After all, both are vertebrates and even adult fish and humans share similar features: two eyes, a mouth, a backbone, blood circulation, etc. Sometimes I go to the fish market and look at the faces chilled on ice. There are definite personalities among those dead fish. However, this is not evidence that the one evolved from the other.

Darwinists uncritically accepted Haeckel's law because it fit presuppositions necessary for their theory. Walter J. Bock of the Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University wrote:

> *...the biogenic law has become so deeply rooted in biological thought that it cannot be weeded out in spite of its having been demonstrated to be wrong by numerous subsequent scholars. Even today both subtle and overt uses of the biogenetic law are frequently encountered in the general biological literature as well as in the more specialized evolutionary and systematic studies.*[lxii]

Another myth used to support the idea of evolution is the Victorian concept of vestigial organs. Once, about 180 of these rudimentary organs (mostly muscles) were identified as useless vestiges from our remote human ancestors. In reality, they were functional body parts that the science of the day couldn't understand. For example, our ear muscles, which are claimed to be vestigial, do not atrophy. They must work at something or else they would atrophy. All muscles are functional. The chronic lower back pain currently afflicting millions of western civilized men comes from sitting around too much, not because we've inherited our physical structure from apes. The human body is perfectly constructed. Zulu warriors could march 50 miles a day, for weeks. There are no useless organs and every organ performs a defined task, even if science doesn't quite know what it is. The same holds true for whales: Those mythical vestigial feet are functional organs used in sex.

Embryologist Søren Løvtrup:

> *I suppose that nobody will deny that it is a great misfortune if an entire branch of science becomes addicted to a false theory. But this is what has happened in biology: for a long time now people discuss evolutionary problems in a peculiar "Darwinian" vocabulary- "adaptation," "selection pressure," "natural selection," etc.-thereby believing that they contribute to the explanation of natural events. They do not...I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science.*[lxiii]

If the Earth were to be suddenly depopulated and space alien anthropologists were to land tomorrow, they would find a whole range of human remains, from tiny pigmy people only a few feet tall to giant Zulu people approaching eight feet in height. If they had a view of the world similar to our evolutionary biologists, they could begin to construct a hypothetical family tree showing the develop-

ment of humanity from lemurs to apes to humans, all from beings that live right now. But such a diagram would in no way prove an evolutionary pathway from pygmy to Zulu.

Henry Gee, editor of *Nature*:

> *To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same validity as a bedtime story - amusing perhaps, even instructive, but not scientific.*[lxiv]

The reconstructions produced by our evolutionary biologists are presented to students as fact. But there is no proof that any of the hypothetical human ancestors such as *Homo habilis* are in fact our genetic ancestors. Indeed, whether or not they are on our evolutionary branch is still debated. Zoologist Lord Solly Zuckerman:

> *We then move right off the register of objective truth into those fields of presumed biological science, like extrasensory perception or the interpretation of man's fossil history, where to the faithful anything is possible - and where the ardent believer is sometimes able to believe several contradictory things at the same time.*[lxv]

Our scientific elite would have us believe that human evolution is an incontrovertible truth. "The fact of evolution" is the way they tell it. But there is no science in it, only an Atheistic creation myth.

[xlvi] Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, (Regnery/Eagle, 2000). The moths were released under controlled conditions and not observed in the field. Dead moths were placed on trees to simulate actual conditions. Similar experiments conducted elsewhere do not duplicate results in England.

[xlvii] Stephan J. Gould, *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory*, (Harvard, 2002), pp. 580-582.

[xlviii] H. Curtis, *Biology*, (Worth, New York, 1962), p. 712.

[xlix] George Gaylord Simpson, "The Biological Nature of Man." *Science*, 1966, v. 152, p.472.

[l] Lord Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond the Ivory Tower* (New York: Taplinger, 1970), p. 64.

[li] *New Scientist*, 15 May 1999, p.27.

[lii] Geir Moulson, "2-Year Neanderthal Genome Project Launches" *Associated Press*, July 20, 2006. "The Neanderthal project follows scientists' achievement last year in deciphering the DNA of the chimpanzee, our closest living relative. That genome map produced a long list of DNA differences between humans and chimps and some hints about which differences might be crucial. The chimp genome "led to literally too many questions, there were 35 million differences between us and chimpanzees — that's too much to figure out," Jonathan Rothberg, 454's chairman, said in a telephone interview."

[liii] Earnest A. Hooton, *Up From The Ape*, (McMillan, New York, 1931), p. 332.

[liv] Erik Trinkaus, "Hard Times Among the Neanderthals," *Natural History*, vol. 87, December 1978, p. 10

[lv] Kenneth F. Weaver, "The Search for Our Ancestors" *National Geographic* Nov. 1985, p. 614-623. See also, Randall White, *Dark Caves, Bright Visions, Life in Ice Age Europe* (New York: Norton, 1986).

[lvi] Roger Lewin, *Human Evolution, an Illustrated Introduction* (New York, W.H. Freeman, 1984).

[lvii] Stephen Jay Gould, "Smith Woodward's Folly," *New Scientist*, 5 April 1979.

[lviii] Donald C. Johanson & M. A. Edey, *Lucy, The Beginnings of Humankind*, (Simon & Schuster, New York, 1981), p. 250.

[lix] Russell H. Tuttle, "The Pitted Pattern of Laetoli Feet," *Natural History***,** vol. 99, March 1990, p. 64. The whole question of dating rocks is not the subject of this book, but the recent discovery of a 65 million year old *Tyrannosaurus rex* with its soft muscle tissue still intact, soft, elastic and fibrous, replete with red blood cells, calls into question the validity of modern ideas about, at least, the accepted age of the dinosaur epoch. Helen Fields, "Dinosaur Shocker" *Smithsonian* magazine, May 2006. Or internet search "T rex blood."

[lx] Robert Kunzig, "The Face of An Ancestral Child", *Discover*, December 1997, pp. 97, 100.

[lxi] *Smithsonian Institution's Annual Report of 1899*. This is not an isolated incident. There are multitudinous artifacts indicating ancient human inhabitation dating back hundreds of millions of years. See William R. Corliss, *Ancient Man: A Handbook of Puzzling Artifacts*, (Glenarm Maryland: The Sourcebook Project, 1978). Also, Michael A. Cremo and Richard L. Thompson, *Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race*, (Unlimited Resources, 2003).

[lxii] Walter J. Bock, "Evolution by Orderly Law," *Science*, v. 164, no. 3880, May 9, 1969, p. 684-685.

[lxiii] Søren Løvtrup, *Darwinism: The Refutation of A Myth*, (Croom Helm, New York, 1987), p. 422.

[lxiv] Henry Gee, *In Search of Time: Beyond the Fossil Record to a New History of Life*, (New York, The Free Press, 1999), p. 126-127.

[lxv] Zuckerman, *op. cit.*, p.19.

Materialism in Historical Perspective

According to Darwinist theory, life proceeds without the necessity of any conscious directive force and is therefore wholly materialistic: Blind chance rules the evolution of organic life and the universe as a whole. This atheistic approach to science promotes the notion that life is essentially inconsequential. Modern *angst* often represents a human lost in an immense universe in which lives seem to have no real or lasting value. There are those who appear to accept this premise, although polls show that 85 percent of all Americans do not accept it. Our educational system tries to convince us that human evolution from apes is our heritage and many Euro-Americans can, and do, become comfortable with this theory because it does provide a plausible alternative to theological musings. After all, accepting a material rather than spiritual view of history is reassuring because it supports so many basic assumptions about life that are sold to us every day, repetitively.

The Darwinist view of life allows us to see ourselves as the pinnacle of organic evolution. By looking into this mirror of life, we are sure that we see that the whole of history has evolved into you and me. Viewing the world in this way can be satisfying, especially for members of the Euro-American white ruling elites, who seem to be doing very well in the material world. After all, how many of us have the time to probe deeply into the implications of our existence? If we can define ourselves as the end product of four billion years of organic evolution, then we may feel that it is ethically acceptable to justify our feelings of superiority. This is ethnocentrism: My country's

wars are always moral endeavors. When my country's army defeats the enemy, it's a great victory. When the enemy defeats my country's army, it's a massacre perpetrated by villainous fiends.[lxvi] It's the same with every country on earth. Each nation teaches the superiority of its own history and culture. Ruling elites can use concepts like natural selection and survival of the fittest to justify their own material superiority over one another.

Social Darwinism is not explicitly taught in our schools. In fact, our intellectual systems disown any association with it. However, the Darwinist ethos is implicit in our society. Since theological speculations no longer form the foundation of our public education experience, a need arose for another way to teach the justification for our existence. Through the competitive mindset expressed by our society's general acceptance of the theory of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, every endeavor becomes a battle with a winner and a loser: Hence our fascination with sports. Such an understanding, neatly defined by 16th century theologian John Calvin, is not new.[lxvii] Our approach to life, which promotes the accumulation of material possessions as proof of our worth, began with Greco-Roman society.

History tells us that the Roman Empire collapsed in the 5th century AD. However, we are then told that it actually survived for another 1,000 years in the East, centered in Constantinople, now Istanbul. The Roman Empire changed form, and it did this many times: It disguised itself and masked its presence so well that we still do not generally recognize its survival into the 21st Century. Even now, Roman codified civil law is the basis of western civilization's jurisprudence system, and, on a moral and religious level, the official Roman religion of Christianity is still the dominant theological system. Roman military and civil organizations are still the structural basis for such diverse groups as the Roman Catholic Church, the

Mafia, and the modern military. The republican form of government, originally envisioned by Greco-Roman theorists, is the idealized basis for the structure of modern governments today; the perfect democratic society we fight wars to impose upon others seemingly less fortunate.

The Roman Empire survived into the 21st century through the imposition of Roman civil law and its official theology, Christianity. The Roman Empire, like the later Nazi Empire, was structured upon a slave labor system designed to control a large body of laborers whose natural inclination was freedom. Slavery comes in many forms: One is chattel slavery, as when Africans were transported to America in chains to work without pay. In the classical Roman Empire, it was different. There were large bodies of forced laborers who actually had a fair amount of freedom. Some were gladiators—professional athletes who were well paid for their bloody work. Others were ship builders, transportation workers, street cleaners, service sector employees, and household servants who were also free to come and go, just so long as they showed up for work each day. They could go out and have a drink after work or go to the games as they wished. Some were permitted to own property, even land. Slaves who owned property could bequeath it to their children who would remain slaves with property holdings. What kept them all in place was the Roman concept of civil law which limited their personal freedom. In this respect, civil law exists to keep a populace functioning under tight control. It purposefully confuses its victims into thinking that personal freedom is a benefit granted to them by the state and not a natural right. When civil and theological systems are forced upon us; inevitably, we are compelled to accept them as correct and essential. The end result is that we voluntarily and often happily live within the limitations these systems impose.

When viewed in an historical context, we can see that the Roman Empire never really collapsed. It may have disintegrated in some ways, only to coalesce again in a different form and place. This may be viewed as a growth of the state. As this lengthy historical progression unfolded, the Roman Empire evolved into individual nation states that included what we now call England, France, Spain, Germany, and the United States. These federalized Roman states emphasized and made holy the acquisition and preservation of material wealth by individuals. Prior to the imposition of Roman civil law, groups such as the Celts, and Pre-Columbian Native American civilizations had no concept of personal property. They lived in communal societies. One individual might own a tool but another member of the group was free to use it at any time, providing the owner was not using it. The imposition of Roman law, theology, and military organization changed all this.

A Roman-style military organization was responsible for the destruction of Native American peoples. Spain practiced a systematic genocide in South and Central America for the express purpose of repopulating the area with its own people and African slaves. In North America, England, and later its rebellious colonies, completed the destruction of indigenous cultures: those few remaining have been romanized and live under the imposition of Roman-style civil law and theology.

There were, however, other people, such as central European Germans who could not be defeated by a Roman military organization. So Rome conquered these societies through the imposition of civil law. Prior to this, these groups were only familiar with common law, which existed to protect the rights of free people and to compensate them for criminal injury. Common law encompasses rules for human behavior that are so self-evident they don't need to be written down or codified to be recognized and enforced. The authors of the

United States' Bill of Rights sought to ensure the permanence of common law rights when they wrote in the ninth article:

> *The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.*

They feared that the listing of specific rights such as free speech and assembly could be used to deny common law rights such as the right to privacy from meddlesome bureaucrats. "A man's home is his castle" is the proverb that expresses this common law right that is now meaningless in today's police surveillance state.

Civil law exists primarily to protect the state. It tells people what they may, or may not, do. For example, if a stranger was to take your car for a ride and wreck it, civil authority would punish the perpetrator but not compensate you, as common law would. Nowadays you must make provisions yourself for losses through criminal injury, usually with insurance, lawyers, or both. Civil law is concerned only indirectly with the rights of individuals, in that by prohibiting criminal acts, domestic tranquility is assured. As such, civil law primarily serves the interests of the ruling elite. Within communal societies there are those with more power and possessions than others, but their power is limited and only had through communal consent. Civil law enables a minority within communal societies to turn the whole situation around. Through its imposition the majority of people had their freedom limited by the creation of laws criminalizing all sorts of activities. Simultaneously, as a further method of control, the Roman Empire's official religion, Christianity became the accepted theological basis of western civilization.

Christianity, originally a Jewish splinter group, was promoted by the Romans to be the official religion of state in the 4th century AD. At that time, the power of the Western Roman Empire was beginning to wane and the ruling elite thought that the new Jewish cult, with

their unorthodox deity, could be used as a religion to control their slave labor empire. Jesus preached a religion of nonviolence. Like Ghandi, he said; "Turn the other cheek" as a method to spiritually resist the overwhelming force of Roman material power. Twisting his message, non-resistance to Roman slavery became the point. Re-writing history, Jesus ceased to be a powerful leader opposed to Rome, but rather submitted meekly to Roman civil authority and was significantly executed in accordance with Roman law. The Romans wanted to make it perfectly clear that it was they who murdered Jesus judicially, and incredibly, Jews are blamed for this event, even into this day. But if Jewish law had executed Jesus, he would have been stoned to death rather than crucified, the method Romans specifically used for civil executions. Selling one lie on top of another, the Roman ruling elite made their version of Christianity its official religion.[lxviii]

The newly federalized Empire evolved into an efficient agrarian society in Western Europe, during a thousand-year period commonly known as the Dark and Middle Ages. Later, in the 16th century, certain northern European states made an ideological and economic break with Rome, and a new movement was born. On an ideological level, Calvinism and the new Protestants promoted the idea that individuals must confirm their own salvation by proving material success on Earth (Roman Christianity had hitherto tolerated poverty with some compassion since Jesus had renounced material wealth). The new ideology rejected tolerance for the poor. Calvinists came to believe that the accumulation of material wealth would insure a preordained selection to paradise in the afterlife. Those who lacked the drive to succeed on a material level were obviously doomed to eternal hellfire and unworthy of assistance.

However, Calvinist countries remained federal Roman states in their continued dependence upon and use of Roman law, customs, and civil institutions. It was in these states, most notably Germany,

Netherlands, Sweden, Great Britain, and eventually the United States, that modern western science and the national industrial state evolved. It was almost axiomatic that the further away from Rome one got, the more freedom for inquiry and usury one found. The accumulation and organization of information and wealth, in order to form a schematic material understanding and exploitation of the world, developed in the states where Calvinist theology flourished. In ancient times, it was thought that humans worked in order to have leisure time: to think, to play, and to enjoy life. Calvinist ideology reversed this. It stressed that humans had leisure time only so that they might work more effectively. With the work ethic serving as a model for human behavior, northern Europeans developed a technological society with materialistic science serving as its data bank.

In the 18th century, the invention of the steam engine created a revolution, not only in industry, but also in human thought. When it was discovered that a steam engine could be made progressively bigger and more powerful, it came to be believed that human societies could also be made progressively better.[lxix] Utopia, an idea from the 16th century, came to influence political thinking in the 18th and 19th centuries as Europeans became convinced that humanity could be actively manipulated in an attempt to create a perfect society. There were a number of approaches to this end: socialism, communism, republican democracy, Malthusian doctrine and Eugenics. Within this historical context materialism came to dominate our civilization and Darwinism, as an idea, found a receptive audience. Darwinism became a material explanation for the nature of reality. The ruling elites readily accepted the Darwinist view of eternity and its material progression of genetic inheritance. The idea that certain races were naturally favored, i.e., superior, struck a sympathetic chord with Europeans and Americans who viewed their technologically advanced civilization ethnocentrically. Individuals sought to prove their

own standing among the select through hard work and the accumulation of wealth.

Darwin's view of life closely conformed to the ideology of Euro-American Calvinism; that one's relationship to eternity (selection) was measured by evidence of material wealth (successful adaptation) on earth. Both emphasized that work (fitness) and the accumulation of wealth (advantages) are proof of one's ability to survive and one's value to society.[lxx] The Darwinist approach seemed logical and appropriate at a time when many Euro-Americans became dissatisfied with the evident inconsistencies of Christian dogma. Rational Humanism, with Darwinism as its linchpin, became accepted as an alternative concept of creation and existence. Science emerged as a new religion, one that offered an understanding of the universe based upon logic and facts, rather than myth. In a technological and, eventually electronic telecommunication age, such a view afforded many the comfort and security of a history based upon a massive accumulation of hard facts rather than blind faith. Modern Atheism, of which Darwinism is an integral part, may have philosophical shortcomings, but for many it's better than illogic and superstitious threats of hellfire and brimstone.

[lxvi] Tamosa Shibutani, *Social Processes: An introduction to Sociology* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press 1986) Shibutani gives accounts of how countries "demonize the enemy" during wartime in order to get public support for its war efforts. It is interesting to note how erstwhile vicious enemies can soon become close allies.

[lxvii] Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (New York: Scribner, 1958). The implication of Weber's thesis is that work and the accumulation of capital become a religious experience.

[lxviii] Many historians still regard *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, written by Edward Gibbon (1737-1794) in the 18th century, to be the definitive history of the Roman Empire. He writes on the

conversion of Constantine and Roman Emperors in general to Christianity: *"The passive and unresisting obedience which bows under the yoke of authority or even of oppression must have appeared in the eyes of an absolute monarch the most conspicuous and useful of evangelic virtues."* The problem with understanding the ascension of Christianity to be the official religion of the Roman Empire is that it is generally unproductive for historians to investigate this topic. Our civilization is, after all, a Christian one, and Christian churches wield considerable power. The official line on the rise of Christianity is that it was an historic inevitability, owing to the divinity of Jesus and the truth of His words and works. Gibbon didn't approach it in that manner and received a lot of flack at the time for having the courage to list political reasons as the prime causal factors in the rise of Christianity. Take a look at Edward Gibbon, Esq., *History of Christianity: Comprising all that relates to the progress of the Christian Religion in the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire and a Vindication of Some Passages in the 15th and 16th Chapters*. (New York, 1883), reprinted under the title *The Atheist Viewpoint* (New York**,** 1972), Madelyn Murray O'Hair advisory ed., p. 307. This is a rather unfortunate re-titling in that it implies Gibbon was an atheist, for which there is no evidence. The title also implies that any understanding of this epoch, which is not Christian, must therefore be atheistic. Also *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* by Edward Gibbon, 3v. (New York: Heritage, 1946). Good historical novels are hard to come by. A very good one about this era is Gore Vidal's, *Julian, A Novel* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1964). As far as the reality of Jesus as an historical figure is concerned, there is no direct evidence that he ever existed. Whatever contemporary evidence may have existed is no longer extant. The four gospels, which describe his life, were written long after his death. However, there is compelling circumstantial evidence that Jesus did exist and that he is not a creation of politically savvy Christians and Romans. Certainly if Jesus were a creation, the Romans could have chosen a god which did not emphasize the equality of women. Jesus is often to be seen in the gospels hanging around with women, even various prostitutes whom he saw as having eternal souls worthy of redemption. The disciples marveled that Jesus would even talk with women much less have them in his entourage. Women were very active in the early Christian movement. By the year 200, Christian men were taking pains to eliminate women from positions of authority. Timothy writes, "Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men: she is to keep silent..." Cited in *The Chalice and the Blade*, *op. cit.*, p. 130. Truly if Jesus didn't exist, then there would have been no need for patriarchal Romans to manufacture a god that preached women were equal

with men in the eyes of God. See also, Leonard Swindler, "Jesus was a Feminist" *The Catholic World*, January 1971, cited in *The Chalice and the Blade*, *op. cit.*

[lxix] An idea from Aldous Huxley, in his introduction to the *Bhagavad Gita*, trans. by Swami Prabhavananda and Christopher Isherwood (The Vedanta Society, 1972, pp. 16-17). Huxley writes: "*In regard to man's final end, all the higher religions are in complete agreement. The purpose of human life is the discovery of Truth, the unitive knowledge of the Godhead. The degree to which this unitive knowledge is achieved here on Earth determines the degree to which it will be enjoyed in the posthumous state. Contemplation of truth is the end, action the means. In India, in China, in ancient Greece, in Christian Europe, this was regarded as the most obvious and axiomatic piece of orthodoxy. The invention of the steam engine produced a revolution, not merely in industrial techniques, but also and much more significantly in philosophy. Because machines could be made progressively more and more efficient, western man came to believe that men and societies would automatically register a corresponding moral and spiritual improvement. Attention and allegiance came to be paid, not to Eternity, but to the Utopian future. External circumstances came to be regarded as more important than states of mind about external circumstances, and the end of human life was held to be action, with contemplation as a means to that end. These false and, historically, aberrant and heretical doctrines are now systematically taught in our schools and repeated, day in, day out, by those anonymous writers of advertising copy who, more than any other teachers, provide European and American adults with their current philosophy of life. And so effective has been the propaganda that even professing Christians accept the heresy unquestioningly and are quite unconscious of its complete incompatibility with their own or anybody else's religion.*"

[lxx] The legend that was posted above the gates to *Auschwitz* read *Arbeit macht frei*, "Work sets you free."

Life Has Meaning

The idea that life has no intrinsic value is deeply instilled in the psyche of modern Euro-Americans. Educational systems that stress evolutionary biology as the prime mover in life are intimately involved with industrial military states whose histories are riddled with genocidal destruction. There is no getting away from this. For example, there is a notion among educated people that the world is overpopulated. Overpopulation is supposed to be one of the major threats to the environment. Yet, what does this idea really mean? When we say the world is overpopulated, do we mean that there is too much life? When we say there are too many people, do we really mean there should be *less life?* When modern Euro-Americans say the world is overpopulated, what they are really saying is; nonwhite peoples from Asia, Africa, and the Middle East overpopulate the world. If pressed, many might and do say that it would be in everyone's best interest to get rid of these people and things would then be better. At this point in history, the United States is doing just that in Iraq and Afghanistan while the Europeans concentrate on depopulating Africa.

Most modern Euro-Americans, who are thoroughly convinced that the world is overpopulated, have no idea that this notion is essentially a philosophy of genocide. The idea that the world is overpopulated promotes the assumption that large numbers of people should be eliminated to set things right. This is what the Nazis thought about the Jews and they did something about it. People convinced that the world is overpopulated do not grasp how deeply repugnant this idea is to moral, right thinking men and women.

Anyway, who are the people that provide us with the information that the world is overpopulated? It is the university systems and their think tanks. While overpopulation may be a legitimate cause for concern, it is interesting to note that these very institutions selling this myth are also involved with the design and production of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, conventional arms, and other elaborate methods for human destruction. A case in point is the University of California, the world's largest producer of nuclear weapons.[lxxi] This is the very same university that purports to teach Humanism which studies the accomplishments of humankind rather than our relationship to an eternal spiritual life on another non-material plane of existence.

The modern university's emphasis on Humanism came about after a long process by which the national state finally escaped domination by theologians. The development of Darwinism as the philosophical basis for a Humanist understanding of life was the ultimate break from Christianity. *Darwinism, a deduction from materialism, is now the foundation for materialism*, and ultra-Darwinist atheistic literature like *The Blind Watchmaker* by Richard Dawkins is required reading for incoming students at the University of California where Humanism is taught along with the building of nuclear bombs. What an astounding contradiction! However, the University of California is not the only academic institution within the Euro-American system heavily invested in the politics of genocide. Many other universities, including Christian ones, are as well.

Overpopulation is another modern Malthusian/Darwinian idea. Based upon the evidence available, the world is not overpopulated. Overpopulation is not even a symptom of a problem. The real problem is poor resource management and social injustice. Even an incredibly poor country like Bangladesh is capable of feeding its own people.[lxxii] The difficulty Asian and African nations face is internation-

al debt. Being in debt, they are forced to move production away from foodstuffs for their own people toward the development of cash crops for export. This is why these nations can't feed their own people. For example, Columbia is an incredibly poor country, yet its main crops are coffee and cocaine, which are exported to the United States. It's hard to get a cup of good coffee in Columbia, but it's available on every street corner in America, as is cocaine. The ruling elites in Columbia and other poor countries, deep in international debt and squeezed by Euro-American bankers, promote the development of cash crops for export to insure their own survival in positions of power. In 2008, speculators were also driving up the price of commodities even though there were no real shortages. Millions starve worldwide as a result. However, the concept of overpopulation hardens us to the misery and protects the Darwinist notion that life is a cruel, remorseless struggle for existence.

[lxxi] The University of California owns the Los Alamos, New Mexico and Lawrence Livermore, California nuclear weapons laboratories.

[lxxii] Frances Moore Lappe and Joseph Collins, with Cary Fowler, *Food First: Beyond the Myth of Scarcity* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1977). The following article appeared in the *Santa Barbara News Press*, Dec. 18, 1990, sec. A, p. 11, reprinted from the Florence, S.C., *Morning News*: "Ten years ago an ecologist and an economist took the unusual step of submitting their opposite theories to a reality test: They made a bet. The result was written up in the influential *New York Times Magazine*. The more famous lost. He is Paul Ehrlich, Stanford University's butterfly expert and the mass media's favorite ecologist. His 1968 best seller *The Population Bomb* is among the environmental movement's founding texts. In 1980, Ehrlich took up the gauntlet thrown down by University of Maryland economist John Simon: To demonstrate the point that, far from becoming scarcer as population grows, natural resources actually become more available thanks to human innovation. Simon offered a challenge to predictors of overpopulation. Pick any natural resource, he said, and he would bet that its price would decline by any stipulated date. Ehrlich and two colleagues bet $1,000 on five metals, chrome, copper, nickel, tin and

tungsten. The 10 years Ehrlich stipulated ended in October. World population grew by 800 million in the decade, but all five metals declined in real price. Together they declined by almost 40 percent. This adds one more thing to the long list of Ehrlich's predictions that have proven false, notably mass starvation in the 1970s and near depletion of many key minerals before 1985. Yet Ehrlich's ideas retain standing with the mass media as an authority on the planet's future. This is unchanged: Frances Moore Lappe, *Getting a Grip: Clarity, Creativity, and Courage in a World Gone Mad*, (Small Planet Media, 2007).

The Problem with Organs of Extreme Perfection

Early objections to Darwinism came from Lewis Agassiz, the great naturalist who first formulated the Ice Age theory. He, and most naturalists of the day, such as Richard Owen and Georges Cuvier, objected to Darwin's generalization by what they saw in nature. They observed that there were no transitional forms. Not then, not now. They also saw from the fossil record that many extinct forms were often superior in every way to modern forms. Darwinists counter this argument by pointing out that evolution doesn't necessarily mean progress. It was Wallace who first suggested that evolution means only change and not inevitably improvement.

That's a fair enough argument. But an evolution of species according to the Darwinian model must proceed through a long series of progressive stages. What complicates the process is the Darwinist notion that evolution proceeds without any ultimate goal or purpose. Once the chance genetic mutation that produces a new variation occurs, the forces of natural selection then act upon the variant ***on an individual level.*** In evolutionary growth, the new *single variant individual* must be favorably selected, i.e., the change must be progressive and immediately advantageous to the lone organism so that it successfully reproduces. This is the crux of Darwinism. Such a series of progressive, albeit mechanical changes, need occur again and again in succeeding generations and in correct order for a new organ or species to appear. Each change must be justified by the immediacy of the moment and since there is no conscious planning towards a

goal, we are asked to believe that miraculous constructions such as the ear, compound eye, hair, teeth, blood circulation, feathers, and even a snake's poison apparatus evolved through a series of progressive changes, always advantageous, but never with motive. These random alterations toward perfectly functioning new organs and species would seem to require some coordination. But again, if evolution is mindless, directionless, and not necessarily progressive, how and why does evolution produce an astounding diversity of complex organs and species? The Darwinists address this problem in only vague generalities. Here's what Darwin himself said about the human eye:

> *To suppose that the eye, with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest possible degree. Yet reason tells me, that if numerous gradations from a perfect and complex eye to one very imperfect and simple, each grade being useful to its possessor, can be shown to exist; if further, the eye does vary ever so slightly, and the variations be inherited, which is certainly the case; and if any variation or modification in the organ be ever useful to an animal under changing conditions of life, then the difficulty of believing that a perfect and complex eye could be formed by natural selection, though insuperable by our imagination, can hardly be considered real.*[lxxiii]

Darwin here assumes that the micro evolutionary changes that he observed on his field trip can be extrapolated onto a larger macro evolutionary scale. He deduces that natural selection may cause not only an alteration in the size of a bird's beak, like in the finches he observed, but can be fantastically creative as well. But can natural selection actually generate new and incredibly complex organs? Well

into its second century, Darwinists are still unable to answer this question in any way other than through sweeping generalities.

As for the eye, there is an anecdote circulating that a computer simulation shows how easily the compound eye might have evolved from a light-sensitive patch in the relatively short period of time of only 350,000 years. I actually encountered this tale in 2005 over a holiday meal. The host scoffed at my assertion that the eye could not have evolved by Darwinian means. He dismissed me by saying that this had been clearly demonstrated by a modern computer simulation. Fortunately, I was able to counter his statement because I'd read a series of articles on this supposed computer simulation by David Berlinski, a senior fellow at the Discovery Institute, a mostly Christian think tank dedicated to at least opening up discussion on the very real debatable points in the whole evolution question.[lxxiv] Berlinski also wrote quite a bit on Darwinist problems in the Jewish affairs journal *Commentary*, and it's about time Jews finally recognized the nature of the enemy.[lxxv] However this is another difficult pill to swallow for most Jews, who have been historically persecuted by the same Christians who lead in the struggle against Darwin. Jews, like most educated Americans, tend to accept Darwinism, and many of the most influential Darwinists, like the late Stephen J. Gould and Carl Sagan, were also Jewish, as is Berlinski, who has a doctorate in Math and collaborated in mathematical refutations of Darwinist theories. Darwinists have always been allowed to assume limitless time for their mechanics to permit the random generation of new organs and species. Berlinski and others have tried to show that much more time would be needed if evolution were truly random.[lxxvi]

As for the eye and the imaginary computer simulation, here are the details: In 1994, two Darwinist thinkers, Dan-E. Nilsson and Susan Pelger, published a mathematical paper showing that it is at least theoretically possible for the eye to rapidly evolve.[lxxvii] The Darwinist

establishment accepted this without question. In response, Berlinski wrote that it may be possible for the eye to evolve rapidly, perhaps even over the course of a weekend, but the more cogent question is, could the eye rapidly evolve given the constraints of natural selection acting upon random mutations? This cannot be calculated without being completely arbitrary. After all, who can do anything but guess at what the "selection pressures" were like on a group of fishes three hundred and fifty million years ago? What's more, Berlinski showed that the authors of the paper did not take the essential Darwinian mechanic into account. Mutations would have to create not only the myriad components of the compound eye: rods, cones, lens, etc. but also the skull and bones that support and protect the eye, as well as the muscles to move it and the nerves to work it. Berlinski:

> *Making the point that the emergence of even the most modest eye will require simultaneous and parallel evolutionary developments, (I am asked) that I defend my claim that this process could not have taken place by quantitative steps. In the first place I made no such claim, if only because its truth struck me as obvious. But were I to make such a claim I would observe, as Richard Dawkins does, that to the extent that simultaneous and parallel changes are required to form a complex organ, to that extent does the hypothesis of random variation and natural selection become implausible. It is one thing to find a single needle in a haystack, quite another to find a dozen needles in a dozen haystacks at precisely the same time. Surely the burden of proof in such matters is not mine. I am not obliged to defend such mathematical trivialities as the proposition that as independent events are multiplied in number, their joint probability of occurrence plummets.*[lxxviii]

Such is the essence of Nilsson and Pelger's paper. Liking what he read in their paper, Richard Dawkins then made-up a story about how Nilsson and Pelger developed a computer simulation program that demonstrated the evolution of the eye. They did nothing of the

kind, but this deception is now part of the popular imagination. Nor was this a casual, mistaken reference to a computer simulation. Dawkins described it at length in amazing detail, and here is a small excerpt:

> *"Nelson and Pelger began with a flat retina atop a flat pigment layer and surmounted by a flat protective transparent layer. The transparent layer was allowed to undergo localized random mutations of its refractive index. They then let the model transform itself at random, constrained only by the requirement that any change must be small and must be an improvement on what went before. The results were swift and decisive. A trajectory of steadily mounting acuity led unhesitatingly from the flat beginning through a shallow indentation to a steadily deepening cup, as the shape of the model eye deformed itself on the computer screen…And then, almost like a conjuring trick, a portion of this transparent filling condensed into a local spherical region of higher refractive index… This ratio is called Mattiessen's ratio…Nilsson and Pelger's computer-simulation model homed in unerringly on Mattiessen's ratio.*[lxxix]

The conjurer's trick is an apt metaphor. None of this is even remotely true. But the consequences have gone much further than my Christmas dinner. Researcher John Horgan interviewed renowned linguist Noam Chomsky who was also taken in by Dawkins' deception:

> *Darwin's theory essentially says that there is a naturalistic explanation for things, Chomsky elaborated. Anyone who does not believe in divine intervention accepts as much. The difficulty lies in determining what the correct naturalistic explanation is…Biologists could make progress in reconstructing human traits similar to those found in other animals, Chomsky said. For example Richard Dawkins and other theorists had developed plausible computer models showing how a flat photosensitive surface could turn into an eye in a not-too-large number of generations.*[lxxx]

Thus the lie transverses the globe. Chomsky is probably the greatest linguist of the late 20th Century. He, like most western intellectuals, must center his approach to understanding humanity upon the assumption that Darwin's generalization is for the most part true. But so much of Darwinist reasoning is based upon deception, suppression of evidence, as well as outright lies and intimidation that Euro-American thinkers are continually led astray. Dawkins typically showed no hesitancy in fraudulently touting an imaginary computer simulation because in its essence Darwinism is impossible to demonstrate. Yet it remains, incredibly, the defining principle of our Age. In 1893 an ardent supporter of Darwin confessed,

> *...it is really very difficult to imagine this process of natural selection in its details; and to this day it is impossible to demonstrate it in any one point.*[lxxxi]

More than a century later, this observation is as fresh as morning dew. Darwinists have never been able to causally explain the evolution of any single species or organ. What they have done is use the data to show that their theory *is not impossible*. The fact remains that the evolution of species, as well as various organs of extreme complexity by the action of natural selection, has neither been observed nor demonstrated. All this creates confusion in the mind of the average person, because the case for evolution by natural selection is presented as fact. It is not true that one species ever became another according to the doctrine of natural selection: That only shows a way in which some species might become extinct, while others survive to propagate themselves and their genes.

The Darwinists refer to this survival group as the "gene pool." My college Physical Anthropology teacher, Miss Torkov, talked a lot about genes because most of the Darwinist technical literature is about them. According to theory, a "gene pool" of specific organic

types mates with one another and promotes and protects its survival and its genes. For example, all the lions in Africa can be considered a gene pool. The process of selection weeds out genetically inferior individuals unable to cope with changing environmental conditions. This is clearly true, and it's the reason why Antelopes run fast, and those that don't get eaten by the lions. Within this ongoing eternal process, those genes that possess some, perhaps slight, evolutionary advantages are thus able to stay viable and promote their own survivability; depending upon the outside surroundings. Of course, remember that genes are bits of chemicals that direct and determine the characteristics of the life form. They are along for the ride, acting as informational agents. The tiny advantages that they promote are then passed on from generation to generation, while the constant ongoing action of genetic mutation perhaps adds other slight modifications that might prove advantageous. Eventually, after some time and possibly through geographical separation, a new species will, as Wallace put it, "depart indefinitely from the old type." Something like this probably happened when lions and tigers diverged to become separate species, although they can still mate and produce fertile cubs. But the cats are fundamentally the same animal and their skeletons are indistinguishable. Realistically, the variations between a dog and a fox, or a lion and a tiger, are trivial compared to the differences between a mouse and a bat. There is no evidence for the evolution of bats. Like whales and just about everything else, bats suddenly appear in the fossil record, fully developed without any transitional phase. What they evolved from can only be guessed at but since bats are mammals, Darwinists assume that they must have "evolved" from some early mammal that walked about like a rat or a mouse.

These inconsistencies are the real guts of evolutionary theory. In an attempt to overcome the difficulties, Darwinists recently proposed a new idea called *punctuated equilibria*.[lxxxii] They said that gaps in the

fossil record would never be filled because evolution first occurs in small, relatively isolated areas. Then, once a new form proves its success in this isolated pocket, it explodes outward, dominating the old form wherever else it might occur. Since the evolutionary change takes place in a small remote area, there would be very few fossils, if any, remaining to illustrate the evolutionary leap from one species to another. It is for this reason, Darwinists say, that the fossil record often shows the sudden appearance of new forms without any introductory or intermediate forms indicative of evolutionary development. What makes this new theory especially attractive to Darwinists is that it rationalizes a lack of proof. It says, in effect, don't worry about it; there won't be any proof because there isn't any. Beginning with a theory for which there never was any proof, Darwinists then propose another theory that explains why there never will be any evidence, and all evidence, whatever it is, is always interpreted according to the theory anyway.

When Darwin first proposed his theory, he assumed that the gaps within the fossil and geological records would eventually come together as time passed. It's closing in on two centuries now and the evidence remains incomplete. Species tend to appear and disappear in the fossil record without making any recognizable physical changes. They may get bigger or smaller, but they remain the same species. We haven't observed alterations in the fossil record indicative of *directional* change toward a new macroevolution, and we don't observe it happening now. Species appear in the fossil record completely functional without any introductory or developmental phase. Darwinists have a real problem maintaining that the fossil record demonstrates transitional forms. A few progressions have been noted and Darwinists leap to display them as proof for their theory. However, those "transitions" are usually like *Therapsids*, mammals that have jaws similar to reptiles.[lxxxiii] But the transition from reptile to mammal

would have necessitated thousands of complex changes such as the evolution of a completely unique reproductive system and mammalian skin and hair, to mention only a few.

There were many types of Therapsids, and if they were, in fact, transitional, then all mammals, a diverse class that includes bats, whales, opossums, humans, and many others, would all have to be descended from a single line of Therapsids. How a land animal like this should have then evolved into a whale is an impossibility that only the unsuspecting might swallow. The whale is an intricate mammal with specialized apparatus for suckling its young underwater, sonar for navigation, and with myriad other modifications needed to make it perfectly adapted to an aquatic existence. What would it take for a land mammal to evolve into a whale gradually? Darwinist critic Douglas Dewar:

> *Let us notice what would be involved in the conversion of a land quadruped into, first a seal-like creature and then into a whale. The land animal would, while on land, have to cease using its hind legs for locomotion and to keep them permanently stretched out backwards on either side of the tail and to drag itself about by using its fore-legs. During its excursions in the water, it must have retained the hind legs in their rigid position and swim by moving them and the tail from side to side As a result of this act of self-denial we must assume that the hind legs eventually became pinned to the tail by the growth membrane Thus the hind part of the body would have become like that of a seal. Having reached this stage, the creature in anticipation of a time when it will give birth to its young under water, gradually develops apparatus by means of which the milk is forced into the mouth of the young one, and meanwhile a cap has to be formed round the nipple into which the snout of the young one fits tightly, the epiglottis and laryngeal cartilage become prolonged downwards so as tightly to embrace this tube, in order that the adult will be able to breath while taking water into the mouth and the young while taking in milk These changes must be effected completely before the calf can be born under water. Be it noted that there is no stage in-*

termediate between being born and suckled under water and being born and suckled in the air. At the same time various other anatomical changes have to take place, the most important of which is the complete transformation of the tail region. The hind part of the body must have begun to twist on the fore part, and this twisting must have continued until the sideways movement of the tail developed into an up-and-down movement. While this twisting went on the hind limbs and pelvis must have diminished in size, until the latter ceased to exist as external limbs in all, and completely disappeared in most, whales.[lxxxiv]

The proposition that something like a wolf or a hippopotamus might become a whale, as a natural consequence of organic development, is ridiculous. The differences between a whale and a land mammal are unbridgeable except by miracle. But Darwinists deny the miraculous and say that transitional forms for whales have been discovered. This is a lie that borders on criminality. Most of the forms that Gould, for example, cites as the "sweetest series of transitional fossils an evolutionist could ever hope to find" are in fact land animals with four legs and with no apparent whale characteristics except some similar teeth and ear bones.[lxxxv] These wolf-like forms are said to include *Pakicetus inachus, Ambulocetus natans, Rodhocetus kasrani, Indocetus ramani,* and *Protocetus atavus* (known only from a skull, vertebrae, ribs, a tooth, and part of a second skull) and later the fully aquatic sea creature *Basilosaurus isis.*[lxxxvi] All of the former are similar to modern bears in that they might have lived near and hunted in the water and they all may have been contemporary to one another.

The fossil record of cetaceans (whales) is incomplete and has not provided unequivocal evidence on whether archaeocetes gave rise to one, both, or neither suborder of living whales.[lxxxvii]

One might also ask why these 'transitional" fossils, from *Mesonychid* to *Cetus* (whale), are all at one end of the spectrum or the other?

One either finds a complete whale or else a fully purposeful land animal trotting about on four entirely functional legs. Here is how a 2001 issue of the *National Geographic*, a magazine editorially committed to Darwinism, discussed the evolution of whales:

> *I tried to visualize some of the varieties of whale ancestors that had been found here and nearby...As the rear limbs dwindled, so did the hipbones that supported them. That made the spinal column more flexible to power the developing tail flukes. The neck shortened, turning the leading end of the body into more of a tubular hull to plow through the water with minimum drag, while arms assumed the shape of rudders. Having little need for outer ears any longer, some whales were receiving waterborne sounds directly through their lower jawbones and transmitting them to the inner ears via special fat pads. Each whale in the sequence was a little more streamlined than earlier models and roamed farther from shore.*[lxxxviii]

This is not science but pure speculation. It sounds just like a schematic for a car design. The Darwinist logic here, and the only logic in the whole thing, is that since whales exist, they must have evolved from land animals. Ergo, just connect the dots. Create new organs by mutation whenever necessary. But mutations don't create functioning new organs. Neither mutations nor selection add new genes. A mutation only modifies an already existing form. There would have to be thousands, even millions, of transitional forms, between the wolf-like *Mesonychid* and whales, and millions more for the fabulous transition from reptile to mammal. So where are the transitions? ***They are not there*** according to Gaylord Simpson, the most renowned paleontologist ever:

> *This is true of all thirty-two orders of mammals ...The earliest and most primitive known members of every order [of mammals] already have the basic ordinal characters, and in no case is an approximately continuous sequence from one order to another known. In most cases the break is so sharp and the gap so large that the origin of the order*

> *is speculative and much disputed ...This regular absence of transitional forms is not confined to mammals, but is an almost universal phenomenon, as has long been noted by paleontologists. It is true of almost all classes of animals, both vertebrate and invertebrate...it is true of the classes, and of the major animal phyla, and it is apparently also true of analogous categories of plants.*[lxxxix]

A critic can say; "Hey, Simpson said this sixty odd years ago, surely the situation has changed?" No it has not. Eugene Koonin, Senior Investigator, National Center for Biotechnology Information, writing in 2007:

> *Major transitions in biological evolution show the same pattern of sudden emergence of diverse forms at a new level of complexity. The relationships between major groups within an emergent new class of biological entities are hard to decipher and do not seem to fit the tree pattern that, following Darwin's original proposal, remains the dominant description of biological evolution. The cases in point include the origin of complex RNA molecules and protein folds; major groups of viruses; archaea and bacteria, and the principal lineages within each of these prokaryotic domains; eukaryotic supergroups; and animal phyla. In each of these pivotal nexuses in life's history, the principal "types" seem to appear rapidly and fully equipped with the signature features of the respective new level of biological organization. No intermediate "grades" or intermediate forms between different types are detectable.*[xc]

Koonin is talking about *all life* here, everything there is. The fossil record does not substantiate the gradual development of species by selective action upon chance mutants. But Darwinists fool the public by showing progressions that *they say* proves evolution. For example, there are various types of winged creatures; some that glide short distances and some that glide longer distances, some which fly a little, and some that fly miles high. Simply to show a progression like this is not proof for evolution. These types of creatures all exist right now on earth. Each is a separate and distinct species. They do not mate with

one another, and there is no evidence that they are in the process of evolving into more efficient fliers and gliders. Nor is there any evidence that gliders evolve into fliers. The transitional forms noted by Darwinists are only animals that have some similarities to each other. For example, your knee joint is somewhat similar to a fly's. This doesn't mean that you have evolved from flies, nor from the many other animals that have similar joints and muscles. All it means is that there is only one good way to make a functional knee joint. Nature does that. How nature does it is the essential question that Darwinists try to answer through theory. It may be as they say, but they can apparently only certify it among themselves.

Darwinism is not apparent, and it should be if it is a ***creative force.*** If evolution were actually proceeding according to random-chance mechanical factors, physical changes within species would need to appear often, considering the astonishing diversity of life on Earth. *Every individual animal and plant would have to be, by its very nature, a transitional form.* Structural changes would *need* to occur often, and regularly everywhere within all species. Evolution by chance would necessarily produce multitudinous *false starts*. There would be some record of these gradual changes, considering the astounding diversity of forms on Earth. It would follow that if this model were correct, genetic mutations indicative of directional change would be bursting out every day. Weird creatures, radically different from their parents, would be, by necessity, born every moment, in order for natural selection to be a creative force. *But we don't observe this happening at all.* As always, a good place to look for critical analysis of Darwinism is from Darwin himself:

> *…Why, if species have descended from other species by fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?*

With the number of species on Earth now estimated to be perhaps a half billion or more, we must assume that if Darwin's ideas were correct, *structural alterations in the direction of speciation must be happening all the time.* We would be able to observe this, especially since we've been looking for it for more than a century. But we don't see it. The earth should be populated, as Darwin noted, *entirely* by transitional forms. Instead, we see millions of separate and distinct species, which do not appear to be in the course of transforming into anything else. It is important to note again, the fossil record also says no to this idea. Zoologist Pierre Grasse:

> *Heedful of genetics and demography, Darwinians have seldom taken fossils into consideration, or, and this is more serious, they have applied the laws of genetics to them without making a critical analysis; considering our ignorance of the relationships between fossils, which in most cases are found very far apart in distinct beds, this approach can only be arbitrary. Paleontologists, who cannot have recourse to experiments when deciding that a given character is genetically valuable, thus express a very hypothetical opinion. Assuming that the Darwinian hypothesis is correct, they interpret fossil data according to it; it is only logical that they should confirm it: the premises imply the conclusions. The error in method is obvious.*[xci]

It's difficult to say that Darwinism doesn't make sense to educated people without getting into an argument. Like many others, I was once indoctrinated and in effect bewildered, by years of Darwinism in the schools and the *a priori* acceptance of Darwinism in nature shows and in our society's literature. *But the fact is, there is very little proof for this idea, and there is no way to prove it.* It's a brainstorm about the past. What the Darwinists cite as evidence is only a demonstration that species appear and disappear. How new species appear and whether they evolve according to a gradual process of natural selection is not known.

[lxxiii] Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species, A Facsimile of the First Edition* (New York: Athenaeum, 1967) pp. 186-187. One hundred and two years later, in addressing the problem of the eye, Garrett Hardin, in *Nature and Man's Fate* (New York: Mentor, 1961), pp. 71-72, uses an approach not very different than Darwin's: *"Were all other organisms blind, the animal which managed to evolve even a very poor eye would thereby have some advantage over the others. Oysters have such poor eyes, many tiny sensitive spots that can do no more than detect changes in the intensity of light. An oyster may not be able to enjoy television, but it can detect a passing shadow, react to it as if it were caused by an approaching predator, and, because it is sometimes right, live another day. By selecting examples from various places in the animal kingdom, we can assemble a nicely graded series of eyes, passing, by not too big steps, from the primitive eyes of oysters to the excellent (though not perfect) eyes of men and birds. Such a series, made up from contemporary species, is not supposed to be the actual historical series; but it shows us how evolution could have occurred."* Richard Dawkins' more tortuous explanation is essentially the same: long on supposition, short on fact. Dawkins' defense of Darwinism is typical of the genre: When writing on genetics he is very scientific. When explaining the nature of evolution by natural selection he relies on simile, metaphor and analogy (often human). R. Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1986), pp. 77-81.

[lxxiv] David Berlinski, "A Scientific Scandal" *Commentary*, April 2003, pp. 29-36, also, "A Scientific Scandal? David Berlinski and Critics," *Commentary*, July 2003, pp.10-26.

[lxxv] David Berlinski, "The Deniable Darwin" *Commentary*, vol. 101, June 1996 No. 6. Also, the critics respond in "Denying Darwin, David Berlinski and Critics" *Commentary*, September 1996, pp.4-39.

[lxxvi] Mathematicians have shown that Darwinists are far too optimistic in their appraisal of the relationship between time and chance necessary for an evolution of species through random processes. See Murray Eden, "Inadequacies of Neo-Darwinian Evolution as a Scientific Theory" *Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution*, D.S. Moorehead and M.P. Kaplan, eds. (Philadelphia: Wistar Institute Press, 1967), and R. Bernhard, "Heresy in the Halls of Biology: Mathematicians Question Darwin" *Scientific Research 2*, Nov. 1967, pp. 59-66.

[lxxvii] Dan-Erik Nilsson and Susan Pelger, "A Pessimistic Estimate of the Time Required for an Eye to Evolve," *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, London B (1994), 256, 53-58.

[lxxviii] "Controversy: A Scientific Scandal? David Berlinski & Critics" *Commentary*, July 2003, p. 25.

[lxxix] Richard Dawkins, *River Out of Eden: A Darwinian View of Life*, (HarperCollins, 1996) and "Where'd You Get Those Peepers," *New Statesman*, July 16, 1995.

[lxxx] John Horgan, *The Undiscovered Mind*, *op.cit.* p 178.

[lxxxi] "The All-Sufficiency of Natural Selection" by Professor A. Weismann, cited in Robert M. Young, *Darwin's Metaphor: Nature's Place in Victorian Culture* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985), p.119.

[lxxxii] N. Eldredge and S.J. Gould, "Punctuated Equilibria: An Alternative to Phyletic Gradualism," *Models in Paleobiology*, 1972, T.J.M. Schopfeld, ed., pp. 82-115.

[lxxxiii] In the 315 pages of argument against Creationist Science, *Scientists Confront Creationism*, Laurie R. Godfrey ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1983), attempts to cite transitional forms on only two pages, pp. 201-201, and then only vaguely. Elsewhere, pp. 157, 181-182, 251, Archaeopteryx is cited as a transitional form when, in fact, there exists absolutely no evidence for the evolution of feathers. As noted in the text and in notes, Archaeopteryx has modern feathers; no transitional form of feathers exists. What Darwinists cite as evidence for transitional forms is completely arbitrary, see Philip Gingerich, "Paleontology and phylogeny: patterns of evolution at the species level in early tertiary mammals" *American Journal of Science*, 1976, v. 276, pp. 1-28. There is no evidence that any of the forms cited by Gingerich actually evolved from one another and, even if they did, no one knows how or why it happened.

[lxxxiv] D.Dewar, *More Difficulties of the Evolution Theory*, (Thynne & Co. London, 1938), pp.23-24.

[lxxxv] Stephen Jay Gould, "Hooking Leviathan By Its Past" *Natural History* (April 1994).

[lxxxvi] For example, Thewissen, J.G.M., Hussain, S.T. and Arif, M., 1994. "Fossil evidence for the origin of aquatic locomotion in Archeo-

cete whales" *Science*, 263:210–212. The journal itself was forced to note, "The authors provide some evidence for the seemingly preposterous conclusion that archaic whales were capable of walking on land." Annalisa Berta, *Science*, 263:180(1994).

[lxxxvii] Michel C. Milinkovitch, Axel Meyer, and Jeffrey R. Powell, "Phylogeny of All Major Groups of Cetaceans Based on DNA Sequences from Three Mitochondrial Genes," *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 11, no. 6 (1994): p. 939.

[lxxxviii] *National Geographic*, "Evolution of Whales", November 2001, p. 69.

[lxxxix] George G., Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*, New York, 1944, pp.105-107.

[xc] Eugene V. Koonin, "The Biological Big Bang model for the major transitions in evolution," *Biology Direct* 2007, **2:**21. Here are some of Koonin's credentials: expert in evolutionary and computational biology. Senior Investigator, National Center for Biotechnology Information, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA MS (1978) and PhD (1983) in Molecular Biology from Department of Biology, Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia. Research in Computational Biology in Institute of Poliomyelitis and Institute of Microbiology, Moscow (Russia) in 1985-1991. Research in Computational Biology and Genomics at NCBI since 1991. Editor of Genome Analysis section in *Trends in Genetics*.

[xci] Pierre-P. Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms: Evidence for a New Theory of Transformation* (New York: Academic Press, 1977), pp. 5-7.

The Triumph of Social Darwinism

Darwinists have assembled all the evidence concerning their theory, and they have a troubled history rejecting conflicting data. This has happened for a number of reasons, some of them legitimate. When scientists are doing research, the general tendency is to collect evidence that conforms to the original idea. When they are convinced of the accuracy of their idea, history shows that they begin to protect it and their careers. In modern academia, Darwinism is the paradigm for explaining the history and origins of humankind and of life. Contradictory ideas are simply not allowed in the classroom. I know I never heard any.

There is also a tendency to conform to the ideology of the nation state. The national governments of western civilization, long involved in colonialism and other forms of domination repugnant to their citizenry, require an ideology that justifies and makes ethically correct their abuses. Darwinism has provided this framework. Modern 19th and 20th century colonialism is a practice whereby industrialized states subdue foreign nations militarily with the goal of turning them into client states for slave labor. Among the colonizers, no one talks about it quite like this. There are usually attempts at social justification. For a long time, colonialism was even referred to as "the white man's burden," i.e., white Euro-Americans were under the moral and ethical obligation to colonize foreign peoples in order to bestow upon them the benefits of Euro-American institutions, such as democracy. We hear this story now in Iraq and Afghanistan.[xcii]

Darwinists have tried to separate themselves from colonizers, calling them "Social Darwinists" and accusing them of misinterpreting Darwin's idea, which they consider to be absolutely true but open to manipulation. What has been forgotten is that Darwinism grew as a science within a social framework that was already acting upon ideas such as "natural selection." This is one reason why contemporary Darwinism and the fascist racist mentality are closely linked: Social Darwinism did not come about through a misuse of Darwin's ideas. Rather, Darwinists developed their ideas in a society where the domination of peoples in a framework already defined by Malthus was commonplace. Darwin and his ideas are a reflection of 19th and 20th century Anglo-Saxon moralities, which view life as a harsh brutalizing trial whereby only the most powerful and ruthless survive. For Europeans and Americans who have dominated and exploited much of the world, as well as their own people, this ethos has taken on an aura of respectability.

After a while, in an attempt at damage control, the Darwinists took pains to divorce themselves intellectually from the Social Darwinists. They began to downplay the primacy of "struggle." Leading evolutionary biologist, G.G. Simpson, wrote this on the role of the evolutionary struggle for existence:

> *Struggle is sometimes involved, but it usually is not, and when it is, it may even work against rather than toward natural selection. Advantage in differential reproduction is usually a peaceful process in which the concept of struggle is really irrelevant. It more often involves such things as better integration into the ecological situation, maintenance of a balance of nature, more efficient utilization of available food, better care of the young, elimination of intra-group discords (struggles) that might hamper reproduction, exploitation of environmental possibilities that are not the objects of competition or are less effectively exploited by others.*[xciii]

This may be true and it sounds very balanced and benign. However it might be, this view of evolution has not filtered down to the popular understanding of how theoretical Darwinism works. Although Simpson may have let go of the idea of the struggle and natural selection as the primal force in speciation, this revisionist notion has never caught on and is not taught in secondary schools and colleges. That's because there are so many problems explaining theoretical Darwinism: Those who teach evolutionary biology cannot effectively do so because there is no clear and simple rationale for Darwinism and what its struggle for existence implies. Here is what England's genius Aldous Huxley had to say about the development of human populations:

> *(In) the 20th Century, we do nothing systematic about our breeding; but in our random and unregulated way we are not only overpopulating our planet, we are also, it would seem, making sure that these greater numbers shall be of biologically poorer quality. In the bad old days children with considerable or even slight hereditary defects rarely survived. Today, thanks to sanitation, modern pharmacology and the social conscience, most of the children born with hereditary defects reach maturity and multiply their kind.*[xciv]

Sounds exactly like something Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf*.

> *Here the state must act as the guardian of a millennial future in the face of which the wishes and the selfishness of the individual must appear as nothing and submit. It must put the most modern medical means in the service of this knowledge. It must declare unfit for propagation all who are in any way sick or have inherited a disease and can therefore pass it on, and put this into actual practice.*[xcv]

What Huxley laments, Hitler celebrated with action. And the source of all this is Darwin himself:

> *With savages, the weak in body and mind are soon decimated. We civilized men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed and sick. Thus the weak members of society propagate their kind.*[xcvi]

It should be noted here that Darwin ceased practicing Christianity in 1849 when he was forty years old.[xcvii] Not ever the paragon of religious virtue as some people believe, it is evident from his writings that he was as heartless a racist as Hitler. Darwin had this to say in his *The Descent of Man*:

> *At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes ... will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest Allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as the baboon, instead of as now between the Negro or Australian and the gorilla.*[xcviii]

Darwin was clearly not the sort of racist we have come to identify: alcoholic, poorly educated, unskilled, or unable, for various reasons, to participate in mainstream society. Rather Darwin, like Hitler, viewed History in terms of racial struggle and this is the theme of *The Descent of Man* as well as *Mein Kampf*. In Darwin's book, he states that the extermination of non-white races is a likely consequence of natural selection. Darwin assumed that this selection process would be organically biological. For Hitler, the organized forces of the modern industrial national state would direct the process.[xcix] From this Darwinian/Malthusian rationale, Hitler justified racial purification, cultural/ethnic cleansing, forced sterilization, and the murder of peoples deemed genetically inferior. With Huxley, who came later, we can see that even after Hitler's genocidal Second World War, ideas about racial purification, generally thought to be the prerogative of

only the Nazis, were deeply embedded in the consciousness of a supposedly compassionate and liberal thinker. For Huxley to say what he said—and for which there is very little proof—shows that the grand ideas of modern evolutionary biologists like Simpson have not filtered down to even the most powerful thinkers of our age. On the surface, it is not easy to see how even the greatest minds can be so easily misled. But they have been indoctrinated their whole lives in the Darwinian ethos as the only viable alternative to religious fanaticism. But where is the evidence that the human race, as a whole, is weakened because a few people manage to survive into adulthood with conditions that were at one time fatal? There is no proof that any society is weakened in the long term through the survival of beings deemed by some to be less fit than others.

Obviously, not every Darwinist is a racist. I've listened to Richard Dawkins. In many ways he seems like a fine and gentle spirited man who wouldn't harm anyone. He, and most Darwinists have devoted their lives to the propagation and maintenance of a theory they believe is an empowering truth, even though no clear agreement has ever been reached as to the exact nature of the mechanics of evolution. Darwinists, however, do present a united front to maintain credibility. If the lack of a clear consensus among them were to become generally known, a deeper public scrutiny might allow alternative ideas to surface. A biologist in China recently remarked, "In China, you can criticize Darwinism but not the government; and in the USA you can criticize the government but not Darwin." More than that, there are laws to prevent criticizing Darwinism in American schools. However, not every nation is committed to Darwinist theory. The French have problems with it, as they do with most English ideas. Pierre P. Grasse, the most distinguished French zoologist, was a professor of evolutionary biology at the Sorbonne, former president of

the *Academie des Sciences*, and editor of dozens of volumes of the monumental *Traite de Zoologie.* He had this to say about the theory:

> *…Darwinism, which is so sure of itself, impresses incompletely informed biologists, misleads them, and inspires fallacious interpretations. Through use and abuse of hidden postulates, of bold, often ill-founded extrapolations, a pseudo-science has been created. It is taking root in the very heart of biology and is leading astray many biochemists and biologists, who sincerely believe that the accuracy of fundamental concepts has been demonstrated, which is not the case. Biochemists and biologists who adhere blindly to the Darwinian theory search for results that will be in agreement with their theories and consequently orient their research in a given direction…This intrusion of theories has unfortunate results: it deprives observations and experiments of their objectivity, makes them biased, and, moreover, creates false problems.*[c]

Darwinists often deflect criticism of their theory by insinuating that dissenters are not familiar with the "facts" of biology. Stephen Jay Gould:

> *Virtually all thinking people accept the factuality of evolution and no conclusion in science enjoys greater documentation.*[ci]

This remark is, in all respects, false and absurd. Quantum mechanics and relativity are accurate to a dozen decimal places. The origin of species has never been documented. It is unknown. You often hear that Darwinism is as evident as the law of gravity, which is what Gould was saying. But there is no question about the law of gravity. You can drop an apple off a tree and it will fall, which was what gave Newton the idea in the first place. The laws of gravity can send rockets to orbit the outer planets. But Darwinism is not obvious. There are no real convincing experimental data for the origin of species. All thinking people do not accept Darwin's idea. A leading Darwinist once described Grasse's knowledge of zoology as "encyc-

lopedic." No one in the world was ever more cognizant of the "facts" than Grasse. Yet he thinks Darwinism is absolutely wrong, and a *pseudo science*. Obviously, social forces, primarily fascism, have promoted this very aberrant idea into dogma.

Darwinism was already established as an idea when fascism emerged in the 20th century and it's difficult to interpret a definition of fascism. Ask any educated person you know to give you a definition of fascism and you'll get a blank stare, even though it is western civilization's primary mode of public administration. Webster says that fascism is:

> *A system of government characterized by rigid one-party dictatorship, forcible suppression of the opposition, private economic enterprise under centralized government control, belligerent nationalism, racism and militarism.*

That's a pretty good one and there's a lot in this definition, including the implication that fascism is an economic system. Mussolini, who invented it, defined fascism as "corporatism plus reaction." He meant that government exists to serve corporate interests, usually through huge military contracts. There is also a merging of state and business leadership. We can see that in the United States today (2008), as the vice president promotes a war in Iraq where the corporate firm he previously led, as well as himself, reaps huge profits. The same thing happened in the Vietnam War but the cast of characters was a bit different. By reaction, Mussolini meant responding negatively to egalitarianism, trade unionism, women's rights, and any other modern progressive notion that might limit the power of the ruling elite. Hence, we sometimes hear, vaguely, that fascism is a "reaction against modernism."

Generally, a fascistic movement venerates an ethnic or racial majority and its language and history. It calls for a return to the tradi-

tional, i.e., patriarchal values; fundamentalist theological doctrine; the control of artistic expression through censorship and intimidation; and an emphasis on the glorification of military force. As wealth becomes concentrated among the elite, the common people and labor become superfluous commodities, and there is an implicit negation of individuality. Each person is expected to conform to the directives of the state: dissenters are not tolerated but are seen as enemies of the corporate state and are usually singled out for imprisonment or destruction. Today, in America, the state has openly declared war on non-violent drug users and fashioned a massive corporate prison system to incarcerate them alongside those exhibiting vicious anti-social behavior. In Hitler's Germany, the enemy of the state was the Jews.[cii]

The Holocaust

Benito Mussolini really didn't care about Jews.[ciii] His brand of fascism was imperial, not ethnic. The Nazis were the racists, and when they took over Italy, the Jews there were in trouble. German fascism emphasized genetics, and in 1941 the Nazi state made a macabre foreign policy decision. It decided to use the government to *direct and accelerate natural selection*—European Jews and Gypsies would be annihilated and secular Europe readily acquiesced. Hitler and his mentors, most notably the British author Houston Stewart Chamberlain[civ] whom Hitler visited on his deathbed, were evolutionists. They believed that the evolutionary struggle for survival made it absolutely necessary that Aryan, or "noble" races constantly strive to transform themselves into societies of superior peoples that would supplant inferior strains. Here is Darwin's thinking on Africans in *The Descent of Man*:

> *if we reflect on the weighty arguments above given, for raising the races of man to the dignity of species, and the insuperable difficulties on the other side in defining them, it seems that the term 'sub-species' might here be used with propriety.*[cv]

Hitler also defined Jews as "sub-species" (*der Untermensch*) and believed that a new human strain, the Superman, (*der Ubermensch*) might rapidly emerge with selective breeding combined with the elimination of the Jewish *Untermensch*. Mass murder then became the driving force for the existence of the national state. Even now, some Christians accommodate themselves to Darwin's theory even though it epitomizes atheism. But since Hitler was an atheist, there was no ethical problem for him. Essentially, Darwinism is *anathema* to Christianity because it negates their god, and its triumph will only mean the eventual destruction of Christianity and *all* other religions and systems of morality, which is what the Nazi ultra-Darwinist state aimed for.[cvi]

Darwinists now deny any association with the horrors done in the name of improving the racial stock of European peoples. They say it was all an unfortunate mistake carried out under the direction of a madman. But contrary to what we have been led to believe, the destruction of European Jews was known in Great Britain and the United States and those nations not only did nothing to stop it, but actively participated in it. Like Casey Stengel used to say: "You can look it up." Go to the library and look in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*, 1943-44, or various newspaper indexes, under the heading "Jews." You will find articles describing the extermination of European Jews, including names, places, pictures and the number of victims.[cvii] The racial extermination program administered by central European Nazis during WWII was done with the active complicity and eager assistance of most secular governments of Nazi-occupied Europe. With the German war machine involved in campaigns from

Norway to North Africa, from Eastern Russia and the Caspian Sea, to the shores of the United States, there was no way the assembly, transportation, and murder of millions of people was done without the active support of occupied Europe's police forces fueled by racist national and local governments.[cviii] In addition, the Allies never informed the German people about what was being done in their name. No radio broadcasts on the BBC or from Radio Moscow ever told them about the horrors of the concentration camps, even though this information was known. Although the United States filed over 100 diplomatic protests to Tokyo through intermediaries about its treatment of prisoners during the war, the United States never once filed a diplomatic protest to Berlin about its treatment of European Jews. They didn't care.

After the war, members of the American Jewish community looked for some answers and formed a commission headed by former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg. The commission issued a report that stated in part:

> *The record showed that Allied governments were well aware of Hitler's extermination policy but for a variety of reasons were generally reticent and evasive about calling attention to the fact that his target was genocide of the Jews. They made little or no attempt until very late in the war to rescue Jews and in some cases actually obstructed such attempts by others. Their attitude on the subject was construed by the Nazi authorities as tantamount to acquiescence. Goebbels, (the Nazi propaganda minister) in his diaries wrote, "At the bottom I believe both the English and Americans are happy that we are exterminating the Jewish riff-raff.*[cix]

Goebbels was right about the English and Americans, and the only people who didn't know exactly what was happening to the European Jews were the Germans themselves. Like most of us, Germans have a tendency to believe their own government. The Nazi government told them that the Jews who had disappeared were

resettled in the East. When Germans went to the movies during WWII, they saw newsreels of happy Jews comfortably and happily moved to the Ukraine. Of course the newsreels were phony, produced by the Nazi Propaganda Ministry. To be sure, German people heard rumors about what was going on in concentration camps, but they were reluctant to talk about it, because loose talk about concentration camps could lead to incarceration in one. Besides, spreading rumors in Nazi Germany was an official crime punishable by death.

So 6 million Jews were murdered, as well as millions of eastern Europeans, gypsies, homosexuals, handicapped and mentally ill people, all of who were deemed *Untermenschen* or sub-humans. There is no way to get an accurate head count, which is why "Holocaust denial" is ridiculous. A massive massacre happened in Eastern Europe in 1941-45 and there is no knowing exactly how many died. The Russo-German war consumed between 20 and 30 million Soviet citizens. It's impossible to determine exactly how many. German Army doctrine was to torch Russian villages and then machine gun the civilians as they tried to escape in case there might be some soldiers among them. Not every Jew died in Auschwitz or in the other camps. Some just died in combat. Some died of disease. Some escaped and migrated. In the end, Europe was rid of its Jews, which was the overall plan. This was the logical end product of Darwinist education within the structure of evolutionary biology taught in the schools and universities of Europe. This race-oriented education emphasized Herbert Spencer's idea of "survival of the fittest" which Darwinists incorporated as a part of their credo. The racial extermination programs were a conscious state-directed attempt to accelerate and direct natural selection towards a biological end.[cx] Certainly Darwinism wasn't the sole cause for the Holocaust. Racial hatreds and genocides of various types have been typical of European history right into the twenty-first century. Darwinism, however, gave the butchers a

scientific rationale and direction for their atrocities, which were carried out in a sustained and methodical way.

---

xcii Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States* (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), gives us insight into the exploitation of under-developed nations by the United States that was done primarily to obtain resources and cheap labor. All nations involved in colonialism have essentially the same motives. Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, (Metropolitan Books, 2007). Iraq's oil is now open for complete control by western oil monopolies. Chriss Hodges and Laila Al-Arian, *Collateral Damage: America's War Against Iraqi Civilians*, (Nation Books, 2008).

xciii Cited in Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason* (Boston: Gambit, 1971), pp. 57-58. A short, clearly written volume about the problems with Darwin's theory.

xciv Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World Revisited* (New York, Harper & Row, 1958), p. 19. Two British authors created differing visions of future society. One was Orwell's grim *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949), where people were controlled by a violently repressive police state. Huxley's vision in *Brave New World* (New York: Bantam, 1958) was more serene. There, the state led people to conformity through entertainment, drugs and genetic manipulation. Huxley wrote *Brave New World Revisited* to consider the implications of his previous work and to investigate the ways in which modern society seemed to be conforming to his vision rather than to Orwell's.

xcv Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, (Boston, 1943), p. 404.

xcvi Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, vol. I, 2nd edition, (London, 1874) pp.205-06.

xcvii Adrian Desmond and James Moore, *Darwin: The Life of a Tormented Evolutionist*, (Michael Joseph, London, 1991), p. 658. Also, Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, (TFE Publishing, Toronto, 1984).

xcviii Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, New York: (Prometheus Books, 1998), pp.162, 163.

xcix Hitler, *Mein Kampf,* "Chapter II, The State," pp.386-437.

[c] Pierre-P. Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms: Evidence for a New Theory of Transformation* (New York: Academic Press, 1977), pp. 5-7. Lamarckism, an idea from the Marquis Jean Baptiste de Lamarck, is another alternative to the generally accepted code of neo-Darwinism. Lamarck asserted that learned behavior, which is vital to the survival of the individual, might be transmitted biologically to the offspring. Thus he believed that individual organisms have the ability to consciously direct the nature of evolution. This is an extreme contradiction to the Anglo-American version of Darwinism, which holds that variations in form appear by chance to be then selected upon by the forces of nature. For more on Lamarckism, see Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, (New York, Harper & Row, 1983), pp. 36-54. In this easy to read volume, Taylor notes that the Darwinists have negated Lamarckian theory because it can't be proven. Of course, by the same standards of judgment, the Darwinist theory of speciation can't be proven either. See also *Genetic Selection and Adaptive Evolution*, E. Steele, ed. (Toronto: Williams and Wallace, 1979) and A.C.R. Dean and Sir Cyril Hinshelwood, *Growth, Function and Regulation in Bacterial Cells*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966).

[ci] Stephen Jay Gould, "More Things in Heaven and Earth" *Alas, Poor Darwin: Arguments Against Evolutionary Psychology*, Hilary & Steven Rose, editors, (New York, 2000), p.103.

[cii] Wilhelm Reich, *Mass Psychology of Fascism*, trans. Vincent R. Carfagno (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1970). Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966). For images of day-to-day life in the fascist state see Milton Mayer, *They Thought They Were Free: The Germans 1933-1945* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1955).

[ciii] *"Race! It is a feeling, not a reality: Ninety-five percent, at least, is a feeling. Nothing will ever make me believe that biologically pure races can be shown to exist today... National pride has no need of the delirium of race."* Mussolini in 1933.

[civ] Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century,* (London, 1911).

[cv] Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, (1998), p.182.

[cvi] The Nazis, for example, tried to remove crucifixes from the schoolrooms in Bavaria until public protest halted the action. Also, *Nuremberg Project for the Rutgers Journal of Law and Religion*, "The Nazi

Master Plan: The Persecution of the Christian Churches" in four parts, A document prepared by the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) Research and Analysis Branch. Also, Selwyn Duke, "Hitler and Christianity" *The New American*, June 22, 2008.

[cvii] For example as noted previously, "(The) effect of our silent complicity in the massacre of the Jews," *New Republic*, January 10, 1944. Address of May 2, 1943 on the Jewish massacres; Excerpt. A.A. Berle, *Current History*, June 1943. "European Jews are in a desperate plight," *Christian Century*, September 8, 1943.

[cviii] The great French film, banned in DeGaulle's France, *The Sorrow and the Pity* documents the active and eager compliance of French local government and police in assisting the Gestapo. The film also notes that the people involved in the French resistance were a very small minority and were mostly communists. Also Claude Levy and Paul Tillard, *Betrayal at the Vel d'Hiv* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1967).

[cix] Cited in David Black, *The Plague Years: A Chronicle of AIDS, the Epidemic of Our Times*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), pp. 144-145. See also Walter Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret: An Investigation into the Suppression of Information About Hitler's Final Solution* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1980), Helen Fein, *Accounting For Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization during the Holocaust* (London: Collier Macmillan, 1979). For more on Allied treatment of Jewish refugees see John Mendelsohn, *The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes*, vol.7 "Jewish Emigration: The SS St. Louis Affair and Other Cases" (New York: Garland Publishing, 1982) and Gordon Thomas and Max Morgan Witts, *Voyage of the Damned* (New York: Stein and Day, 1974).

[cx] Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966). It is Arendt's idea that the Holocaust was a national state's attempt to accelerate natural selection.

Hitler and Darwinist Ideology

American Sociobiology originated in 1975 with the publication of Edmund Wilson's massive 700-page volume entitled *Sociobiology*.[cxi] It is an extension of Nazi science. The book implies that all human behavior can be understood through, and is *absolutely determined by* genetics. Wilson and his disciples, who call themselves Sociobiologists, argue that the dominant life form on the Earth is the gene, even though genes are only chemicals. For them, the human form is irrelevant. Sociobiologist Richard Dawkins asserts:

> *…genes swarm in huge colonies, safe inside gigantic lumbering robots, sealed off from the outside world, manipulating it by remote control. They are in you and me; they created us, body and mind; and their preservation is the ultimate rationale for our existence ...we are their survival machines.*[cxii]

This idea fascinates others as well. Here is what Adolf Hitler had to say:

> *...events in the lives of peoples are not expressions of chance, but processes related to the self-preservation and propagation of the species and the race and subject to the laws of Nature, even if people are not conscious of the inner reason for their actions.*[cxiii]

In the United States and Britain today Dawkins is regarded as a genius that tells us there is no god but the deity of genetics. Hitler said the same thing. This is why the Nazi movement won't die. The

same ideas emerge again and again, from Dawkins, Wilson, and all the Atheistic biologists of modern times who echo *der Fuhrer's* ideas so gleefully, as if they have discovered something new.

Since most Sociobiologists hang around places like Harvard and Oxford, they don't talk to many Nazi theoreticians. If they did, and chose to read the works of Adolph Hitler and chief Nazi ideologist Alfred Rosenberg, they might be able to see how their discipline is essentially Nazi fascism disguised as science. In fact, the Nazis invented a scientific discipline to determine the influence of genetics upon society. They called it *Gesellshaftsbiologie*, translated literally as sociobiology, and also *Rassenhygiene,* or "racial purity." One problem with modern academia is that professors are insulated from each other's area of study. Biologists don't comment upon historians and *vise versa*. Everyone remains within the narrow confines of their own area of expertise. So historians of fascism might suspect that Sociobiology bears an uncomfortable resemblance to the racist sciences of the Nazi empire, but they won't comment on it.[cxiv]

Who was Adolf Hitler?

The German dictator was born in Austria in 1889 and took political power in Germany in 1933. This confuses some people right away because they wonder how an Austrian was accepted as the leader of another country. Back then, being German, or *Deutsch*, was a racial or ethnic classification, not a national one. The word Austria is an Anglicization of the German word *Osterreich,* meaning "Eastern Empire." Hence, Austria is a term for a national boundary where many ethnicities resided—ten in fact—among which the Germans, or *Deutschen*, were the largest and most powerful. They ran the country and when the combined armies of Austria-Hungary and the German Empire lost World War I in 1918, the victors prohibited any future

union of the two central European German states. One of the things Adolf Hitler the politician did was unite Austria and Germany into one country, *Gross Deutschland* (Greater Germany). This consolidation was part of a racial plan to unite all Germans in Europe into one large ethnically pure nation. Since Germans then lived all over Europe, in northern Italy, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, France, Poland, Romania, Ukraine, the Baltic States and Russia, Hitler's plan, as clearly outlined in his best selling book *Mein Kampf*, necessitated war. One historian described Hitler's book this way:

> *…Hitler arrives at a whole 'philosophy of history', an interpretation of human existence from beginnings onwards, which has* ***a certain crazy originality****. (Emphasis mine) As Hitler sees it, human history forms part of nature and follows the same laws as the rest of nature…There follows an outline of history that portrays it as one long degeneration. Nature demands inequality, hierarchy, subordination of the inferior to the superior-but human history has consisted of a series of revolts against this natural order…*[cxv]

There is nothing original about any of it. Somewhere along the line, Hitler may have lost his mind, but all his ideas in *Mein Kampf* are based upon the leading philosophical and scientific knowledge of his day and before.[cxvi] The lineage from Malthus, Spencer, Darwin, and the Eugenics movement through Ernst Haeckel, Darwin's German popularizer and promoter of the myth of racial superiority, is clear. A professor of Biology at Jena University, Haeckel's books sold in the millions. Here is what he had to say on the Teutonic "Aryan" race:

> *…symmetry of all parts, and that equal development, which we call the perfect type of human beauty…the lower races-are psychologically nearer to the mammals-apes and dogs-than to civilized Europeans, we must therefore assign a totally different value to their lives.*[cxvii]

Hitler certainly did assign different values to people's lives, exactly adopting Darwin's notion of "sub-humans" as he formulated his genocidal plans. Hitler never met Haeckel, nor did he mention him, but his influence is clear. Historian Daniel Gasman:

> *Hitler's views on history, politics, religion, Christianity, nature, eugenics, science, art and evolution, however eclectic, and despite the plurality of their sources, coincide for the most part with those of Haeckel and are more than occasionally expressed in very much the same language.*[cxviii]

Hitler also drew upon the popular ideas of Alfred Plotz, a eugenicist influenced by Haeckel.[cxix] Plotz introduced the term *Rassenhygiene* into practical use after the Nazis seized power in 1933. In 1936 Hitler appointed Plotz to a chair at the University of Munich because he echoed Hitler's own ideas about eliminating people with hereditary diseases from a nation's social fabric. Plotz believed that advances in medicine would only insure the survival of the weak and eventually debase the racial stock of the splendid German master race. Many Darwinists, including Charles himself and later Aldous Huxley, as noted earlier in the text, held similar beliefs. Plotz was instrumental in establishing the T-4 Euthanasia Program, the official name for the plan that was instrumental in the murder of 200,000 Germans suffering from mostly minor hereditary diseases.[cxx]

Hitler took a mix of scientific knowledge and bastardized elements of German philosophy to arrive at his conception of the world. He co-opted the philosophical thoughts of Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), who was, sorry to say, a racist, not unlike just about every Euro-American thinker at the time. Nietzsche originated the term *Ubermensch* and applied it to personal development as part of a proposed magical transformation of the German *Herren Rasse* (Noble Race) into a mystically endowed transhuman, hence his term "the will to power" adopted by Hitler as a personal mantra. Nietzsche pro-

posed that the *Ubermensch* would inevitably appear as a function of the *Noble Races'* superior will and in the process destroy Christianity, another of Hitler's long-term goals. It was Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) who believed that the human "will" (*der Wille*) was far more significant than material power, actually the primal force in life, hence Hitler's belief that his march to political power was a "triumph of the will" against the corrupt materialism of *bourgeoisie* society. Hitler then arrived at a worldview in which the entirety of existence revolved around the purification and survival of the Germanic Race (*das Volk*), *as a single conscious organic being*.[cxxi] This was Hitler's God. He was not a Catholic. He never went to church, Catholic sacraments were irrelevant to him and he never took confession either. He was not a Social Darwinist. He was a *Sociobiologist* and the Nazi state became the world's first ultra-Darwinist state: Amazingly, in a short time, biology became the organizing principle for the German national state's policies, just as Hitler outlined in *Mein Kampf*. The biological end of German political action would be the complete annihilation of the Jews: When the last Jew in Europe was dead, then the *Ubermensch* would appear, and the whole German race would be mystically and immediately transformed by the power of *der Wille* into an extraordinary transhuman race, unbound by conventional moral and physical limitations. This explains a lot of things, namely the first Cause.

The first cause of the Holocaust is a deeply troubling problem for many people, not only Jews, but also for anyone concerned about righteousness. Just a brief history of Holocaust scholarship shows that for 15 years after the end of the Second World War, no major historical study was made until 1961 when Raul Hilberg quietly published, with extreme difficulty, his massive study on the perpetrators of the crime.[cxxii] It was a subject very few people wanted to talk about and it is just beyond the scope of this book to get into the problems Hilberg faced and why. But more studies followed and the general consensus

was that anti-Semitism lay as the root cause.[cxxiii] Undoubtedly anti-Semitism was part of the problem, especially considering the motivation for the thousands of ordinary Germans who became Hitler's enthusiastic killers.[cxxiv] However, the question we are asking here is; what motivated the Nazi ruling elite, the men who made the policy decisions? Anti-Semitism does not explain their actions since the Holocaust was perpetrated to the extreme detriment of the Third Reich's own survival and actually led to its destruction. This is something difficult to comprehend. David Berlinsky:

> *For reasons that they could not make clear, even to themselves, the men controlling the Third Reich determined that it would be a fine thing to exterminate 9 million European Jews.* [cxxv]

They did make it clear to themselves. The connections between Darwinism and the Nazi genocide of Jews and Gypsies are obvious, but the scientific establishment has been in denial for quite some time, and their protectors in the media and academia are unwilling to draw anyone's attention to just how murderous a doctrine Darwinism is. Hitler, unlike Malthus, didn't have any agenda against poverty. A pauper, as long as he was Aryan, made as good a soldier as anyone. Hitler was a racist and he saw History in terms of a racial struggle for existence in the same way that Darwin did. It was Ernst Haeckel who coined the phrase "politics is applied biology"[cxxvi] and Hitler's deputy, Rudolf Hess, reaffirmed Haeckel when he stated, "The German Nazi state is nothing but applied biology."[cxxvii] These are not idle words. The Nazi ultra-Darwinist state applied biological notions to its domestic and foreign policies and acted upon them. Alfred Rosenberg on Germany's war on the Eastern Front that began in 1941:

> *At the same time this eastern territory is called upon to solve a question which is posed to the peoples of Europe; that is the Jewish question. In the east some six million Jews still live, and this question can*

> *only be solved in the biological eradication of the entire Jewry of Europe. The Jewish question is only solved for Germany when the last Jew has left German territory and for Europe when not a single Jew lives on the continent up to the Urals.*[cxxviii]

Hitler was not a scientist, but with a photographic memory he was also not a fool. He gladly accepted as true the 19th and 20th century notions about the inherent superiority of the white or Aryan races. However, Hitler was unwilling to accept the concept that the "noble" Aryan race was descended from apes, and so he distanced himself from Haeckel and never acknowledged him. Instead Hitler drew upon ideas from members of the Thule Society and the Theosophical Society who believed that the Aryan race was descended from *more highly evolved* human forms that originated in the far north, perhaps in the Himalayan Mountains.[cxxix] The Nazis then sent expeditions out there looking for their hereditary roots. In the late 1930s and early 1940s, teams of Hitler's elite guard, the *SS*, were sent to Iraq, Afghanistan, India, and Tibet as "archeologists" to find ancient artifacts, as well as "biologically pure" specimens of the mystical Aryan root race.[cxxx]

Hitler was obsessed with the notion of racial purity and believed that by "cleansing the blood" of the German race, it might attain the mythical powers of the Aryan root race. His mentor, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, had this to say about "the sacredness of pure race."

> *The individual members may have ever so different qualities…yet together they form a molded unity, and the power-or let us say rather the importance-is multiplied a thousand fold by his organic connection with countless others.*[cxxxi]

Hitler believed that the *rationale* for human existence was the survival and purification of the race or *Volk*. Darwinists now define this as the *gene pool*. It's important to note again that Nazi ideologues went

far beyond the notion that the main motive for political action was the survival of the national state. For them, the national state was but a means to an end, and that end was the purification and survivability of a master race. Hitler in *Mein Kampf*:

> *The state is not an end in itself.... The state is a means to an end. Its end lies in the preservation and advancement of a community of physically and psychically homogeneous creatures.*[cxxxii]

This is the most radical, and least discussed of Hitler's ideas, but it is the most crucial because it dispels the currently accepted myth that the Nazis used European Jews as scapegoats in their quest for political power. If this were the only reason for Nazi rhetoric against the Jews, then certainly they could have left the Jews alone once they took control of the government in 1933. They didn't let them be. The Nazis passed laws, closely modeled on American eugenic laws, which made it difficult for Jews to live in Germany, thereby encouraging Jewish emigration. Prior to World War II, the Nazis had no explicit plan to murder Europe's Jews, if only because there was no practical way to execute it. Heinrich Himmler, chief of the Nazi police, thought to resettle German Jews in Madagascar after the British rejected a Nazi plan to create a Jewish homeland in Palestine.[cxxxiii] At that point mass murder was not yet an option and Nazi race policy was only designed to get rid of *German Jews* by any means possible. However, to kill *all European Jews*, Hitler needed a war against the country that harbored the most of them: Russia. The Holocaust then began after the savage German invasion of 1941, as roving Nazi death squads took the opportunity to murder vast numbers of Jews in the confusion of a major war. Hitler and his subordinates then organized the indiscriminate killings into *die Endlosung* "the Final Solution to the Jewish problem."

What takes most people by surprise about the Holocaust is the intensity of it all. In a relatively short time, from July 1941 until the defeat of Germany in the spring of 1945, about 6 million Jews were murdered, and that's probably a low estimate. There are two schools of thought on this. The first, the Functionalist view, claims that the Holocaust was primarily the product of a Nazified German bureaucracy that served a national industrial purpose but was not part of a larger, strictly ideological plan: This methodical organizing of the Holocaust progressed in ever more violent stages but was no different than the ordinary efficient bureaucratic workings of the German state. It was, however, directed and driven in a wholly unique biological way by enthusiastic civil servants who dehumanized the victims, and were proud to be part of a history making process and who often, on their own initiative, found the most expedient ways to kill as many Jews as possible within the shortest amount of time and with a minimum use of resources.[cxxxiv]

This explanation didn't sit well with historian Lucy Davidowicz who claimed the entire war was centered upon racial extinction.

> *Hitler had embarked on an ideological war, to achieve ideological/racial goals, but to win that war he also had to fight a conventional war.*[cxxxv]

Davidowicz was the first of the *Intentionalists*, the other point of view. She saw that German political and military actions only made sense if their object was the complete annihilation of the Jews. Hitler on July 22nd 1941:

> *Russia has become a plague-center for mankind…For if only one state tolerates a Jewish family among it, this would provide the core-bacillus for a new decomposition (of the race).*[cxxxvi]

Here is the notion that the present Aryans were deteriorated from the fabled root race. Hitler, from Chamberlain, and echoed by the Thule Society and Theosophists, felt the Aryans had lost their primal powers through an intermixing of impure blood. This situation could only be rectified by racial purification through a nationally directed ethnic extermination program. Hence the Nazi quest to kill every last Jew; man, woman and child. For example, in October 1941 the Germans rounded up, among thousands of others, 2000 Spanish Jews in Paris in retaliation for an attack on some German soldiers. The Spanish government pressed for their release and they were willing to take these Spanish Jews off the German's hands and ship them to Morocco, at their own considerable expense. But Heydrich denied them:

> *These Jews would be too much out of the reach of the direct measures to be taken after the war regarding the fundamental solution to the Jewish question.*[cxxxvii]

What? The whole of Europe was in the midst of the most chaotic war in its history. The Nazi government was dealing with millions of prisoners of war and physically occupied with the brutal forced mass deportation of more millions of people. In the middle of all this, these 2000 Spanish Jews couldn't be allowed to escape the Nazi grasp, even momentarily? Obviously by this time complete insanity had overwhelmed German leadership, and the outline for the absolute annihilation of European Jewry had already been philosophically decided upon. It is this driving need to murder *all* the Jews, to not even allow the survival of a single family, which makes one question the conventionality of the Functionalist perspective and see the situation in a wholly different light. Holocaust historian Christopher R. Browning:

> *The Holocaust was a watershed event in human history-the most extreme case of genocide that has yet occurred. What distinguishes it*

> *from other genocides are two factors; first the totality and scope of intent-that is the goal of killing every last Jew, man, woman and child, throughout the reach of the Nazi empire; and second, the means employed-namely the harnessing of the administrative/bureaucratic and technological capacities of the modern nation state and western scientific culture. It is precisely these elements that define the singularity of the Holocaust and distinguish the Nazi Final Solution in its ultimate form from the regime's prior policies of population decimation, genocide and even the systematic and total mass murder of all Soviet-as opposed to all European-Jewry. It is not a trivial historical question to ask when Hitler and the Nazi regime passed the point of no return and committed themselves to a vision of murdering all the Jews of Europe through the most modern and efficient methods available to it.*[cxxxviii]

I can answer Browning's question right now. What was an unrehearsed murderous scheme in 1941 had become the basis for national action by the beginning of 1942. It was then clear that the conventional war with the Soviet Union was not going to be a short one, and had in fact evolved into a true world war with the United States now an enemy. Hitler along with Heinrich Himmler, Reinhard Heydrich, and Alfred Rosenberg, his closest ideologues concerning race, were all convinced that when the last Jew in Europe was killed, or when a critical mass of them was eliminated; then the whole Aryan race would immediately transmutate into the next, inevitable stage of human development, the *Ubermensch*, or else revert to and attain the immense supernatural powers of the Aryan root race. Hitler on February 17th, 1942:

> *Peace can only result from a natural order…It is Jewry that always destroys this order. The more we render the Jew incapable of harming us, the more we shall protect ourselves from this danger. The Jew plays in nature the role of a catalyzing element. A people that are rid of its Jews returns* ***spontaneously*** *to the natural order.*[cxxxix]

This is a direct reference to the spontaneous emergence of new traits species-wide and the reason why the total obliteration of the Jews often took precedence over the conventional war effort: Their destruction *was* the war aim. Hitler believed that an Aryan species-wide transmutation could happen suddenly and immediately upon the Jews' complete annihilation. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler had this to say on the coming war against Russia:

> *The way to do this is above all for the state not to leave the settlement of the newly acquired territories to chance, but to subject it to special norms. For this however, definite racial purity must be established.*[cxl]

As outlined by his mentor Chamberlain, Hitler believed that through racial extermination, the Aryan race would, at some point in the process, assume the paranormal proportions of the *Ubermensch*, with every individual German's personal power *spontaneously and immediately* increased a thousand fold. *This event would win the war*. This is why the killings continued unabated, and actually increased in intensity, even after a series of cataclysmic military defeats against the Red Army. How else can the illogic of it all be explained? Davidowicz:

> *The Final Solution had top priority, even at a time of military exigencies. The need for railroads to transport Jews to their deaths often competed with the need for railroads to transport soldiers and military supplies to the front. Both received equal consideration.*[cxli]

This explains the true death camps like Belsec, Treblinka, Sobibor and Chelmno, whose only function was to kill Jews as quickly and efficiently as possible, even when this mandate was at odds with the increasingly unsuccessful titanic military struggle against the Red Army. Historian Norman Rich:

The Holocaust was to be carried out…with an almost total disregard for political and economic consequences.[cxlii]

Most Americans today cannot grasp the magnitude of the combat between Germany and the Soviet Union. A rough analogy would be to imagine Canada as a nation of 300 million people with advanced military doctrine waging a ruthless total war against the United States, invading and completely destroying the entire east coast from the Atlantic to the Mississippi. Can you imagine any country taking the time and resources to imprison and exterminate an ethnic minority in the midst of a situation like that? That's why the Holocaust doesn't make any *logical* sense. Only the *illogic* of Nazi racial mysticism can explain it. Now it's true that by 1942, some Nazis saw an inefficiency in murdering millions of Jews and Russian prisoners of war when they could more profitably be worked to death as slave laborers in the German armaments industry. The new plan was so effective that German military production tripled from 1943 to 1944, even though the British and the Americans were bombing German cities around the clock. It was at this time that German industry relocated out of the cities to work in conjunction with the slave labor/death camps which were never bombed. So on one level, the destruction of European Jews served the purposes of those money managers and investors involved in capital production, as the profits were enormous from a labor pool that worked without pay.[cxliii]

Not only Germans were involved. The American company ITT for example, owned the German aircraft firm Focke-Wulf, which produced a number of hot interceptors that were very adept at shooting down American bombers. Many of the parts for these warplanes were built with slave labor. This meant huge profits for all concerned, since the German mark was a valid currency actively traded throughout the war. After the war, ITT had the audacity to demand compensation from the American government for damages to its German holdings

by the American bombers that their Focke-Wulf 190's were shooting down. Since most Allied governments were involved in various ways, they wanted as little public discussion as possible about the exact workings of the slave labor camps. So the United States government paid damages to ITT and quietly closed the affair.[cxliv]

Economics aside, the war was an opportunity to advance and manifest the Nazis' ultimate aim, which was the creation of a new and superior human species: the *Ubermensch.* Our version of history places the onus squarely upon Hitler—it's another "lone gunman theory" on a massive scale. The idea that one man, who was mad, masterminded the Holocaust, neatly circumnavigates the very evident trend in European history that has been discussed throughout this book. By labeling Hitler the sole architect of the Holocaust, our civilization deftly avoids confronting the true nature of the crime. Hitler, the madman, serves as a perfect scapegoat for a society unwilling and unable to confront the links between the Malthusian/Darwinist ethos and Nazi fascism. After all, many of the fundamental elements of that political philosophy form the basis of 20th and 21st century Euro-American social orders. This is one reason why malignant doctrines like Sociobiology can take root in our culture. The Malthusian/Darwinian philosophy is a generally accepted truth, upon which other destructive ideas such as survival of the fittest and Sociobiology are justified and gain scientific credibility through their conformity to the prevailing fascist, racist ideology that is now central to Euro-American governments.

The slaughter of Jews and Gypsies served the Nazis' purpose: They were convinced that the purification and transformation of the German race into a *new species* could only be accomplished through the elimination of other races deemed inferior. In this scheme, the current human is but a Darwinian transitional form. These ideas conformed to a general intellectual trend in our civilization, which

accepted, as truth, an evolution of species and peoples by means of *selection*. Daily, at the labor camps, Nazi doctors stood ready to *select* those doomed to immediate death or to temporary survival for work as slave laborers. The impetus for this system came from Darwinian theory. Implicit was the notion that all species were in a constant flux of evolution and that some species and races were more highly evolved than others. To the theorists who were convinced that the ultimate rationale for human existence was the purification and higher evolution of the race, the destruction of Jews, Gypsies, and others deemed "polluters of the blood," or the gene pool, served a grand purpose. They sought to accelerate and give direction to the forces of natural selection. If they had at hand Wilson's *Sociobiology* or Dawkin's *The Selfish Gene,* either could have served as guidebooks for the Nazis. Wilson and his popularizers give ultimate scientific justification for the destruction of human individuality in favor of race consciousness and a racial deterministic interpretation of history. Hitler's book, *Mein Kampf,* did the same thing.

The book *Sociobiology*, and the whole Sociobiology movement, is particularly dangerous because the authors imply that an understanding of social insect behavior will enable us to understand human behavior. Sociobiologists believe that if the gene is the dominant life form on the planet and then our relationship as humans to the gene is not essentially different from that of social insects: the termites, bees, and ants that thrive in a completely controlled environment. The individual workers, soldiers, and nurses are all genetically identical to one another. They are clones with no sexuality, no individuality, and they exist solely to perform their functions. Their ultimate goal is the efficiency and survivability of the colony, which is actually a single living entity. With the exception of the Queen, all members instantly sacrifice their lives for the survival of the group, or the "gene pool," as the Darwinists say. Like Hitler's views on society, the "science" of

Sociobiology says human free will is non-existent, and people's actions are best understood as unconscious reflections in accordance with the principles of gene survival. Human individuality is of minor importance—we exist only to protect and propagate our genes. In a nutshell, this is Nazi ideology. For the Nazi mentality individuality is not only irrelevant, it is dangerous.

Sociobiologists like to refer to their discipline as the final revolution in Darwinist thought. They are now referred to as ultra-Darwinists. More likely, Sociobiology is the ultimate perversion of Darwinism. Darwinism tells us that we evolved as humans from lower forms of life through mechanical means. The Sociobiologists would have us believe that our lives as humans, and all of history, are totally irrelevant to the grander purpose of gene survival. It should be emphasized here that Sociobiologists do not see the gene as having any individual consciousness. Like all Darwinists, the ultra-Darwinists are committed to a mechanical understanding of biology. To them, and to mainstream Darwinists, genetic functions take place irrespective of outside environmental conditions. Genes do not think nor make decisions to determine the direction of evolution in the "host" organism, as they are chemicals. In both systems, mechanical mutations are given direction by the outside forces of natural selection acting *upon the individual organism* by giving it a better chance to reproduce successfully. That's the sum total of *all* Darwinist thinking.

Ultra-Darwinists say that human behavior is understood best when we know that our ultimate purpose is the preservation of genetic material. This is *a philosophical system* that promotes atheism in its most brutal form, and reduces our understanding of human behavior to its very simplest and darkest level; all in conformity with mainstream Darwinist doctrine, which maintains that life processes are of a completely mechanical nature. Sociobiology, a reductionist argument to validate Darwinist thought, lessens all modes of human

behavior to genetics; hence it is Nazi science. Mainstream Darwinists fear it because, within the context of their more mundane ideology, Sociobiology does logically follow. At first, genetics was a proof for Darwinist theory. Now, according to Sociobiology, genetics shall be the ultimate *raison d'être* for human existence. It is difficult for Darwinists to argue against this since their theory is so intimately bound to mechanical genetic forces. Mainstream Darwinists like Steven Jay Gould and Richard Lewontin censor Sociobiologists because that discipline shows most profoundly how and why Darwinism is inexorably entwined with racist theory.[cxlv] But there is no getting away from it.

If our civilization continues to rely upon Darwinism as the philosophical basis for understanding the development of humanity, the influence of Sociobiology will not disappear. Could the war against Iraq be the beginning of the next Holocaust? Right now, the United States is actively engaged in bombing both Iraq and Afghanistan with radioactive munitions that will poison the land and water in the Middle East for decades, and we are now seeing birth defects, as a result.[cxlvi] More Americans are willing to accept torture as an acceptable police option and we live in an often brutal prison-industrial state: For those who seek freedom from racism, militarism, and genocide, a new understanding of the way in which humanity functions is necessary. Somewhere along the line, thinkers need to recognize alternatives to scientific disciplines that protect and promote human subjugation in return for the apparent security of a highly disciplined, militaristic national police state.

It is important to note that even the most seemingly benign ultra-Darwinists are completely totalitarian in their plans for social engineering. The creation of a new and improved society has been around since Malthus and little has changed. Sociobiologist Daniel C. Dennett is director of the "Center for Cognitive Studies" at Tuft's University.

His aptly titled book, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea,* offers the notion that religions will only be tolerated in an ultra-Darwinist state if evolution is taught. He writes:

> *Save the Baptists! Yes, of course, but not by all means. Not if it means tolerating the deliberate misinforming of children about the natural world.*[cxlvii]

His idea is that Darwinism is an absolute truth; therefore, anyone who disbelieves this reality must be destroyed. In effect, there is not much different between Dennett and Hitler. Dennett's approach is the worst and lowest form of destructiveness; one that offers the rejection and annihilation of long held moral and religious convictions in the belief that that there is no inherent meaning or purpose to existence outside of Darwinian logic. Dennett:

> *There is no denying, at this point, that Darwin's idea is a universal solvent, capable of cutting right to the heart of everything in sight. The question is: What does it leave behind? I have tried to show that once it passes through everything, we are left with sounder, stronger versions of our most important ideas. Some of the traditional details perish, and some of these are losses to be regretted, but good riddance to the rest of them.*[cxlviii]

There is obviously got to be quite a bit of "cultural cleansing" involved in this agenda. The Baptists and "the rest of them" might not want to go down without a fight, and considering that America is the most heavily armed country in the history of the world, Dennett's brand of social engineering is going to need a lot of firepower to back itself up. No problem. Dennett would find good company with modern Nazis and skinheads who envision the same sort of merciless program for America and the world. Darwinists like Dennett and Dawkins have persistently proposed a model for human development that is essentially spiritless and amoral. To them, there is no intrinsic

value to human existence. They say life proceeds according to mechanical forces outside the intentions of humanity. This is a *Cosmological* viewpoint that says the Universe is a closed mechanical system, devoid of spiritual direction. In presenting this view of life, they have consistently overlooked, discarded, and suppressed evidence for any alternative to their own view.

Obviously we can't blame Darwinism and the historical model it presents for all our current ethical problems. However when a civilization comes to accept as a fundamental reality a mechanical worldview that is destructive to human nature, we may logically question it. *A correct assessment of the nature of life should enhance the quality of life.* That's not happening. Instead, we see a total breakdown of moral principles and common decency toward our fellow humans. The rout of Western Civilization is almost complete.

[cxi] Edward O. Wilson, *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975). Wilson is one of the world's leading authorities on ants; hence his use of them as models for human behavior. He writes on ants: "The ants filled the earth because they stumbled upon a highly successful general strategy: the formation of a colony of self-sacrificial non-reproducing workers, arrayed around a fertile queen...a factory within a fortress, a splendid arrangement of soldiers, builders, nurses, and other specialists united in single minded dedication to the survival and reproduction of the queen and hence the proliferation of more ant colonies." In short, the perfect fascist society in miniature. Also, Wilson, "Empire of the Ants," *Discover*, v. 11, No. 3, March 1990, p. 50. Wilson apparently holds humanity in less esteem. He writes, for example, in *Sociobiology*: "human beings are absurdly easy to indoctrinate...they seek it" p. 562.

[cxii] An idea from Richard Dawkins cited in *Time* magazine, "Why You Do What You Do. Sociobiology: A New Theory of Behavior," August 1, 1977, pp. 54-63. See also Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976). Refutations to Sociobiology can be found in Lewontin *et al, op. cit.*, and the excellent *Evolution and the Humanities* by David Holbrook (Aldershot, Hampshire, England: Gower, 1987).

[cxiii] Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1943), p.283.

[cxiv] Daniel Gasman, *The Scientific Origins of National Socialism: With a New Introduction by the Author,* (Transaction, Somerset, New Jersey, 2004).

[cxv] Norman Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide: The Myth of the Jewish World-Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1967) p.184.

[cxvi] George J. Stein, "Biological Science and the Roots of Nazism" *American Scientist*, 76(1), 1988, pp. 50-58.

[cxvii] Ernst Haeckel, *The History of Creation: Or, the Development of the Earth and Its Inhabitants by the Action of Natural Causes*, (Appleton, 1876), p. 321 and *The Wonders of Life: A Popular Study of Biological Philosophy*, (Harper, 1905) p. 390.

[cxviii] Gasman, *op.cit*. p.161.

[cxix] Haeckel, (1905) p.116.

[cxx] John Cornwell, *Hitler's Scientists: Science, War, and the Devil's Pact*, (Penguin, 2003) pp 71-90. Also, Richard Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler, Evolutionary Ethics, Eugenics, and Racism in Germany*, (PalgraveMacMillan, 2004).

[cxxi] Hitler, *op.cit*. "Personality and Conception of the Folkish State" pp. 442-451. George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology*, (Grosset and Dunlap, New York, 1964), p.4, *Das Volk* as "The union of a people with a transcendental essence."

[cxxii] Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, (Octagon Press 1978). First published in 1961, Hilberg encountered resistance and hostility from the Jewish community for his study's concentration on the German machinery of genocide rather than the suffering of the victims. Actually preceded by Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe 1939-1945* (New York: The Beechhurst Press. 1953).

[cxxiv] Stein, *op.cit*.

[cxxiii] For example Lucy Davidowicz argues that it's possible to trace the lineage from Medieval German anti-Semitism and Martin Luther to the Holocaust. Lucy Davidowicz, *The War Against the Jews: 1933-1945*, (New York, 1975).

[cxxiv] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, (New York, Knopf, 1996). Goldhagen sees the entire German nation as being "of one mind" with Hitler on anti-Semitism. In looking for a single explanation he purposefully overlooks many others to promote his thesis. For a review of the literature see Christopher R. Browning, *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*, (HarperPerennial, 1998), pp. 191-223. Browning: *"The fundamental problem is to explain why ordinary men-shaped by a culture that had its own peculiarities, but was nonetheless within the mainstream of western, Christian and Enlightenment traditions-under specific circumstances willingly carried out the most extreme genocide in human history…It would be very comforting if Goldhagen were correct, that very few societies have the long-term, cultural-cognitive prerequisites to commit genocide, and that regimes can only do so when the population is overwhelmingly of one mind about its priority, justice and necessity. We would live in a safer world if he were right but I am not so optimistic. I fear that we live in a world where war and racism are ubiquitous, in which the powers of government mobilization and legitimization are powerful and increasing, in which a sense of personal responsibility is increasingly attenuated by specialization and bureaucratization, and in which the peer group exerts tremendous pressures on behavior and sets moral norms. I such a world, I fear, modern governments that wish to commit mass murder will seldom fail in their efforts for being unable to induce "ordinary men" to become their "willing executioners."*

[cxxv] David Berlinsky, *The Devil's Delusion: Atheism and its scientific Pretensions*, (New York, 2008), p.29.

[cxxvi] Stein, *op.cit.*

[cxxvii] Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race*, (Thunder's Mouth Press, New York, 2004), p.270.

[cxxviii] Christopher R. Browning, *Nazi Policy, Jewish Workers, German Killers*, (Cambridge University Press, 2000), p.48.

[cxxix] Joscelyn Goodwin, *Arktos: The Polar Myth in Science, Symbolism and Nazi Survival*, (Phanes, 1993), pp.13-76, Dusty Sklar, *The Nazis and the Occult*, (Dorset Press, New York, 1977), Jacques Biergier and Louis Pauwels, *The Morning of the Magicians*, (Avon, New York, 1960).

[cxxx] Heather Pringle, *The Master Plan: Himmler's Scholars and the Holocaust*, (Hyperion, New York, 2006).

[cxxxi] Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, John Lees, trans. vol. 1, (London, 1913), p. 320.

[cxxxii] Hitler, *op.cit.* p.393.

[cxxxiii] In July 1937 the Palestine Royal Commission and Lord Peel declared that a plan for a Jewish homeland in Palestine was unworkable. The Nazis then began to work out a plan to resettle European Jews in either Guiana or Madagascar, which never got off the ground. See Nora Levin, *The Holocaust: The Destruction of European Jewry 1933-1945* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1968), p.128+ for the Palestine question, pp. 199-203 for the Madagascar plan. Also Francis R. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1985).

[cxxxiv] For example, Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, rev.ed. (New York, 1985). Also, Christopher R. Browning, *The Path to Genocide: Essays on Launching the Final Solution*, (Cambridge, 1992).

[cxxxv] Lucy Davidowicz, *The War Against the Jews: 1933-1945*, (New York, 1975), p.142.

[cxxxvi] Ian Kershaw, *Hitler, 1936-1945*, (London, 2000), p. 470.

[cxxxvii] Christopher R. Browning, (2000), p. 40.

[cxxxviii] Christopher R. Browning, (2000), pp. 32-33.

[cxxxix] *Hitler's Table Talk, 1941-1944: His Private Conversations,* Norman Cameron and R.H. Stevens, trans. (Enigma, New York, 2000), p.314.

[cxl] Hitler, p. 405.

[cxli] Davidowicz, *op.cit.*, p.140.

[cxlii] Norman Rich, *Hitler's War Aims: Ideology, the Nazi State, and the Course of Expansion*, 2 vol. (Norton, 1973), vol. 2, p.11, also, vol. 1, pp.57-58.

[cxliii] Albert Speer, *Der Sklavenstaat [the slave state]: Meine Auseinandersetzungen mit der SS* (Stuttgart: Anstalt, 1981), *Inside the Third Reich*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Avon, 1971), and *Infiltration*, trans. Joachim Neugroschel (New York: MacMillan, 1981). Also, Edwin Black, *IBM and the Holocaust: The Strategic Alliance Between Nazi Germany and America's most Powerful Corporation*, (Three Rivers, New York, 2002). Information about slave labor in Nazi Germany is hard to come by. As late as 1990, the entire University of California library system has only one reference under the subject heading "slave labor, Germany," *i.e.*, the personal reminiscences of Gerda Weissmann Klein, *All But My Life* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957). For more information one must consult the euphemistic subject heading "conscript labor" to find only the following foreign language titles: Gerd Wysocki, *Zwangsarbeit in Stahlkonzern: Salzgitter und die Reichswerke Hermann Goring 1937-1945* (Braunschweig: Magni-Buchladen, 1982), Klaus-Jorg Siegfried, *Das Leben der Zwangsarbeiter in Volkswagenwerk, 1939-1945* (Frankfurt/New York: Campus, 1988), Hans Pfahlmann, *Fremdarbeiter und Krieggefangene in der deutschen Kriegswirtschaft, 1939-1945* (Darmstadt: Wehr und Wissen, 1968), Jochen August, *et al*, *Herrenmensch und Arbeitsvolker: auslandische Arbeiter und Deutsche,1939-1945* (Berlin: Rotbuch, 1986), Rainer Frobe, *et al*, *Konzentrationslager in Hannover: KZ-arbeit und Rustungsindustrie in der spatphase des zweiten Weltkrigs* (Hildesheim: A. Lax, 1985).

[cxliv] Anthony Sampson, *The Sovereign State of ITT* (New York: Stein and Day, 1973).

[cxlv] Richard Lewontin, Steven Rose and Leon J. Kamin, *Not In Our Genes: Biology, Ideology and Human Nature*, (Pantheon, 1985). Richard Dawkins, in his review of the book, says the authors are Communists. "Sociobiology: the debate continues" *New Scientist*, 24 January 1985.

[cxlvi] Marc W. Harold, "Uranium Wars: The Pentagon Steps Up Use of Radioactive Munitions" http://www.cursor.org/stories/uranium.htm. Larry Johnson, "Iraqi Cancers, Birth Defects Blamed on U.S. Depleted Uranium" November 12, 2002 *The Seattle Post Intelligence.*

Hassan Hafidh**, "**Iraq says cancer cases soar since Gulf war"*Reuters* Tuesday, March 7, 2:12 PM.

[cxlvii] Daniel C. Dennett, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meaning of Life* (New York, 1995), P.516. Also, *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*, (Penguin, 2006). Materialism as God.

[cxlviii] Dennett, p. 521.

The Ideology of Atheism

One evening I sat down to talk to a sociologist. He asked me what I was working on, and I told him about this book. He scoffed. "Darwinism? Darwinism is dead." This fellow had a PhD from the University of California but he was clearly confused. I didn't want to be rude, so I didn't suggest that as a Sociologist he was probably thinking about Social Darwinism, which is officially "dead" while the science of Darwinism is very much alive. We got past that and he asked, "Well, what's your alternative?" At first, I argued that there was no need for one. I said that if people were under the misperception that 2+2=5, I didn't need to recommend a substitute. After all, two plus two does not equal five, and that's all there is to it.

But that's not right either. Any thinking person needs to have a reasonable alternative if one is to say, "Hey, this thing is clearly wrong!" My sociologist friend was right to ask for one, and so should anyone reading this book. In fact, there are plenty of alternatives to Darwinist thought. The problem is that each legitimate option has been summarily dismissed with, "That's not science!" The reason alternative choices are labeled "not science" is because science is defined in our system as *materialistic science*. The agent of change, *causality*, must always be matter, or something measurable. This is the essence of Darwin's idea; that change and creation are measurable, natural phenomena that occur gradually. Darwin in *The Origin of Species*:

> *If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.*[cxlix]

Unfortunately for Darwin, his theory does break. The process of measuring is so gradual that the steady development of new species and organs cannot be recorded. Intelligent Design was born in response to his unconvincing approach.

The notion that the Universe requires an *intelligent design*er is an old one in western thought, beginning with the Greeks Socrates, Aristotle and Plato, and later with the Roman Cicero.[cl] The Rev. William Paley furthered the "Argument from Design" in the 18th century, and in the 20th century evolutionary biologist Pierre Grasse, in his *Evolution of Living Organisms*, proposed similar reasoning to comprehend the emergence of complex organisms, including blood clotting. In the final paragraph of this informative work, Grasse suggests that there must be some mystical, immeasurable energy that propels natural selection as a creative force. This, in a nutshell, is Intelligent Design (also known as ID) and the concept remained in limbo until resurrected with the publication of Michael Behe's book *Darwin's Black Box* in 1996.[cli]

Behe, a professor of microbiology, proposed like Grasse' that some elements of the cell, specifically propulsion and blood clotting in humans, could not occur through Darwinist means. He called this problem "irreducible complexity" and defined it as:

> *…a single system composed of several well-matched, interacting parts that contribute to the basic function, wherein the removal of any one of the parts causes the system to effectively cease functioning...Since natural selection can only choose systems that are already working, then if a biological system cannot be produced gradually it would have to arise as an integrated unit, in one fell swoop, for natural selection to have any thing to act on.*[clii]

The following is a similar example of macroevolution, which was discussed in an earlier chapter: How is it possible for a creature like a small bear to lose its legs, twist its pelvis 90 degrees, streamline its shape and weight its head with oil so that it can dive hundreds of feet under water, develop sonar and intricately specialized breasts designed for suckling its young under water to become a whale? Remember, all these changes and more would need to occur in a coordinated way through chance mutations, acting on the level of the individual organism and not the species as a whole.

Behe asked the same sort of question about cells, which are much more complicated than any man-made machine, including space ships and computers. Many of his points are well taken because Darwinist literature has not addressed the issue.[cliii] In Ben Stein's movie, *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, he asked David Berlinsky "If Darwin's perception of the cell was a mud hut, what is our conception of it now?" Berlinsky answered "A galaxy." There are no primitive cells. All cells are incredibly complex, practically beyond comprehension, including the cellular organs Dr Behe investigated.

Behe's detractors have tried to show that he is wrong, but all their arguments are theoretical or centered on "recruitment," the notion that the cellular machinery for "irreducibly complex" systems was already in existence doing other things. So presto, when the cell needed a new function, all the machinery was there to do the job. Here is what H. Allen Orr, an ardent Darwinist had to say about this:

> *First it will do no good to suggest that all the required parts of some biochemical pathway popped up simultaneously by mutation. Although this "solution" yields a functioning system in one fell swoop, it's so hopelessly unlikely that no Darwinian takes it seriously. As Behe rightly says, we gain nothing by replacing a problem with a miracle. Second, we might think that some of the parts of an irreducibly complex system evolved step by step for some other purpose and were then recruited wholesale to a new function. But this is also un-*

likely. You may as well hope that half your car's transmission will suddenly help out in the airbag department. Such things might happen very, very rarely, but they surely do not offer a general solution to irreducible complexity.[cliv]

Admittedly, Orr did propose a pathway, but it was completely theoretical. He made no mention of natural selection acting upon random mutations to produce functioning new organs; the new parts just appear when needed, like magic. Here is similar reasoning from Darwinist technical literature:

Here is a possible scenario for the evolution of the bacterial flagellum: A secretory system arose first. Association of an ion pump (which later became the motor protein) to this structure improved secretion…The protoflagellar filament arose next…Gliding-twitching mobility arose at this stage or later…Thus we see how a swimming system could arise in stepwise fashion.[clv]

This is hand waving, very similar to the kind of reasoning we saw used to describe the evolution of mammals from reptiles. The pathway is generally known; just state the fact of its existence and presume it all happened according to Darwin. But this logic, while sounding reasonable, does not and cannot address the issue as to *how* these functioning new parts arose. In a general sense, there is no doubt that Darwinism has great explanatory power, but is it true? Behe asserts that there is no simple Darwinian solution in a technical sense, at least not one that is known, and Behe is not alone is his analysis:

There are no detailed Darwinian accounts for the evolution of any fundamental biochemical or cellular system, only a variety of wishful speculations.[clvi]

Behe's solution is to look beyond mechanical science to Intelligent Design, which the media goes at great lengths to discredit. In an

attempt to debunk Intelligent Design, *The New Republic* published a fourteen thousand-word essay that devoted only two sentences to the key question of whether or not natural selection and random mutations can account for the generation of complex biological systems:

> *Biologists have now observed hundreds of cases of natural selection, beginning with the well-known bacterial resistance to antibiotics, insect resistance to DDT, and HIV resistance to antiviral drugs. Natural selection accounts for the resistance of fish and mice to predators by making them more camouflaged, and for the adaptation by plants to toxic minerals in the soil.*[clvii]

This is deception. As previously noted, these are only examples of adaptation amid statistical demographics and not creation. Unfortunately, millions of people accept these explanations as evidence for the origin of species.

A school district in Pennsylvania tried to insert some diversity of opinion into its science curriculum. Sued in federal court, the district lost because the judge was unable to recognize the concerns of a very large majority. In the case, *Kitzmiller et al. v. Dover (Pennsylvania) Area School District*, John E. Jones, the federal judge, was either duped or predisposed in favor of the plaintiffs. He never used the term Darwinism but continually referred to it as "evolution" either not knowing, or unwilling to admit, that materialistic Darwinism does not cover the entire field of evolution. He couldn't understand that Darwinism was *only one possible mode of evolution*, another being Intelligent Design. To wit:

> *Before discussing defendants claims about evolution, we initially note that an overwhelming number of scientists, as reflected by every scientific association that has spoken on the matter, have rejected the ID proponent's challenge to evolution. Moreover, plaintiff's expert…provided unrebutted testimony that evolution, including common descent and natural selection is "overwhelmingly accepted"*

by the scientific community and that every major scientific association agrees.

First off, science shouldn't be a popularity contest, or else we'd still think the earth was the center of the universe. Also, "every major scientific association agrees" for a reason; modern science has an *a priori* commitment to materialism. The attorneys from the Thomas More Law Center, who represented the defendants *pro bono,* were lax in allowing the prosecution to introduce evolutionary biology textbooks as evidence without objection. Textbooks offer only general precepts. Judge Jones:

In fact, on cross-examination Professor Behe was questioned concerning his 1996 claim that science would never find an evolutionary explanation for the immune system. He was presented with fifty eight peer reviewed publications, nine books and several immunology textbook chapters about the evolution of the immune system; however he simply insisted that this was still not sufficient evidence for evolution, and that it was "not good enough."

Here the judge clearly indicated his predisposition for the plaintiffs. He allowed them to simply dump a large stack of articles and books on the witness stand without giving anyone a chance to read the material. He also acknowledged that he, the judge, never read them either. Furthermore, the judge persistently misused the term evolution as *ipso facto* evidence to show that a progression is proof for Darwinism. We know that this is, in fact, not enough. Darwinism must show proof that a mechanical pathway exists, driven *only* by mutation and selection. None of the articles, books, or textbooks mentioned by the judge shows this. And finally the Judge lied when he wrote that Dr. Behe said the evidence introduced was "not good enough." It was the prosecuting attorney who actually said that.[clviii]

A key question before the judge was whether or not Michael Behe, the defense's expert witness, had any scientific credibility. Behe's

claim is that the evolutionary pathways toward functioning cellular propulsion systems are not known. Of course, the textbooks, as tools for teaching orthodox evolutionary biology, say they are known. The defense was so evidently botched by the law firm dedicated to protecting Christian values that one defense witness, Steve Fuller, had the doubtful distinction of having his testimony cited by the plaintiffs in support of their position in the closing arguments. The judge continued:

> *The evidence presented in this case demonstrates that ID is not supported by any peer-reviewed research, data, or publication.*

This is absolutely untrue. There is a long list of peer-reviewed articles supporting ID.[clix] It might be added here that the editor of one journal that published an article supporting ID suffered retribution and lost his position.[clx] It appears that the playing field is not level. Peer-reviewed publications such as *Nature* and *Science* will not publish critical analyses of Darwin. Nor will a pop science magazine like *Scientific American*. The system works like this: Someone like Behe sends a paper to a peer-reviewed journal and the editor responds, as one did to Professor Behe:

> *I'm torn by your request to submit a (thoughtful) response to critics of your non-evolutionary theory for the origin of complexity. On the one hand I am painfully aware of the close-mindedness of the scientific community to non-orthodoxy, and I think it is counterproductive. But on the other hand we have fixed page limits for each month's issue, and there are many more good submissions than we can accept. So, your unorthodox theory would have to displace something that would be extending the current paradigm. What I would suggest you do is to write something quite short--a letter--that would fit in, say, three pages or so of [the journal]. Then, if your letter is sufficiently provocative and lively, I might have an easier time convincing the other editors of its worth.*

So professor Behe re-submitted a shortened article, which was then sent to another peer, a professor deeply committed to orthodox Darwinism, who also knew that to accept Behe's article for publication could mean his own exclusion from the scientific community. He rejected the article. Finally, the original editor replied to Behe saying:

> *Because of the controversial nature of your letter to [this journal], and concern about whether it would be appropriate for a scientific journal, I asked a senior [journal] advisor to take a look at your submission. As you will see, the accompanying review identifies many apparent flaws in your arguments, and also questions the basic premise of your arguments, that complex systems cannot be dissected to reveal individual components' roles. I concur with this reviewer's sentiment: complex systems are being unraveled! Sincerely, [The editor]*

And how did the reviewer show that complex systems are being unraveled? He said:

> *This reviewer is no authority on the blood clotting cascade, but if a plausible model for its evolutionary development, compatible with all known facts, has indeed not been generated so far, the remaining question marks are not threat to science--on the contrary, they are a challenge added to thousands of other challenges that science met and meets. In this instance, too, science will be successful. Is that too bold a prediction? On the contrary, it is not bold. If science, in the modern sense of the word (defined by its method), were only just beginning its career, onlookers would naturally be divided into optimists and pessimists. But, as young as science still is, its accomplishments have verified over and over again that the world of the observable and the measurable is understandable in terms of the observed and measured. Pessimism in this respect has come to lack intellectual status…If evolutionary pathways were difficult to find, nature faced these difficulties and solved them.*

This is the standard logic: If you are unable to specifically explain the process, just say, "Nature solved them." It never enters the Darwinist mind that objections are not to the facts of nature but whether the difficulties can be unraveled, given the constraints of natural selection acting upon random genetic mutations, all on the level of individual organisms. Can these processes account for the creation of completely new systems? The assumption is always that there is no other possible explanation. The peer concluded:

> *If Behe were right in spite of all, it would become apparent in due time through failures of science. It would be very much out of place to denounce such failures now, since they have not occurred. Having not yet understood all of biology is not a failure after just 200 years, given the amount of understanding already achieved. Let us speak about it again in 1000 years. Meanwhile, metaphysicians should spare scientists their metaphysics and just let the scientists do their work--or join them in doing it.*[clxi]

Come back in 1000 years, he says. The reviewer did not address Dr. Behe's scientific arguments in any way. His entire rejection, noted above, was based upon philosophical grounds, as was the decision rendered by Judge Jones who wrote:

> *Professor Behe's concept of irreducible complexity depends on ignoring ways in which evolution is known to occur.*

Nothing is known about the ways in which evolution occurs. Dr. Colin Patterson, Senior Paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, London:

> *One of the reasons I started taking this anti-evolutionary view, was … it struck me that I had been working on this stuff for twenty years and there was not one thing I knew about it. That's quite a shock to learn that one can be so misled so long. …so for the last few weeks I've tried putting a simple question to various people and groups of*

people. Question is: Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing that is true? I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time and eventually one person said, ' I do know one thing -- it ought not to be taught in high school.[clxii]

Darwinism, in its entirety, is theoretical deduction based upon population studies. Darwinist technical evolutionary literature, studies with exotic and obscure titles like "Genetic Drift" "Soft Selection," "Muller's Ratchet," or the "Fundamental Theorem of Natural Selection," are analyses of specific population groups and how selection increases or decreases the size and fitness to survive among members of a cluster. Researchers are still in the same place Darwin and Wallace were in 1859 when they echoed Malthus' earlier population study. One hundred and fifty years later, no one can show how new species and organs arise through natural selection and genetic mutation other than through sweeping generalizations. David Berlinski:

Swimming in the soundless sea, the shark has survived for millions of years, sleek as a knife blade and twice as dull. The shark is an organism wonderfully adapted to its environment. Pause. And then the bright brittle voice of logical folly intrudes: after all, it has survived for millions of years. This exchange should be deeply embarrassing to evolutionary biologists. And yet, time and again, biologists do explain the survival of an organism by reference to its fitness and the fitness of an organism by reference to its survival, the friction between concepts kindling nothing more illuminating than the observation that some creatures have been around for a very long time. "Those individuals that have the most offspring," writes Ernst Mayr, the distinguished zoologist, "are by definition . . . the fittest ones." And in Evolution and the Myth of Creationism, Tim Berra states "fitness in the Darwinian sense means reproductive fitness-

> *leaving at least enough offspring to spread or sustain the species in nature." This is not a parody of evolutionary thinking; it is evolutionary thinking.*[clxiii]

This is not an exaggeration. Gould says the same in his *Magnum Opus* published after his death:

> *The basic formulation or bare-boned mechanics of natural selection is a disarmingly simple argument…organisms enjoying differential reproductive success will, on average, be those variants that are fortuitously better adapted to changing local environments and those variants will then pass on their favored traits to offspring by inheritance.* [clxiv]

That's all there is to it. There is nothing more except ideas and genetic data.

But the judge ignored all the fundamental problems with Darwinist thought and went on to define Intelligent Design as a front for the Creationist movement. This is not correct. Creationists do not recognize the validity of theistic evolution, the basis of Intelligent Design. Rather, they reject Darwinism in its entirety and believe in the existence of a God and that the universe does not move without His direct consent and direction in all matters.[clxv]

Most of the people involved in the Darwinist movement are atheists. Let's face it. A 1996 survey of 1,000 randomly selected natural scientists in the United States found that 61 percent expressed "disbelief or doubt in the existence of God." Among the members of the National Academy of Sciences, the percentage was 93%, or effectively, all of them.[clxvi] In contrast a 1984 pamphlet entitled *Science and Creation: A View from The National Academy of Sciences* says that it is "false…to think that the theory of evolution presents an irreconcilable conflict between science and religion." Interesting, but how would an organization whose members are almost entirely atheists know this? The conflict is not between science and religion. People of faith have

no problem with Newton's laws, chemistry, plate tectonics, quantum physics, relativity, or anything else science offers as truth. The problem is when science tells them that no God created anything on this planet and their religious convictions are meaningless. William Provine, biologist and historian of science at Cornell University:

> *Modern science directly implies that there are no inherent moral or ethical laws, no absolute guiding principles for human society…There is no way that the evolutionary processes as currently conceived can produce a being that is truly free to make moral choices.*[clxvii]

The Darwinists think they have discovered a universal truth but someone got there first. Nazi icon Ernst Haeckel in 1900:

> *The human will has no more freedom than that of the higher animals, from which it differs in degree and not in kind.*[clxviii]

Ultra-Darwinist Richard Dawkins:

> *A universe of physical forces and genetic replication…has precisely the properties we should expect if there is at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but blind pitiless indifference.*[clxix]

This is the ideology of Nazi Germany, up to now, western civilization's only experience with an ultra-Darwinist state. In the end, the Nazis wanted to eradicate all religion, especially the Judeo-Christian ethic that Hitler, and others before him like Nietzsche, felt weakened the splendid German master race. Ultra-Darwinist and Sociobiologist E.O. Wilson:

> *We have come to the crucial stage in the history of biology when religion itself is subject to the explanations of the natural sciences. As I have tried to show, sociobiology can account for the very origin of*

mythology by the principle of natural selection acting on the genetically evolving structure of the human brain. If this interpretation is correct, the final decisive edge enjoyed by scientific naturalism will come from its capacity to explain traditional religion, its chief competitor, as a wholly material phenomenon. Theology is not likely to survive as an independent intellectual discipline.[clxx]

There is nothing new here: Ernst Haeckel, Nazi precursor and atheist in 1905:

All transcendent (religious) ideas are necessarily unscientific. Social rules are the laws of heredity and adaptation. (Morality) rests on biological grounds and has been developed in a natural way.[clxxi]

Religion has come to be the nemesis of Darwinian atheists, and they mean to root it out and destroy it. Neo-Darwinist Richard Lewontin:

The primary problem is not to provide the public with the knowledge of how far it is to the nearest star or what genes are made of, for that vast project is, in its entirety, hopeless. Rather the problem is to get them to reject irrational and supernatural explanations of the world, the demons that exist only in their imaginations, and to accept a social and intellectual apparatus, Science, as the only begetter of truth.[clxxii]

Ultra-Darwinist Daniel Dennett:

Zoos are now more or less seen as second-class havens for endangered species, but at least they are havens and what they preserve is irreplaceable. The same is true of complex memes (religion) and their phenotypic expressions (churches)…My own spirit recoils from a God Who is He or She in the same way my heart sinks when I see a lion pacing neurotically back and forth in a small zoo cage. I know, I know, the lion is beautiful but dangerous; if you let the lion roam free it would kill me; safety demands that it be put in a cage. Safety de-

mands that religions be put in cages, too- when absolutely necessary.[clxxiii]

Are concentration camps essential to the ultra-Darwinist state? It would seem so. Let's remind ourselves that Hitler was an atheist who structured his worldview around Darwinist thought. There should be no doubt about the nature of this struggle against evil. Darwinists not only disclaim religion, they hold it in contempt and ultimately propose its complete annihilation. This might be all right if the Darwinists are correct. But as we have seen, their "science" is no more than a mode of thought.

One key objection the court had in *Kitzmiller v. Dover* was that the teaching of Intelligent Design violated the U.S. Constitution's "establishment clause" prohibiting government-sanctioned religion in the United States. The judge came to the conclusion that, despite all evidence to the contrary, "the argument for ID is not a new scientific argument but rather an old religious argument for the existence of God." Therefore, he ruled that teaching ID established religion in schools and that the court…

will enter an order permanently enjoining Defendants…from requiring teachers to denigrate or disparage the scientific theory of evolution, and from requiring teachers to refer to a religious alternative theory known as ID.

I, myself, am not a practicing Christian but I do try to generally adhere to the constructs of the Judeo-Christian code. However, I am personally appalled at American Christianity's absolute sellout to right-wing political circles that do nothing but manipulate Christians for material wealth and power. My conflict with Darwinism, and my reason for writing this book, is that Darwinism is wrong. It is not partly wrong. It is absolutely wrong, and slavishly accepting it has resulted in the destruction of whole societies and the triumph of

atheism. They can get away with it because Atheism is defined as not being a religion because it has no ideology. That may have been true once but is no longer. From the mid-19th century forward, Darwinism has become the ideology of Atheism, and both it and Atheism are now the fundamental principles supporting public policy and education in the United States. Apparently, it can be no other way.

Again, Richard Lewontin:

> *We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs…because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninformed. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.*[clxxiv]

Atheism is now a religion—its faith based upon the conviction that there is no God and that the universe is a closed mechanical system. Their god is Materialism. Until the advent of Darwinism, Atheism was only an argument by negation. But Darwin gave atheists a structural material foundation upon which to verify their views. Atheist Richard Dawkins:

> *…although atheism might have been logically tenable before Darwin, Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist.*[clxxv]

Today's Atheists are well organized: They have periodicals, journals, web sites, philosophers, conventions, and they dominate American scientific institutions.[clxxvi]

Webster's defines religion as "any specific system of belief, worship, conduct, etc., often involving a code of ethics and a philosophy."

Therefore, Atheism should be considered an organized religion replete with a code of belief. If this is the case, then teaching Darwinism in the public schools would violate the establishment clause separating church and state, as Atheism presents a religious view disguised as science. Opponents of Darwinism should then file suit in federal court to enjoin the state from teaching Darwinism. They would need to be prepared to take the case all the way to the Supreme Court. Say what you will about the politics of the current U.S. Supreme Court but its members are all outstanding jurists. There are a number of legal deceits structured within Darwinian logic. One is the idea that correlation implies causation, also known as C*um hoc ergo propter hoc*, Latin for "with this, therefore because of this" and *Post hoc ergo propter hoc*, Latin for "after this, therefore because of this." Both notions promote a false *cause and effect* relationship. Just because two events happen at the same time, or happen in sequence, doesn't mean they are necessarily related. These deceptions lie at the essence of Darwinist reasoning and the jurists on the Court might rule favorably when arguments against Darwin are based upon such logical line of reasoning.

All witnesses would need to be rigorously examined in court, and the penalties for perjury carefully explained. In the Kitzmiller case, many of the Darwinist "expert" witnesses were not vigorously cross-examined and were allowed to evade the truth. For example, Darwinist Kenneth R Miller was not prevented from presenting himself and his family as god-fearing Christians. I'm sure this may be true, however, he also knew that the vast majority of evolutionary biologists, over ninety percent of them, are atheists.[clxxvii] The defense was simply too inept to properly cross-examine him and other witnesses for the plaintiff. Many Darwinists have publicly admitted problems with the theory. They need to be held accountable in a court of law by attorneys who know what they are doing.

Finally, Darwinists do not like to be challenged. They are unaccustomed to it and react to questioning with anger and contempt. I have often noted this personally but one doesn't see it too much on the larger stage because Darwinists are habituated to a secure intellectual environment where dissent is not tolerated. On the few occasions where it is, as for example in a series of articles in *Commentary*, leading Darwinists were beside themselves. Their letters directed at Dr. Berlinski were condescending, rude and often profane. Berlinski, responding to personal attacks in "The Deniable Darwin":

> *Still, one general point deserves attention. Both Daniel Dennett and Richard Dawkins have fashioned their reputations as defenders of Darwinian orthodoxy. Their letters convey the impression of men who expect never to encounter criticism, and are unprepared to deal with it. This strikes me as a deeply unhealthy state of affairs. Ordinary men and women are suspicious of Darwin's theory. Dennett and Dawkins hardly go far here in persuading them that their intellectual anxieties are misplaced.*[clxxviii]

The defenders of the Darwinian orthodoxy might find a very hostile legal environment awaiting them before the United States Supreme Court. The next stage in the struggle is to get them there.

[cxlix] Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, 6th ed. (New York University Press, New York, 1988), p. 154.

[cl] From Xenophon, *Memorabilia of Socrates*, Book I, Chapter 4, and Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*.

[cli] Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, (Free Press, New York), 2006.

[clii] Behe, p.39.

[cliii] Thornhill, R.H., Ussery, D.W. 2000. "A classification of possible routes of Darwinian evolution." *J. Theor. Bio.* 203: 111-116. They

write: "However, the more theoretical question about the accessibility by Darwinian evolution of irreducibly complex structures of functionally indivisible components, if such exist, has not been thoroughly examined. ….One factor hampering examination of the accessibility of biological structures by Darwinian evolution is the absence of a classification of possible routes."

[cliv] H. Allen Orr, "Darwin v. Intelligent Design (Again)" *Boston Review*, Dec-Jan, 1996.

[clv] Ian Muscrave, "Evolution of the Bacterial Flagellum" *Why Intelligent Design Fails: A scientific Critique of the New Creationism,* Matt Young and Taner Edis, eds. (Rutgers 2006).

[clvi] Franklin Harold, *The Way of the Cell*, (Oxford, 2001), J. Shapiro, "In the Details…What?" *National Review,* Sept.16, 1996, pp. 62-65, cited in Behe, p.310.

[clvii] J. A. Coyne, "The Case against Intelligent Design: The Faith That Dare Not Speak Its Name" *The New Republic*, Aug.22, 2005.

[clviii] David K. Dewolf, *et.al. Traipsing into Evolution: Intelligent Design and the Kitzmiller vs Dover Decision*, (Discovery Institute Press, Seattle, 2006), pp. 85-86.

[clix] For example, Stephen C. Meyer, "The Origin of Biological Information and the Higher Taxonomic Categories" *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*, 117(2), 2004, pp. 213-219, W.E. Lőnig, "Dynamic genomes, morphological stasis and the origin of irreducible complexity" *Dynamical Genetics*, 2004, pp. 101-119.

[clx] Richard Sternberg lost his job as editor of *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* for publishing Meyer, *op.cit.*

[clxi] Michael J Behe, "Correspondence with Science Journals: Response to Critics Concerning Peer Review," *Access Research Network*, on line.

[clxii] November 5, 1981, address at the American Museum of Natural History in New York, to the Systematics Discussion Group.

[clxiii] David Berlinski, "The Deniable Darwin" *Commentary*, vol.101, No. 6, June 1996.

[clxiv]Stephen Jay Gould, *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory*, (Harvard, 2002), p.13.

[clxv] For example, Phillip E. Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, (Intervarsity, 1993), Charles Thaxton, *The Soul of Science*: *Christian Faith and Natural Philosophy* (Turning Point, 1994). William Dembski, *The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance Through Small Probabilities* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), *No Free Lunch: Why Specified Complexity Cannot Be Purchased without Intelligence* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2002).

[clxvi] Edward J Larson and Larry Witham, *Scientists in America*, (ibooks, 2003)

[clxvii] William Provine, "Evolution and the Foundation of Ethics" *MBL Science* 3, 1988, pp. 25-29.

[clxviii] Ernst Haeckel, *The Riddle of the Universe*, (Harper, 1900) pp.130-131.

[clxix] Richard Dawkins, *River Out of Eden*, (HarperCollins, New York, 1995) pp.132-133.

[clxx] E.O. Wilson, *On Human Nature*, (Harvard, 1978) p.192.

[clxxi] Ernst Haeckel, *The Wonders of Life*, (Harper, New York, 1905) p.413 and p.467.

[clxxii] Richard Lewontin, "The Demon Haunted World: Science as a Candle in the Dark" *New York Review of Books*, Jan. 9, 1997.

[clxxiii] Dennett, *op cit* p. 515.

[clxxiv] Lewontin, *op cit.*

[clxxv] Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design*, (Norton, New York, 1987), p.6.

[clxxvi] Periodicals include: *The American Atheist, American Rationalist, The Humanist, Skeptic Magazine, Secular Nation Magazine, Secular Humanist Bulletin*. Organizations include: American Atheist, Atheist Alliance, The Secular Web, Positive Atheism, Atheists United, Godless

Americans, Secular Coalition, Secular Humanism, Atheists Anonymous. Radio shows: Atheist Network, Religion is for the Weak, Hellbound Allee Radio, and much more.

[clxxvii] Kenneth R. Miller, *Finding Darwin's God: A Scientist's Search for Common ground Between God and Evolution*, (HarperPerennial, 2002).

[clxxviii] "Denying Darwin: David Berlinski and Critics" *Commentary*, vol.102, no.3, September 1996, pp.4-39. Also David Berlinsky, *The Devil's Delusion: Atheism and its Scientific Pretensions*, (Crown Forum, 2008).

Reflections Upon the Material

Ultimately, this book is about personal power and how our belief systems determine our use of this power. Our beliefs affect our perceptions, and they influence how we interpret the world around us—our worldview. We like to think that science, the media, and the government are all objective, doing the will of the people, for the good of the people, with ethical standards guiding their actions in accord with the Constitution and other moral principles.

In reality, we often find that it is difficult for people to be objective. For example, in a study of 42 leading scientists involved with the Apollo Moon Project, all of them thought it *naïve* to accept that scientists can be detached or objective. They felt that the unemotional scientist was "an ideal to be presented to the public," but that scientists should in fact be attached to their ideas.[clxxix] Is it possible for scientists to be emotionally involved with their ideas and yet remain dispassionate? Apparently, our leading scientists have recognized that it isn't. They don't even try to do it. They get an idea and then sift through the evidence to find facts supporting their idea. Evidence that doesn't fit is discarded. In the end, scientists present a new study or project that is then sold, literally, as objective truth.

At the same time, scientists are accountable to standards established by their peers. They must comply with certain rules and regulations determining the course and outcome of their research, so as to be in conformity with the canons established by modern science. Darwinists are no different. As previously noted, a Chinese scientist said; "In China you can question Darwin, but not the government. In

America you can question the government, but not Darwin." Darwinism is now the official truth, protected from scrutiny by the nation's educational institutions and courts. Hopefully this book has made it clear why this is so.

The rest of us try to do the best job we can, but in the end we are also pressed to conform to standards established by our peers. Media commentators present the news each night as if it was fact, but the story they tell comes about through a consensus. Corporate executives, interested in the power and prestige of the corporations they represent, create this consensus. For example, the NBC television network presents the news every day to the entire United States. The network is owned by the General Electric Corporation, which is America's largest military contractor and also heavily invested in technology for nuclear weapons and power. When NBC presents documentary promoting nuclear electricity, is it news or a promotional for the parent company's investments? You figure it out. An individual newscaster might not like the story that is being presented as fact by the corporate network, but to disagree with it could cost the talking head a job and a way of life. Even people with great personal courage and strong moral convictions often choose job security and the well being of their families over ethical principles.[clxxx]

Our beliefs affect our perceptions, which color our interpretations of reality, creating a definition of a situation, which then determines our actions. If we believe that we have descended from apes, evolving slowly without conscious intent or direction, our actions toward others will be in accordance with this definition. For example, the United States was instrumental in establishing a vicious military dictatorship in Guatemala in the 1950s. At that time, the Guatemalan government was engaged in a war upon its own people and was assisted by the U.S. in creating death squads and in the routine use of

torture. Viron Vaky, an American diplomat, wrote this in a report he submitted on March 29, 1968:

> *"Murder, torture and mutilation are alright if our side is doing it and the victims are communists. 'After all, hasn't man been a savage since the beginning of time? So let us not be too queasy about terror.' I have literally heard these arguments from our people."*[clxxxi]

Now in 2008, the enemies are defined differently but American soldiers hear the same message in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our nation accepts as fact a view of life that sees human affairs in terms of a cruel and remorseless struggle for existence. This approach to life is a direct outgrowth of our acceptance of the Darwinian model for evolution. If we continue to accept its basic tenets as true, we will allow those men and women most violent and brutal to direct the course of our societies and to determine our history and the way we view the world. This is the manifestation of Darwinist history. It is not liberation, as the proponents of ultra-Darwinist education and psychology tell us. Instead, we are enslaved by a doctrine that has, as truth, absolutely no value.

Modern science has placed western civilization in a philosophical bind by eliminating references to our extremely ancient spiritual and cultural roots. Fearful of surrendering power to religious fundamentalism, the scientific community has promoted an idea that life and the universe have no real intrinsic value or direction but are rather the result of random mechanical forces. Modern science has alienated itself from the great numbers of people who intuitively know that life has meaning beyond the material. When people recognize that the idea of a mechanical universe is essentially false, and that modern science dogmatically refuses to consider alternatives, they may well turn to the fundamentalists for guidance. This is already happening on a massive scale. By fanatically asserting a world without spirit,

while at the same time failing to respond to unanswered questions about the universe, modern science will eventually invite its own dislocation.

Ideas become reality when they are acted upon. There are a lot of ideas in the world today, and some are worthless, some are barely acted upon, and others move whole civilizations. Within the framework of ideas are often taken-for-granted assumptions. For example, most Euro-Americans are indoctrinated with the idea that it is inherently good to create business opportunities and make money. Many of our current environmental problems stem from this scheme. Once convinced of this design, many other ideas, such as the work ethic, are based on the original assumption and sold to the population. These ideas, when acted upon, become *facts of life* and eventually form a consensus reality, which we then come to hold as universal truths. However, there are other societies that don't regard any of these ideas to be axiomatic truths at all. Western civilization regards them as universal because these ideas permeate our societies, and alternative perspectives and modes of behavior are invalidated and labeled as unproductive, socialistic, communistic, or even treasonous: "Why do you hate America?"

After we accept an idea as true, we act upon it. We then notice others around us who also seem to be acting as if the idea is true. Since everyone else is doing it, the idea becomes an assumption and the assumption is taken for granted, becoming an accepted reality. We repeatedly act upon the taken-for-granted assumption until our actions become unconscious habits.[clxxxii] Academia, science, television, corporate executives, the Internet, newsprint, and government information services influence our definition of a situation by confirming a false reality, one usually created for their specific needs. Radical or just different ideas often face extreme opposition because they don't fit into the generally accepted stream of collective con-

sciousness. Eventually they might fit in, but it usually takes a concerted effort to convince others to accept the new ideas as credible. For example, when the United States periodically invades and crushes other countries, the rationale behind the invasions is presented as a quest for freedom and democracy. Throughout the course of history, dating back thousands of years, English-speaking people have felt personal freedom and democracy to be ideas of primary importance. So when the United States bombs another country into submission for corporate, geo-political gains, the vast majority of people accept it as a positive action because they are informed about it through the use of recognizable terms such as liberty and social equality. The current war in Iraq is a good example. Iraq is one of the world's richest countries, with immense natural resources. The American ruling elite wants to own and exploit those resources. They get the rest of us to fight and die for it by selling the story, through the media organs they own, of a brutal dictator who is suppressing his people's freedom and who needs to be overthrown by American military might acting as a force for righteousness. It's all a lie of course; we can even view pictures of the war's architects selling armaments to the brutal dictator when he was an ally against some other enemy of freedom and democracy. Meet the new boss, same as the old boss.

> *"Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is to tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country." Reichmarshall Hermann Goering.*

When other countries use military force, they also explain it and sell it in terms that are more in conformity with their own historical inclinations. When the Nazis invaded a country, they would justify this action in terms of a "New Order" and territorial expansion for *das Volk*. When Marxists dominated a country, they legitimized their

actions in jargon compatible with their historical perspective, which was, and is, economic and class struggle. We are all indoctrinated with a certain historical framework, depending upon our culture. Within that structure, it's always possible for people in power to manipulate the actions of the many by slightly altering historical perspectives. For example, the end of the Vietnam War came about through massive intervention by millions of Americans who came to see the war as morally unjustifiable. As the years have gone by, our news media do not celebrate this as a triumph for the American people but rather present their dissent as stupidly misguided and misdirected, often referring to their protests as the "Vietnam Syndrome." That's because the government wants to justify and sell new wars to the American people in order to maintain its credibility and to lay the groundwork for our younger generations' participation in the eternal "War on Terror."

Humans are generally social beings. We find comfort in the company of others. We like to be well-received and well thought of. Conformity can be very comforting, especially when the whole of civilization seems to be moving in that direction too. Scientists are people and not exempt from making decisions based upon, and in conformity with, their culture's historical perspective. They also hold a perspective on reality, and these perspectives affect their interpretations of it. This in turn affects the content of the articles that scientists publish in journals read by their colleagues. Regrettably, research that contradicts prevailing theories and assumptions about reality is often invalidated or ignored by the mainstream. The result is scientists create their reality by what they choose to pay attention to.

It is possible that scientists have become the most highly respected group within our culture, with the exception of rock/sports stars. This took place in part through films of the 1950s and 1960s, which enhanced the social status of scientists as credible, objective heroes:

There were many films from that era that portrayed the Earth and civilization in danger. The rescuer was usually a scientist in a white coat with a pretty female assistant. The scientist could be seen giving out orders to soldiers, politicians, and police, eventually saving the world from destruction. But it goes deeper than that. Thousands of years ago, science and religion were one. When the Greek philosopher Solon talked to Egyptian priests about Atlantis, he was actually talking to their scientists. Until relatively recent times, there was no separation between science and religion. Science means knowledge. For people throughout history, true knowledge was a religious experience. In western civilization, the separation began with the creation of the Roman Church, which became so intimately involved with material political power that true seekers of knowledge were forced to split from it. Through the 19th and 20th centuries, scientists have fought a constant rear guard action against encroachments and domination by Christian authorities seeking to re-establish their power as disseminators of public truth and knowledge. For scientists, this battle for truth of a different kind eventually triumphed: scientists won the respect and admiration of people fed up with dogmatic Christianity and they became the new high priests of knowledge. For many, their word is holy writ, and with good reason. Modern science has made tremendous strides toward understanding and enhancing the nature of our civilization. Certainly, technological breakthroughs such as electric lights, trains, airplanes, refrigerators, computers, telephones, Disneyland, and other delightful entertainment packages have made life easier than living in a state of raw nature. Unfortunately, the separation of science and spirit has also allowed for the development of the most fearsome weapons of mass destruction in recorded history. It seems as though there are no limits. Scientists, for many reasons including monetary and prestigious awards, now

produce bizarre weapon systems that are practically incomprehensible to the average person.

The historical trend within our culture is to put scientists on pedestals as if they were sages interpreting sacred mysteries: dressed in their white robes, High Priests of the new religion, *Science.* The resultant complete separation of science from spirit has left many people with an intuitive feeling that mechanistic science, with Darwinism as its cornerstone, not only fails to adequately explain the nature of reality, but is also leading the world toward inevitable destruction. The influence of Darwinian racism extends into all fields of western intellectual endeavor. Writing about "The Human Genome Project," anthropologist Kenneth M. Weiss makes the most incredible remarks seem commonplace:

> *The Human Genome Project will characterize 'the' human genome in the sense that, with regard to basic function and location of each gene, each person is pretty much alike. But it will be a stereotype of human genes and will result in a composite sequence based on a small number of mainly European families and individuals.*[clxxxiii]

What? The organizers of this project want to preserve the genetic sequence of a small number of *certain* European families? Which ones? Whose genetic sequence shall be preserved above all others? This "project" in centered at the Cold Springs Harbor laboratory on Long Island, New York, where much of the original Eugenics and population reduction research was done. One more time:

> *But it will be a stereotype of human genes and will result in a composite sequence based on a small number of mainly European families and individuals.*

Of all the billions of people in the world, and all the incredibly diverse types, we are back to the same old story? Which families? Royal families? Is it the white, Anglo-Saxon, Aryan elite? Of course it

is. And isn't this just what the Nazis had in mind when they chose to destroy unwanted races—the preservation and protection of their own "noble" genetic sequence? With the Darwinian ethos serving as a guiding principle for our intellectuals, the most peculiar Nazi style Euro-American genetic determinism passes completely unnoticed. However, the fundamental plans for genocide remain, with 90% of the world's population now the target.

Prince Philip Duke of Edinburgh:

If I were reincarnated I would wish to be returned to earth as a killer virus to lower human population levels.[clxxxiv]

Well at least the Prince is honest about it. No doubt his family is one of those already selected for genetic preservation. The objectives are stated quite clearly in America's Stonehenge, a huge granite monument of unknown origin in Georgia, USA. In an array of languages the shrine states:

- Maintain humanity under 500,000,000 in perpetual balance with nature
- Guide reproduction wisely - improving fitness and diversity
- Unite humanity with a living new language

With the world's population over 6.5 billion, America's Stonehenge calls for the murder of 6 billion people, racial purification, and the destruction of all native languages save only one; English I suppose. The Nazi program is still in place, primarily because the true nature of their crimes was never recognized as scientific Darwinian genocide.

Recent history has created a generally accepted belief that a scientist's word is good, and we have come to believe that the scientist is

an objective, freethinking person interested only in the highest truth. We can see now that this is not always the case. Scientists have ideas that become assumptions that then become taken-for-granted beliefs. Once we realize this, we can question them. By becoming conscious of our own values, we can make our own choices as to what we will believe about the nature of reality. We are then free to question what we read, hear, and see from supposed proven and respected authorities. By doing this, we can create a new reality, which is less mechanical, less violent, less manipulative, more open, and freer.

Once Ghandi was asked what he thought of western civilization. He said, "It would be a good idea." Look at the evidence and decide for yourself. Ultimately, you are the judge. If you can liberate yourself from some long-held belief systems, ones that have become taken-for-granted assumptions, new thinking may emerge that will make clear a multitude of possibilities and perspectives. With a new approach towards understanding life and civilization, we as individuals and as a society will attain more purposeful personal and political power than we have, as yet, been able to imagine or acknowledge. An alternative history of the universe can be empowering and liberating. Consider the possibility that our heritage is an old one and that our culture is not a recent addition to the world stage. We are not a throwaway people descended from single celled animals in Darwin's warm and long vanished pond. Our roots are deep. Contrary to assertions made by our scientific elite, life has meaning. If we realize that the human form is a universal one and that our brothers and sisters created great civilizations before us, not only in our solar system, but also perhaps throughout the galaxy, our history becomes deeper and much more meaningful. We no longer need to live in the fear that all our endeavors are but a flickering flame easily extinguished by the whims of a heartless and directionless universe. Our form, our hopes, our endeavors, our God—those things that we hold

most sacred—are most likely universal principles which transcend ordinary limitations of time and space. Our scientific caste has lulled us into a deep forgetful sleep. As a people, we need to wake up soon.

FINIS

[clxxix] Ian I. Mitroff, "Norms and Counternorms in a Select Group of Apollo Moon Scientists: A Case Study in the Ambivalence of Scientists," *American Sociological Review*, 1974, v. 39, pp. 579-595.

[clxxx] Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Herman, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon, 1988). See also Michael Parenti, *Inventing Reality: The Politics of the Mass Media* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1986).

[clxxxi] The US-Guatemala File, available on the National Security Archive's web site, `www.seas.gwu.edu/nsarchive/` cited in "The US-Guatemala File" by Robert Perry, *Alternative Press Review*, vol.5 no.1, Spring 2000.

[clxxxii] For more on the sociology of knowledge, see: Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: 1966).

[clxxxiii] Kenneth M. Weiss, "Biological Diversity Inherent in Humanity" *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, Summer1996, p.26. The current home of the Human Genome Project is the Cold Springs Harbor laboratory on Long Island, NY, the site of the notorious Eugenics Research Office that was started in 1910. Modern branches are The Galton Society, The Sterilization League for Human Betterment, now Engender Health, also variously entitled worldwide: The Association for Voluntary Sterilization, Marie Stopes Memorial Foundation, The Family Planning Association and The International Planned Parenthood Foundation funded by the Eugenics Society and others. See also, http://www.eugenics-watch.com/ Euthanasia is now law in the Netherlands and Dutch doctors often prescribe suicide for depression. See, http://www.euthanasia.com/netherlands.html

[clxxxiv] "Are You Ready for Our New Age Future?" *Insiders Report, American Policy Center*, December 1995.

INDEX