

A black and white portrait of Charles Darwin, an elderly man with a long white beard and a dark bowler hat. He is looking directly at the camera with a serious expression. The background is a textured, mottled grey. On the left side, there are some dark, tangled branches or vines. The text 'DARWIN' is overlaid on the left side of the image, with each letter in a large, bold, white font with a black outline. The word 'Social Influence' is written in a white, cursive script across the lower part of the image. At the bottom, the author's name 'DAVID W. CLOUD' is printed in a white, sans-serif font. A decorative horizontal line with a central circular motif is positioned above the author's name.

D
A
R
W
I
N

Social Influence

DAVID W. CLOUD

Darwin's Social Influence
Copyright 2011 by David W. Cloud
This edition January 2012
ISBN 978-1-58318-159-1

This book is published for free distribution in eBook format. It is available in PDF, mobi (for Kindle, etc.) and ePub formats from the Way of Life web site. See the Free eBook tab at www.wayoflife.org.



Published by Way of Life Literature
PO Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061
866-295-4143 (toll free) - fbns@wayoflife.org
www.wayoflife.org

Canada: Bethel Baptist Church
4212 Campbell St. N., London Ont. N6P 1A6
519-652-2619

Printed in Canada by
Bethel Baptist Print Ministry

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Influence on Philosophy | 3 |
| Influence on Christianity..... | 4 |
| Influence on Psychology..... | 6 |
| Influence on Communism..... | 12 |
| Influence on the Culture of Death..... | 14 |
| Eugenics | 14 |
| Inferior People..... | 17 |
| Birth Control | 21 |
| Abortion | 23 |
| Infanticide | 28 |
| Euthanasia | 31 |
| Eugenics and Hitler | 34 |
| Influence on Criminal Justice | 41 |
| The Law | 46 |
| Morality | 47 |
| Influence on Commerce | 58 |
| Influence on Advertising..... | 60 |
| Influence on Art | 64 |
| About Way of Life's eBooks | 65 |
| Powerful Publications for These Times | 66 |

Introduction

This report is excerpted from our 600-page book *Seeing the Non-existent: Evolution's Myths and Hoaxes*, which is published by Way of Life Literature.

The Darwinian world view is the foundational underpinning of modern Western society, with its worship of self, sexual revolution, and culture of death. Darwinian evolution is at the heart and soul of the legalization of abortion, euthanasia, homosexuality, marijuana, pornography, and more.

Harvard scientist Ernst Mayr called Darwinism “perhaps the most fundamental of all intellectual revolutions in the history of mankind,” because “it affected every metaphysical and ethical concept” (“The Nature of the Darwinian Revolution,” *Science*, June 2, 1972).

Of course, Darwinism is not the only philosophy that has been responsible for change, but Darwinism comes with all of the authority of modern science. It is backed up by an awe-inspiring army of scientists, educators, media personalities, and philosophers.

Daniel Dennett calls Darwinism “a universal acid” that destroys other world views.

“... it eats through just about every traditional concept and leaves in its wake a revolutionized world-view” (Dennett, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life*, 1995).

This is not surprising when we consider the following Darwinian principles:

- Man is an animal, the product of blind chance, with no higher purpose and no greater value.
- Man is accountable only to himself. Darwin wrote in his autobiography that if one does not believe in God or an

afterlife, that his rule of life is “only to follow those impulses and instincts which are the strongest or which seem to him the best one.”

- There is no God and no human soul. This destroys the value of religion.
- There is no basis for moral absolutes. This Darwinian principle is the foundation for moral relativism, the predominant philosophy of the 21st century.
- Man has evolved through the survival of the fittest. Darwin wrote that man arose “from the war of nature, from famine and death”; this argues against moral concepts such as the equality of man, justice, and compassion.
- Man is a product of his inherited properties and his environment; he has no soul and no free-will. This is the foundation for modern psychology’s downplaying of personal responsibility.
- There is no life after death. This results in a focus on this present life and on the pursuit of physical health above all; it was summarized by a television commercial in the 1960s which said, “If you’ve got your health, you’ve got just about everything.” The no life after death philosophy encourages “eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow you die.”
- The embryo is not fully human until late in its development. This has been one of the underpinnings of the pro-abortion movement.

So-called “social Darwinism” has taken a myriad of often conflicting forms, but every form has been based on these principles.

Influence on Philosophy

On the 150th anniversary of the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, Frederic Bouchard of the University of Montreal's Department of Philosophy observed:

“In 300 years from now, there is a greater chance that Darwin will be taught in a philosophy class than Immanuel Kant. He produced a shock wave that transformed every aspect of our perception of the world and ourselves. It's a revolution greater than the Copernican revolution. Darwin demonstrated that human beings are the result of chance. We could have been radically different or not even exist. The world could have remained populated by dinosaurs or bacteria. Natural selection has no precise objective. If we are here it's because our ancestors were lucky” (“Darwin's Seminal Impact on Biology, Anthropology, Philosophy and Psychology,” EurekaAlert, Feb. 10, 2009).

This fatalistic, man-is-an-accident, life-has-no-ultimate-purpose view, which has dominated philosophy since the 19th century, has a solid Darwinian basis.

Influence on Christianity

Skepticism was already permeating Christianity in the 19th century before Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* appeared, but his evolutionary "theory" hastened the spread of doubt in the historicity of Genesis and thus of the entire Bible.

Henry Morris writes:

"[B]iblical Christianity was all but destroyed by evolutionism. The great universities that were originally founded to promote biblical Christianity (e.g., Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Brown, Dartmouth, and many others) are citadels of humanism today. Even more significantly, the large Christian denominations ... were thoroughly permeated with evolutionary philosophy in both faith and practice" (*The Long War Against God*, p. 98).

This evolutionary-fueled unbelief has even permeated "evangelicalism" since the 1950s. "Theistic evolution" is accepted at Wheaton College, Baylor University, Calvin College, and many other major evangelical schools. Wheaton biology professor Pattle P.T. Pun (yes, that's his name) complains about "recent creationists" because they "deny and belittle the vast amount of scientific evidence" ("A Theory of Progressive Creationism," *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, March 1987). Davis Young, professor of geology at Calvin, recommends that Christians "stop treating Genesis 1 and the flood story as scientific and historic reports" ("Scripture in the Hands of Geologists," Part II, *Westminster Theological Journal*, 1987, 49, p. 303).

Countless men and women have lost their faith the Bible because of Darwinism. This began in Darwin's own lifetime with a vengeance.

Consider George Romanes. As a student at Cambridge he was an "out-and-out evangelical." He wrote a prize-winning essay on *Christian Prayer and General Laws*, but under

Darwin's influence he lost his faith and became an "agnostic." In a manuscript left unfinished at the end of his life he said that the doctrine of evolution had caused him to abandon religion (Romanes, *Thoughts on Religion*, edited by Charles Gore, p. 169). Romanes described his bewildered spirit in *A Candid Examination of Theism*. "He had embraced the 'lonely mystery of existence' with the 'utmost sorrow' ... The universe without God had 'lost its soul of loveliness'" (Adrian Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 634).

Influence on Psychology

Charles Darwin foresaw that his idea of evolution would transform the field of psychology. In *On the Origins of Species*, he wrote:

“In the distant future, I see open fields for far more important researches. Psychology will be based on a new foundation, that of the necessary requirement of each mental power and capacity by gradation. Light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history.”

In this, Darwin was a prophet, though it is not light but darkness that has been thrown on man's nature.

In his biography of prominent names in the field of psychology, Leonard Zusne praised Darwin and said that his books “spell out the basic assumption underlying psychology, namely that man is on a continuum with the rest of the animal world ... The evolutionary method ... is now the accepted and pervasive point of view in psychology” (*Names in the History of Psychology*, p. 112).

On the 150th anniversary of the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, Daniel Paquette of the University of Montreal's Department of Psychology observed:

“Just like sociobiology, evolutionary psychology is built on the premise that our thoughts and behaviors as well as our physical traits are the result of evolution and subject to the mechanisms of natural selection and sexual selection” (“Darwin's Seminal Impact,” *EurekaAlert*, Feb. 10, 2009).

Darwinian evolution's influence on psychology is evident in its fundamental belief that man is an evolved animal. It is evident in the belief that there is no soul beyond the brain, that human behavior can be understood by studying the behavior of animals, that man's fears of God and hell are irrational and should be challenged, that there is no absolute moral code to which man is accountable, and that man's own

self-esteem and sense of well-being is the most important thing in life.

Darwin himself pioneered some of these practices. In *The Descent of Man* (1871) he compared the mental and emotional attributes of animals to man, concluding that even man's moral consciousness and his fear of God evolved from animals, such as the instinct for the preservation of the herd and a dog's desire to please his master. Darwin continued this theme in *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (1872).

Darwin's book *Biographical Sketch of an Infant* (1877) was based on a detailed log that he kept on the development of his oldest child, who was born 37 years earlier. Darwin concluded that each child goes through stages of evolutionary growth, just as the embryo does in the womb (the Darwinian doctrine of recapitulation).

We can even identify Darwin's grandfather Erasmus as a major influence on psychology. Erasmus was a skeptic and a humanist who preached his doctrine of evolution in a popular two-volume set of books entitled *Zoonomia; or, the Laws of Organic Life* (1794-96). The books went through many editions in England and America, with translations into German, Italian, French, and Portuguese. *Zoonomia* promotes the very concepts later popularized by Charles: natural selection, survival of the fittest, sexual selection, gradual transformation of species, homology, and vestigial organs. Erasmus believed that everything has risen from an original "living filament," which had formed by "spontaneous vitality" in "the primeval ocean."

In the second volume of *Zoonomia*, Erasmus branded religion and hell as psychological diseases. One of these supposed afflictions was named "spes religiosa" or "superstitious hope." He called this a "maniacal hallucination," an insanity that has produced "cruelties, murders, massacres" into the world. Another alleged psychological disease that Erasmus identified was "orci

timor” or “the fear of hell.” He wrote, “Many theatric preachers among the Methodists successfully inspire this terror, and live comfortably upon the folly of their hearers” (*Zoonomina*, Vol. 2, p 379). Erasmus implied that all preachers of hell are hypocrites who preach for money, which is patently false. Jesus Christ preached about hell, for the very reason that hell is a reality and He came to earth to save men from the punishment that they deserve. Jesus certainly didn’t live comfortably. His payment for speaking the truth in love was the Cross. The earthly reward that Jesus’ disciples received for warning men to flee hell through faith in Christ was persecution and death. The same has been true for countless other Bible preachers in the two millennia since. The early Methodist preachers certainly did not preach for money; they were hounded and persecuted even by the established churches.

Sigmond Freud was “an ardent follower of Darwin.”

“In a 1915 paper, Freud demonstrates his preoccupation with evolution. Immersed in the theories of Darwin and of Lamarck, who believed acquired traits could be inherited, Freud concluded that mental disorders were the vestiges of behavior that had been appropriate in earlier stages of evolution” (Daniel Goldman, “Lost Paper Shows Freud’s Effort to Link Analysis and Evolution,” *New York Times*, Feb. 10, 1987).

In *Darwin Day in America*, John Day observes:

“Freud’s theory of psychic determinism was just as materialistic as explicitly biological explanations of human behavior. Indeed, Freud took Darwinian biology as his foundation. Praising Darwinian biologists for demonstrating man’s ‘ineradicable animal nature,’ he made clear that psychoanalysis was designed to expose the unconscious roots of human behavior in man’s biological instincts, especially his drives for sex and self-preservation [Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, 1960]. Freud drew inspiration from the

popular biology of his time for a number of his specific ideas. For example, he adapted for his purposes the now-discredited ‘law of ontogenesis,’ maintaining that ‘each individual repeats in some abbreviated fashion during childhood the whole course of the development of the human race’ [*A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, p. 209]. Freud even posited the existence of ‘primal phantasies,’ in which a person recalls ‘true prehistoric experiences’ that have been embedded in his heredity through the evolutionary process [Freud, *General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, pp. 379-80]” (West, *Darwin Day in America*, pp. 55, 56).

The aforementioned George Romanes became a prominent psychologist, applying Darwinian principles to “the evolution of the mind” and helping to corrupt society through this lie. Romanes, Freud’s colleague, and was given Darwin’s notes on animal behavior. He established the field of comparative psychology which “seeks to provide insights about human beings by studying the similarities and differences between human and animal psychological functioning” (“Charles Robert Darwin,” *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, April 6, 2001).

Evolutionary psychologists analyze human traits from a Darwinian perspective by asking four questions: How does the trait develop within an individual? How has this trait evolved? What function does it serve? And what triggers the behavior?

These questions are premised on the non-proven assumption that man has evolved from the animal kingdom. Obviously, if human traits were created rather than evolved, it would be impossible for psychology to come to the right conclusions.

The website of Christ’s College, Cambridge, features a report entitled “Charles Darwin and Evolution.” It describes “Darwin’s impact on psychology.”

“Understanding human behavior from an evolutionary perspective has opened many new fields. For example by comparing human infant behaviour with that of infant chimps we can ask questions about how the ability to interact socially develops, when infants learn to imitate or understand the intention of others, and what differences there are between human mental development and that of other apes. Other fields study sexual desire, sexual orientation, and mate choice. Parental care has also been a major field of study. We now have improved understanding of how parental care develops and what effects occur in children when it develops abnormally. We have an improved understanding of how people make decisions, why societies exist, and why so many people believe in a religion. IN SHORT ALL ASPECTS OF THE WAY WE VIEW OURSELVES AND OUR BEHAVIOUR HAVE BEEN TOUCHED BY DARWIN’S IMPACT ON PSYCHOLOGY. ... Studying psychology within an evolutionary framework has revolutionised the field, allowing different approaches to be unified under one banner” (http://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/darwin200/pages/index.php?page_id=e2, accessed April 4, 2011).

John Day observes that evolutionary psychology robs man of free will and destroys any absolute basis for morality:

“In more recent years, the burgeoning field of ‘evolutionary psychology’ has invoked Darwinian theory to offer biological explanations of such practices as rape and adultery. According to Randy Thornhill and Craig Palmer, ‘the ultimate causes of human rape are clearly to be found in the distinctive evolution of male and female sexuality.’ The same is true for casual sex and extramarital affairs. Evolutionary-psychology proponent Robert Wright argues that Darwin’s theory explains why husbands are much more likely to desert their wives than vice versa. ... An evolutionary-psychology textbook, meanwhile claims that casual sex is an evolutionary adaptation based not only on

‘obvious reproductive advantages ... to men’ but also ‘tremendous benefits to women’ [Wright, *The Moral Animal*] ... If fidelity and adultery both exist simply because they furthered the survival of the fittest genes, what objective basis do we have for preferring one trait over the other? And if human beings truly are ‘puppets’ to their genes, puppets whose ‘emotions are just evolution’s executioners’ (to quote Robert Wright), in what sense can people be blamed if they act according to their deepest impulses? One can’t appeal to their free will, because ‘free will is an illusion, brought to us by evolution’ [Wright, *The Moral Animal*, p. 350]. In the end, ‘we cannot escape our animal origins’ [Malcolm Potts and Roger Short, *Ever Since Adam and Eve: The Evolution of Human Sexuality*, 1999, p. 332]” (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 270).

Darwinian-based psychology has had a vast influence on modern society. It has influenced marriage, child training, education, business, criminal justice, nearly everything. And being wrong in its most fundamental principles it has lurched from error to error.

Influence on Communism

Hundreds of millions of people have perished at the hands of Marxist dictators such as Stalin, Mao, and Pot Pol, and their driving philosophy was Darwinian evolution. They have treated men like animals because Darwin taught them that men are animals.

Karl Marx called Darwin's doctrine of evolution "the basis in natural history for our view" (J. D. Bernal, *Marx and Science*, 1952, p. 17). Marx boasted that Darwin had given the doctrine of God "the death blow" (Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, p. 398). In 1873 Marx sent Darwin a copy of *Das Kapital* and asked permission to dedicate the next volume to him.

Engels wrote to Marx on December 12, 1859, "Darwin, whom I am now reading, is splendid" (Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 8).

At Marx's funeral, Engels said that "as Darwin had discovered the law of organic evolution in natural history, so Marx had discovered the law of evolution in human history" (O. Ruhle, *Karl Marx--His Life and Work*, 1929, p. 366)

Lenin was a strict evolutionist and materialist. He concluded "that man's consciousness is a late evolutionary product of no fundamental significance" (Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 221).

Thomas Huxley's *Principles of Evolution* was translated into Chinese by Yen Fu and was widely read, preparing the way for Maoism. Ilza Veith observes, "[I]t was Darwinism, speaking through Huxley, and made to appear organically related to ancient Chinese thought on evolution, that furnished the intellectual basis for China's great upheaval beginning in 1911" (Henry Morris, *The Long War Against God*, p. 222).

When Mao took over China in 1949, the first new textbook introduced to the school system “was neither Marxist nor Leninist, but Darwinian” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 24).

Communists share foundational principles with Darwin. They hold a materialistic faith and reject the Bible, the God of the Bible, and divine creation. They consider man an evolved animal.

The founders of communism believed that Darwin had delivered “the mortal blow” to the doctrine of God (David Jorafsky, *Soviet Marxism and Natural Science*, p. 12).

They believe in progress through survival of the fittest. “[L]ike Darwin, Marx thought he had discovered the law of development. He saw history in stages, as the Darwinists saw geological strata and successive forms of life. ... In keeping with the feelings of the age, both Marx and Darwin made struggle the means of development” (Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 8).

Influence on the Culture of Death

The eugenics movement, which served as a great change agent in creating the modern culture of death, was Darwinian through and through.

Eugenics

Eugenics sought to advance the human race through breeding. It was seen as a way for man to “take control of his own evolution and save himself from racial degeneration” (Horatio Hackett Newman, University of Chicago zoology professor, *Evolution, Genetics, and Eugenics*, 1932, p. 441).

“Not only did many leading Darwinists embrace eugenics, but also most eugenicists--certainly all the early leaders--considered eugenics a straightforward application of Darwinian principles to ethics and society” (Richard Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 15).

While some have tried to distance eugenics from Darwinism, Darwin himself laid out its basic principles, which is the improvement of humankind through controlled breeding.

“With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. 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 the sick: we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment. There is a reason to believe that vaccination has preserved thousands, who from a weak constitution would formerly have succumbed to small-pox. Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of

man. It is surprising how soon a want of care, or care wrongly directed, leads to the degeneration of a domestic race; but excepting in the case of man himself, **hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed** (*The Descent of Man*, p. 873).

Darwin was bemoaning the fact that the “weak in body and mind” are not eliminated from the human gene pool. He taught that men are mere animals and he wanted to see them treated like animals in the matter of breeding.

Darwin told Alfred Wallace, co-discover of the doctrine of natural selection, that he was depressed about the future of mankind because modern civilization allowed the unfit to survive and reproduce.

“[Darwin] expressed himself very gloomily on the future of humanity, on the ground that in our modern civilisation natural selection had no play, and the fittest did not survive. Those who succeed in the race for wealth are by no means the best or the most intelligent, and it is notorious that our population is more largely renewed in each generation from the lower than from the middle and upper classes” (“Human Selection,” in *Wallace, An Anthology*, p. 51).

Charles Darwin was not a brave man and he did not conduct a campaign for the control of human breeding, but he did call for voluntary restraint, saying that “both sexes ought to refrain from marriage if in any marked degree inferior in body or mind” (*The Descent of Man*). Since men do not typically think of themselves as inferior, it is not surprising that Darwin’s call went unheeded.

It was left for Darwin’s family members to set the eugenics campaign in motion.

Darwin’s cousin, Francis Galton (another grandson of Erasmus Darwin), founded the eugenics movement after reading *On the Origin of Species*. Galton invented the word “eugenics” (meaning “good breeding”) and defined it as “the study of all agencies under social control which can improve

or impair the racial quality of future generations.” Galton believed that even moral and mental traits are the product of inheritance and called for “better breeding, as with ‘horses and cattle,’ to ensure that the ‘nobler varieties of mankind’ prevail over the feebler” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 557).

Of course, men like Galton are elitists who consider themselves the cream of society and well capable of determining who is and is not fit. An elitist is willing to eliminate others (either actively through abortion, euthanasia, etc., or more passively through birth control), but the thought doesn’t seem to cross his mind that he should volunteer himself for elimination.

Galton even saw eugenics as a new religion. One of his disciples, the famous playwright George Bernard Shaw, said in 1905 that “nothing but a eugenic religion can save our civilization” (Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 28). Shaw was fascinated with Darwinism. He said, “The world jumped at Darwin.”

Darwin’s son Leonard was the president of the First International Congress of Eugenics. Leonard wanted to register the names of every “stupid” and otherwise “unfit” person in Britain. His plan envisioned that teachers would report “all children to be specially stupid.” To this would be added the names of “all juvenile offenders awaiting trial, all ins-and-outs at workhouses, and all convicted prisoners” (Black, p. 215). Those so registered would be prohibited from propagating. Also, “their near kin were to be shipped off to facilities, and marriages would be prohibited or annulled.”

Darwin’s son George called for the weakening of divorce laws, so that men and women could escape from a marital yoke with an “inferior” type. He also promoted contraceptives to cut down on “inferior” births.

Eugenics was also a major cause for Darwin’s daughter Ruth and her husband William Rees-Thomas, and for

Darwin's daughter Henrietta and her husband Robert Litchfield.

The eugenics movement in Germany, called the German Society for Race Hygiene, was founded by Alfred Ploetz, a staunch Darwinist and a follower of Darwin's chief German disciple Ernst Haeckel. Ploetz told Haeckel that his race hygiene journal would "stand on the side of Darwinism" (Weikart, p. 15).

Wilhelm Schallmayer, who wrote one of the first eugenics pamphlets in Germany, said that "eugenics was indissolubly bound together with Darwinian theory" (Weikart, p. 15).

Inferior People

Eugenicist August Forel called for dividing society into two categories: "a superior, more socially useful, sounder, or happier, and an inferior, less socially useful, less sound and happy." Those in the "superior" division should reproduce bountifully, while those on the "inferior" side should refrain from reproducing (Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 131).

Gustav von Bunge, of the University of Basel, said "the procreation of sick, degenerate children is the most serious crime that a person could ever commit" (Weikart, p. 132).

Eugenicists sought to control the proliferation of the "inferior" through birth control, sterilization, abortion, sex education, restriction of marriage, and incarceration.

The eugenics program in America forced the **sterilization** of 60,000 "inferior" people. Its headquarters was the Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor, New York, funded by the Carnegie Foundation to the tune of millions of dollars. It was also funded from the Rockefeller fortune. The head of the U.S. movement was Charles Davenport, who wanted to breed a super race of Nordics. He was deeply concerned about the influx of the "blacks, browns, and yellows," which he called "cheaper races" (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 37). When Davenport applied for

funding from Carnegie, he complained, “We have in this country the grave problem of the negro, a race whose mental development is, on the average, far below the average of the Caucasian.” He proposed that “permanent improvement of the race can only be brought about by breeding the best.”

The Cold Spring Harbor center established the “Joint Committee to Study and Report the Best Practical Means of Cutting off the Defective Germ-plasm of the American Population.”

One of Davenport’s goals was the registration of every person in America, and eventually every person on the earth, recording the individual’s “blood line” and assigning him a eugenics racial rating. The plan was to assign an 11 digit number to each man, woman, and child which would indicate his or her rating.

The Eugenics Record Office was opened for business in 1910. “Its first mission was to identify the most defective and undesirable Americans, estimated to be at least 10 percent of the population.”

Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson, a staunch eugenicist, praised the Cold Water facility for “assembling the genetic data of thousands of families.” He said, “Those families which have in them degenerate blood will have new reason for more slowly increasing their kind. Those families in whose veins runs the blood of royal efficiency, will have added reason for that pride which will induce them to multiply their kind” (Black, p. 98).

This was based on animal breeding and the Darwinian doctrine of natural selection. One eugenicist put it like this: “Every race-horse, every straight-backed bull, every premium pig tells us what we can do and what we must do for man” (Black, p. 39). Another said, “May we not hope to ... lop off the defective classes below, and also increase the number of the efficient at the top?”

Those that the eugenicists wanted to “lop off” included epileptics, the poor, American Indians, Blacks, paupers, criminals, the insane, the deformed and defective (such as the blind, deaf, and mute), and the “feeble minded.” The latter was a “eugenically damning classification” that included severely retarded individuals as well as “those who were simply shy, stuttering, poor at English, or otherwise nonverbal, regardless of their true intellect or talent.” In fact, if the eugenicists couldn’t shoehorn someone considered inferior into one of the previous categories, there was always the catch-all class called “other defectives.”

The eugenics purification movement sought to sterilize not only the “unfit” themselves but also their extended families. “Even if those relatives seemed perfectly normal and were not institutionalized, the breeders considered them equally unfit because they supposedly carried the defective germ-plasm that might crop up in a future generation” (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 58).

The first three states to adopt eugenic sterilization were Washington, Connecticut, and California, all in 1909. Many other states followed suit.

A test case in 1924-25 went all the way to the Supreme Court, which ratified the eugenics program. A Virginia teen named Carrie Buck was declared “feeble-minded” even though she was a good student and a conscientious and hard worker. She was labeled feeble-minded simply because her mother, Emma, had been so declared and incarcerated in a government facility for life (though there was no evidence that Emma was actually feeble-minded), and because Carrie had gotten pregnant out of wedlock. Though she said that she had been raped, local officials deemed her unfit for society and placed her in the Colony for Epileptics and Feeble-minded. Carrie’s newborn daughter, Vivian, was also labeled “feeble-minded” on the basis of a social worker’s testimony that “there is a look about it that is not quite normal, but just what it is, I can’t tell” (Black, p. 115).

Actually, it wasn't Vivian that was feeble-minded; it was this eugenics social worker! The Colony determined to sterilize Carrie as "the probable potential parent of socially inadequate offspring." When the case came before the Supreme Court, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., ruled in favor of Carrie's sterilization, setting down in his opinion the memorable words, "Three generations of imbeciles are enough."

A major problem with this statement is that there was clear evidence that Carrie and her mother and daughter were anything but imbeciles. (Vivian, who was raised by an adoptive family, was an honor roll student until she died at age eight.)

Chief Justice Holmes was a staunch Darwinist who applied the doctrine of evolution to American law. He "reviled 'dogooders'" and did not believe in "the sacredness of human life." He was fond of the slogan, "... all society rests on the death of men; if you don't kill 'em one way you kill 'em another--or prevent their being born" (Black, p. 120). A plainer statement of the philosophy underlying the modern culture of death has never been made. It is obvious that we live in the "perilous times" prophesied in 2 Timothy 3 when America's Chief Justice talked so flippantly and confidently about killing people.

True to its Darwinist character, the eugenics movement was promoted through the use of bogus "facts" and devious art. Henry Goddard's influential book *The Kallikak Family: A study in the Heredity of Feeble-mindedness* (1913) featured "a series of photographs of nefarious-looking and supposedly defective Kallikak family members." The photos had been "doctored, darkening and distorting the eyes, mouths, eyebrows, nose and other facial features to make the adults and children appear stupid." This allowed Goddard to "portray the Kallikaks as mental and social defectives" (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 77).

The eugenics movement enjoyed the support of many prominent people, such as Alexander Graham Bell, John Kellogg (whose brother, Will, invented Kellogg cornflakes), H. G. Wells, George Bernard Shaw, Winston Churchill (who attended the First International Congress on Eugenics), Henry Osborn (head of the American Museum of Natural History and president of the Second International Congress of Eugenics), and Theodore Roosevelt. In 1913, Roosevelt wrote to Davenport, "I agree with you ... that society has no business to permit degenerates to reproduce their kind" (Black, p. 99). Churchill advocated segregating Britain's 120,000 "feebleminded persons" in colonies "so that their curse died with them and was not transmitted to future generations" (Black, p. 215).

Birth Control

The birth control movement was a product of eugenics. Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood in 1919, sloganized, "More children from the fit; less from the unfit--that is the chief issue of birth control" (Diane Paul, *Controlling Human Heredity*, 1995, p. 20).

Sanger "vigorously opposed charitable efforts to uplift the downtrodden and deprived, and argued extensively that it was better that the cold and hungry be left without help, so that eugenically superior strains could multiply without competition from 'the unfit.' She repeatedly referred to the lower classes and the unfit as 'human waste' not worthy of assistance, and proudly quoted the extreme eugenic view that human 'weeds' should be 'exterminated.' ... In her 1922 book, *Pivot of Civilization*, Sanger thoroughly condemned charitable action. ... Sanger's book included an introduction by famous British novelist and eugenicist H. G. Wells, who said, 'We want fewer and better children ... we cannot make the social life and the world-peace we are determined to

make, with the ill-bred, ill-trained swarms of inferior citizens that you inflict upon us” (Black, pp. 127, 129, 130).

Sanger advocated mass sterilization and incarceration of the “unfit.” She wanted to control the population through birth control and sex education. She also advocated abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia.

Calling large families “immoral,” she said, “The most merciful thing that the large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it” (Sanger, *Woman and the New Race*, chapter 5).

She also complained, “Nature eliminates the weeds, but we turn them into parasites and allow them to reproduce” (Black, p. 133).

The December 1924 issue of Sanger’s *Birth Control Review* featured the following chilling words by John Duvall, writing on “The Purpose of Eugenics”:

“It is interesting to note that there is no hesitation to interfere with the course of nature when we desire to eliminate or prevent a superfluity of rodents, insects or other pests; but when it comes to the elimination of the immeasurably more dangerous human pest, we blindly adhere to the inconsistent dogmatic doctrine that man has a perfect right to control all nature with the exception of himself.”

This position is perfectly consistent with Darwinism. If man is a mere evolved germ, it could not be wrong to refer to him as a pest or a weed.

“Sanger surrounded herself with some of the eugenics movement’s most outspoken racists and white supremacists. Chief among them was Lothrop Stoddard, author of *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy*. Stoddard’s book, devoted to the notion of a superior Nordic race, became a eugenic gospel. ... Shortly after Stoddard’s landmark book was published in 1920, Sanger invited him to join the board of directors of her American Birth Control

League, a position he retained for years” (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 133).

Sanger’s influence continues through her writings, through Planned Parenthood, and through her relatives, as we will see.

Abortion

The abortion movement was also a product of Darwinian eugenics.

“The biggest impact of Darwinism on the abortion debate came through eugenics discourse, which, as we have seen, was founded on Darwinian principles. Eugenics provided important impetus for those promoting the legalization of abortion. Most of the leading abortion advocates--Stocker, Schreiber, Furth, Olberg, and others--were avid Darwinian materialists who saw abortion not only as an opportunity to improve conditions for women, but also as a means to improve the human race and contribute to evolutionary progress. Stocker and her League for the Protection of Mothers consistently used eugenics arguments to support the legalization of abortion, though ultimately they wanted to allow abortion for non-eugenics reasons as well. Eduard David, in an essay on ‘Darwinism and Social Development,’ argued that eugenics was the proper social response to Darwinism, and he approved of abortion as one eugenics measure among others. Lily Braun likewise became a strong advocate of both eugenics and abortion” (Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler*, p. 157).

In 2004, Margaret Sanger’s grandson Alexander Sanger, Chair of the International Planned Parenthood Council, published *Beyond Choice: Reproductive Freedom and the 21st Century*. He said “abortion is good,” arguing that abortion on demand is biologically justified because it aids the human race in its struggle to survive. “We cannot repeal the laws of

natural selection. Nature does not let every life form survive. Humanity uniquely, and to its benefit, can exercise some dominion over this process and maximize the chances for human life to survive and grow. ... we must become proud that we have taken control of our reproduction. This has been a major factor in advancing human evolution and survival” (pp. 292, 302).

Though Planned Parenthood today disavows its racist roots, the eugenics movement has been effective in culling the black population. According to a 2011 report by the New York City Department of Health, 59.8 percent of African-American pregnancies there in 2009 ended in abortion. That approaches genocidal levels of destruction.

The Darwinian doctrine of recapitulation, that the embryo goes through successive stages of evolution, has been used repeatedly to justify abortion.

Dr. Henry Morris wrote,

“We can justifiably charge this evolutionary nonsense of recapitulation with responsibility for the slaughter of helpless, pre-natal children--or at least for giving it a pseudo-scientific rationale” (*The Long War against God*, 1989, p. 139).

Darwin’s prominent German disciple Ernst Haeckel believed that the embryo is still in the evolutionary stage and not fully human. He said that it is “completely devoid of consciousness, is a pure ‘reflex machine,’ just like a lower vertebrate” (Weikart, p. 147).

Thus, killing an unborn baby would be like killing an animal.

In 1982, Dr. James Neel used Haeckel’s doctrine of recapitulation to testify *against* a proposed U.S. Senate “Human Life” bill that would have declared that “the life of each human being begins at conception.” Neel was chairman of the Department of Genetics at the University of Michigan Medical School, a member of the National Academy of

Sciences, and had just been selected as president-elect of the Sixth International Congress of Human Genetics. He used his impressive credentials to foist the fantasy of Darwinian recapitulation into the debate. He said:

“The early embryo appears to pass through “some of the stages in the evolutionary history of our species. ... at about 30 days after conception, the developing embryo has a series of parallel ridges and grooves in its neck which are interpreted as corresponding to the gill slits and gill arches of fish. ... It has a caudal appendage which is quite simply labeled ‘tail’ in many textbooks of human embryology. ... [Because of these ‘facts’] it is most difficult to state, as a scientist, just when in early fetal development human person hood begins, just as I would find it impossible to say exactly when in evolution we passed over the threshold that divides us from the other living creatures” (cited from John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, pp. 325, 326).

John Day observes:

“Although Neel inserted a few qualifiers in his presentation (e.g., ‘appears’), the implication of his testimony was clear. He was arguing that the value of human embryos could be discounted because for much of their development they were equivalent to earlier stages in man’s evolutionary history” (*Darwin Day in America*, p. 326).

Sarah Weddington, the lawyer who argued for abortion in the landmark Supreme Court case *Roe v. Wade*, also testified against the “Human Life” bill, arguing that the fetus is a parasite. She said, “... the law presently allows no person ... the right to use the body of another in a parasitic way, as does the fetus” (*Darwin Day in America*, p. 332).

At the same hearing, Dr. Joseph Pratt, emeritus professor of surgery at the Mayo Medical School, also called the fetus “a parasite if you will.”

In 1990, Carl Sagan and his wife, Ann Druyan, argued that abortion is ethical on the grounds that the fetus is not fully human until the sixth month. Taking Haeckel's recapitulation "theory" as fact, they claimed that the embryo begins as "a kind of parasite" and changes into something like a fish with "gill arches" and then becomes "reptilian" and finally "mammalian." By the end of the second month, the fetus "is still not quite human" ("Is It Possible to Be Pro-Life and Pro-Choice," *Parade*, April 22, 1990).

The Sagans, too, described the fetus as a parasite. "... the fertilized egg ... destroys tissue in its path. It sucks blood from capillaries. It establishes itself as a kind of parasite on the walls of the uterus."

Darwinism is the foundation upon which modern bioethics is built, with its belief that the human fetus has no more value than an animal.

Princeton bioethicist Peter Singer said, "On any fair comparison of morally relevant characteristics ... the calf, the pig, and the much derided chicken come out well ahead of the fetus at any stage of pregnancy--while if we make the comparison with a fetus of less than three months, a fish, or even a prawn would show more signs of consciousness" (*Practical Ethics*, 1979, p. 118).

Mary Anne Warren, philosophy professor at San Francisco State University, said that even a fully developed fetus "is considerably less personlike than the average mature mammal, indeed the average fish. ... if the right to life of a fetus is to be based upon its resemblance to a person, then it cannot be said to have any more right to life than, let us say, a newborn guppy" ("On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion," *Biomedical Ethics*, 4th ed., 1996, p. 437).

It is Darwinism and its ridiculous theories that the fetus is not fully human that has given us the vile practice of using fetuses as medical guinea pigs. John Day describes this in *Darwin Day in America*, pages 335-338.

At the Magee-Women's Hospital in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in the 1960s, live fetuses were packed in ice while still moving and trying to breathe, then rushed to a laboratory for testing.

In the 1960s, Robert Goodlin of Stanford University submerged living fetuses in a saline solution and sliced open their chests in order to directly observe the beating heart.

In the 1970s, American medical researchers took part in a study of fetal-brain metabolism in Helsinki, Finland. The fetuses were removed via C-section and after their hearts stopped beating their heads were cut off and attached to a pump that circulated a chemical mixture through the arteries. Dr. Peter Adam of Case Western Reserve University in Ohio, who helped lead the Finnish study involving decapitation argued, "People need to understand that the fetus doesn't have the neurologic development for consciousness or pain." He said, "Once society has declared the fetus dead and abrogated its rights, I don't see an ethical problem."

Other researchers in Finland cut out the "fetus's" brain, lung, liver and kidneys while the heart was still beating -- without anesthesia.

In Hungary, university researchers cut out the beating hearts of fetuses up to 15 weeks for experimentation.

Bioethicist Mary Anne Warren said:

"While a fetus of five or six months may, perhaps, possess some flickering of sensation or some capacity to feel pain, this is equally true and probably even more true of creatures like fish or insects, which few would doubt the propriety of killing in order to save human lives" ("Can the Fetus Be an Organ Farm?" *Hastings Center Report*, Oct. 1978, pp. 23-24).

Bioethicist Michael Lockwood said:

"I should have thought that, from any sane point of view, it was far preferable to experiment on a near-microscopic blob of unfeeling protoplasm than a

feeling, caring being, albeit of a different species” (“The Warnock Report: A Philosophical Appraisal,” in *Moral Dilemmas in Modern Medicine*, 1985, p. 168).

All of this wickedness is based on Darwinian concept of man as an animal.

Peter Singer said:

“All we are doing is catching up with Darwin. He showed in the nineteenth century that we are simply animals. Humans had imagined we were a separate part of Creation, that there was some magical line between Us and Them. Darwin’s theory undermined the foundations of that entire Western way of thinking about the place of our species in the universe” (Johann Hari, “Peter Singer--An Interview,” *The Independent*, Jan. 7, 2004).

“We can no longer base our ethics on the idea that human beings are a special form of creation, made in the image of God, singled out from all other animals, and alone possessing an immortal soul. ... once the religious mumbo-jumbo surrounding the term ‘human’ has been stripped away ... we will not regard as sacrosanct the life of each and every member of our species, no matter how limited its capacity for intelligent or even conscious life may be” (Singer, “Sanctity of Life or Quality of Life?” *Pediatrics*, July 1983).

Infanticide

Some of the eugenicists went even further, advocating infanticide.

As we have seen, Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger advocated this.

Darwin disciple Ernst Haeckel taught that the newborn child has no soul and therefore infanticide “cannot rationally be classed as murder” (Haeckel, *The Wonders of Life*, 1904, p.

21). For physically or mentally handicapped infants, Haeckel recommended “a small dose of morphine or cyanide” (Weikart, p. 147).

Agnes Bluhm, the leading woman in the German eugenics movement, advocated infanticide (Weikart, p. 155).

Lily Braun also advocated infanticide for less than perfect children such as those with Downs syndrome.

New York physicist William Robinson wrote, “The best thing would be to gently chloroform these children [of the unfit] or to give them a dose of potassium cyanid” (*Eugenics, Marriage and Birth Control*, 1917).

Peter Singer said:

“If the fetus does not have the same claim to life as a person, it appears that the newborn baby does not either, and the life of a newborn baby is of less value than the life of a pig, a dog, or a chimpanzee” (*Practical Ethics*, pp. 122, 123).

Leslie Olson, director of organ procurement for the University of Miami, said that an anencephalic baby named Theresa “better fit the category of benign tumor, rather than human being; she was a ball of tissue” (Mike Clary, “Baby Theresa’s Gift: Debate over Organ-Harvesting Laws,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 16, 1992, A5). Anencephalic babies are born with only their brain stems intact and usually are stillborn or survive only a few hours or days.

Nobel laureates Francis Crick and James Watson proposed that infants not be declared officially alive until three days after birth in order to allow the elimination of defective babies (*Darwin Day in America*, p. 340).

In 1915, infanticide became national news in America with the killing of a newborn by Dr. Harry Haiselden, chief of staff at the German-American Hospital in Chicago. Haiselden ordered the staff to deny all treatment to a baby born to Anna Bollinger. Catherine Walsh, who found the baby alone in a bare room, begged for the baby to be taken to its mother but

was ignored. At an inquest, she testified, "It was a beautiful baby. I saw no deformities." The inquest determined that "a prompt operation would have prolonged and perhaps saved the life of the child" and that there was "no evidence that the child would have become mentally or morally defective" (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 253). The inquest refused, though, to punish the doctor, and the local prosecutor blocked efforts to indict him for murder.

Haiselden considered his vindication "a powerful victory for eugenics." He "proudly revealed that he had euthanized other such newborns." Taking courage from the refusal of the law to punish his murderous actions, "within two weeks he had ordered his staff to withhold treatment from several more deformed or birth-defected infants. ... Other times he would handle it personally, like the time he left a newly delivered infant's umbilical cord untied and let it bleed to death. Sometimes he took a more direct approach and simply injected newborns with opiates" (Black, pp. 253, 254).

Eugenicist leader Charles Davenport praised the doctor, saying, "Shortsighted they who would unduly restrict the operation of what is one of Nature's greatest racial blessings--death" ("Was the Doctor Right," *The Independent*, Jan. 3, 1916).

Hollywood, which from its inception has been a great change agent in creating a society based on the new Darwinist morality, jumped on the culture of death bandwagon in 1917 with *The Black Stork*. This "unbridled cinematic propaganda was given a massive national distribution and promotion campaign. "Haiselden played himself in a fictionalized account of a eugenically mismatched couple who are counseled by Haiselden against having children because they are likely to be defective. Eventually the woman does give birth to a defective child, whom she then allows to die. The dead child levitates into the waiting arms of Jesus Christ" (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 257).

Euthanasia

Eugenists had a major influence on the founding of the Euthanasia Society of America (ESA) in the late 1930s.

“The ESA advisory council included not merely those ‘who had defended eugenics,’ but some of the most prominent leaders in the eugenics movement. These included Henry Goddard (the godfather of hysteria over the ‘feeble-minded’), Arthur Estabrook (who testified in the Carrie Buck sterilization case), Albert Wiggam (eugenics popularizer extraordinaire), and even Margaret Sanger” (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 357).

In his eugenics lectures in 1910, George Bernard Shaw said:

“A part of eugenic politics would finally land us in an extensive use of the lethal chamber. A great many people would have to be put out of existence, simply because it wastes other people’s time to look after them” (Black, p. 248).

In 1900, W. Duncan McKim, a physician, wrote:

“Heredity is the fundamental cause of human wretchedness. ... The surest, the simplest, the kindest, and most human means for preventing reproduction among those whom we deem unworthy of this high privilege [reproduction], is a gentle, painless death. ... In carbonic acid gas, we have an agent which would instantaneously fulfill the need” (*Heredity and Human Progress*, 1900, pp. 120, 168).

In 1904, E.R. Johnstone, in his presidential address to the Association of Medical Officers of American Institutions for Idiotic and Feeble-minded Persons, said,

“Many plans for the elimination [of the feeble-minded] have been proposed” (Black, p. 250).

Paul Popenoe, leader of California’s eugenics movement, said:

“From an historical point of view, the first method which presents itself is execution. ... Its value in keeping up the standard of the race should not be underestimated” (*Applied Eugenics*, 1918, p. 184).

Madison Grant, president of the American Eugenics society, wrote:

“Mistaken regard for what are believed to be divine laws and a sentimental belief in the sanctity of human life tend to prevent both the elimination of defective infants and the sterilization of such adults as are themselves of no value to the community. The laws of nature require the obliteration of the unfit and human life is valuable only when it is of use to the community or race” (*The Passing of the Great Race*, 1916, p. 49).

A glaring question, of course, is who are the “unfit” and who makes the determination to obliterate them.

Charles Darwin, as we have seen, was a deeply depressed near invalid and his offspring did not exhibit any great superiority. “Of the ten, one girl, Mary, died shortly after birth; another girl, Anne, died at the age of ten years; his eldest daughter, Henrietta, had a serious and prolonged breakdown at fifteen in 1859. Three of his six sons suffered such frequent illness that Darwin regarded them as semi-invalid while his last son, Charles Jr., was born mentally retarded and died in 1858, nineteen months after birth” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 121).

In recent decades there have been major advances in euthanasia. This has been highlighted by high profile cases such as that of Terri Schiavo, who was starved to death in 2005 by court order. She was declared to be in a “persistent vegetative state” (PVS) and her feeding tube was removed. This was done even though some professional medical personnel testified that she was aware of her surroundings and responsive. This type of thing is happening frequently.

Some experts are arguing that death should be redefined merely as the cessation of “higher brain functions.” In other words, those declared in a “vegetative state” would be considered legally dead.

In arguing for this in the 1970s, bioethicist Joseph Fletcher used evolutionary grounds. He said humans have three brain parts--reptilian, mammalian, and human--which is pure Darwinianism. If the so-called *human* brain is not functioning, then the person should be considered dead.

A 1996 survey found that 54% of medical directors and 44% of neurologists agreed that PVS patients “should be considered dead” (“Physicians Attitudes about the Care of Patients in the Persistent Vegetative State: A National Survey,” *Annals of Internal Medicine*, July 15, 1996).

Thus, thanks to the Darwinian-driven culture of death, the definition of death itself is being expanded.

John Day comments:

“Within the framework of scientific materialism, such an analysis is perfectly reasonable. If man is solely a physical being, what meaningful life exists apart from the physical functioning of his brain?” (*Darwin Day in America*, p. 352).

Richard Weikart has the following to say to those who are skeptical about the role that Darwinism has played in the creation of the modern culture of death:

“First, before the rise of Darwinism, there was no debate on these issues, as there was almost universal agreement in Europe that human life is sacred and that all innocent human lives should be protected. Second, the earliest advocates of involuntary euthanasia, infanticide, and abortion in Germany were devoted to a Darwinian worldview. Third, Haeckel, the most famous Darwinist in Germany, promoted these ideas in some of his best-selling books, so these ideas reached a wide audience, especially among those receptive to

Darwinism. Finally, Haeckel and other Darwinists and eugenicists grounded their views on death and killing on their naturalistic interpretation of Darwinism” (*From Hitler to Darwin*, p. 161).

Eugenics and Hitler

Hitler had a great appreciation for the eugenics movement. He wrote letters of praise to Leon Whitney, president of the American Eugenics Society, as well as to Madison Grant, author of *The Passing of the Great Race*. Hitler called Grant's book “his Bible” (Black, p. 259). In *Mein Kampf* (“My Struggle”), Hitler proposed his own program to “eliminate the germs of our physical and spiritual decay.” He said, “The demand that defective people be prevented from propagating equally defective offspring is a demand of the clearest reason and, if systematically executed, represents the most humane act of mankind.”

“In page after page of *Mein Kampf's* rantings, Hitler recited social Darwinian imperatives, condemned the concept of charity, and praised the policies of the United States and its quest for Nordic purity. Perhaps no passage better summarized Hitler's views than this from chapter 11: ‘The Germanic inhabitant of the American continent, who has remained racially pure and unmixed, rose to be master of the continent; he will remain the master as long as he does not fall a victim to defilement of the blood’ (Black, *War Against the Weak*, p. 275).

In the first decade of Hitler's regime, American eugenicists praised him.

“During the Reich's first ten years, eugenicists across America welcomed Hitler's plans as the logical fulfillment of their own decades of research and effort. Indeed, they were envious as Hitler rapidly began sterilizing hundreds of thousands and systematically eliminating non-Aryans from German Society. This

included the Jews. Ten years after Virginia passed its 1924 sterilization act, Joseph DeJarnette, superintendent of Virginia's Western State Hospital, complained in the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 'The Germans are beating us at our own game.'

"Most of all, American raceologists were intensely proud to have inspired the purely eugenic state the Nazis were constructing. In those early years of the Third Reich, Hitler and his race hygienists carefully crafted eugenic legislation modeled on laws already introduced across America, upheld by the Supreme Court and routinely enforced. Nazi doctors and even Hitler himself regularly communicated with American eugenicists from New York to California, ensuring that Germany would scrupulously follow the path blazed by the United States" (Black, p. 277).

Hitler conducted his eugenic program of racial purification with the assistance of IBM's Hollerith data processing machines. In 1934, IBM opened a million-dollar factory in Berlin to manufacture the machines. "At the factory opening, the manager of IBM's German subsidiary, Willi Heidinger, spoke vividly about what IBM technology would do for Germany's biological destiny" (Black, p. 309).

Standing next to IBM president Thomas Watson's personal representative, surrounded by Swastika flags and SS Storm Troopers, Heidinger made the following sick idolatrous statement:

"We are proud that we may assist in such task, a task that provides our nation's Physician [Hitler] with the Material he needs for his examinations. Our Physician can then determine whether the calculated values are in harmony with the health of our people. It also means that if such is not the case, our Physician can take corrective procedures to correct the sick circumstances. ... Our characteristics are deeply rooted in our race. Therefore, we must cherish them like a holy shrine, which we will--and must--keep pure. We

have the deepest trust in our Physician and will follow his instructions in blind faith, because we know that he will lead our people to a great future. Hail to our German people and *der Fuhrer!*”

The “corrective procedures” were a matter of public knowledge by then. The Dachau concentration camp had opened almost a year earlier, amid international news coverage. “Hitler’s atrocities against Jews and others were chronicled daily on the pages of America’s newspapers, by wire services, radio broadcasts, weekly newsreels, and national magazines” (Black, p. 299).

By the power of IBM processors and borrowing registration plans drawn up by eugenicists in America, Hitler was able to identify those who had even a small percentage of Jewish blood.

“As the Hitler regime took each step in its war against the Jews and all of Europe, IBM custom-designed the punch cards and other data processing solutions to streamline those campaigns into what the company described as ‘blitzkrieg efficiency.’”

Arthur Keith, British anthropologist and co-discoverer of Piltdown Man, defended Hitler on the ground of evolutionary philosophy. He wrote, “The German Fuhrer, as I have consistently maintained, is an evolutionist; he has consciously sought to make the practices of Germany conform to the theory of evolution” (*Evolution and Ethics*, p. 28).

In his presidential address to the American Historical Association in 1918, William Roscoe Thayer stated:

“I do not believe that the atrocious war into which the Germans plunged Europe in August, 1914, and which has subsequently involved all lands and all people, would ever have been fought, or at least would have attained its actual gigantic proportions, had the

Germans not been made mad by the theory of the survival of the fittest” (Weikart, p. 163).

Already in 1868, only seven years after the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, Friedrich Rolle, one of the earliest disciples of Darwin in Germany, wrote a book on human evolution in which he considered warfare a necessary part of the struggle for existence (Weikart, p. 167). Of the war that Otto von Bismarck engineered with Austria, Rolle said,

“With such magnificent events it is no longer a matter of right or blame, but rather it is a Darwinian struggle for existence, where the modern triumphs and the obsolete descends into the paleontological graves” (Ibid.).

Many other German Darwinists said the same thing, as documented by Richard Weikart in the chapter on “War and Peace” in his book *From Darwin to Hitler*.

Gustav Jaeger justified wars of annihilation. David Strauss said war winnows nations according to their value. Friedrich Hellwald said the destruction of the weaker nations by the stronger “is a postulate of progress.” Robert Byr said, “Whoever it may be, he must stride over the corpses of the vanquished; that is natural law.” Klaus Wagner said war rids the world of “inferior” elements. Fraz Conrad von Hotzendorf said, “Right is what the stronger wills.” Friedrich von Bernhardt called war is a “biological necessity.” Rudolf Cronau said the evolution of humanity progresses “by dint of the right of the stronger.” Alfred Kirchhoff called for “extermination of the crude, immoral hordes.” Oscar Schmidt said natural selection “is a pure question of might.”

In the 1922 book *In His Image*, William Jennings Bryan, who ran for the U.S. presidency and who opposed evolution in the Scopes Trial, said that Darwinism helped “lay the foundation for the bloodiest war in history.” Bryan observed that Darwinism leads to a denial of God and the abandonment of belief in a future life and thus destroys the

stimulus to righteous living. He said that the German philosopher Nietzsche, with his doctrine of might is right, “carried Darwinism to its logical conclusion.” Nietzsche named Darwin as one of the three great men of his century. Bryan quoted an editorial that appeared in the Paris paper *L’Univers* in 1900 as follows:

“The spirit of peace has fled the earth because evolution has taken possession of it. The plea for peace in past years has been inspired by faith in the divine nature and the divine origin of man; men were then looked upon as children of one Father and war, therefore, was fratricide. But now that men are looked upon as children of apes, what matters it whether they are slaughtered or not?” (*In His Image*, p. 124).

Bryan also cited Harold Begbie, who spoke of “the dark and disfiguring shadow of Darwinism” that had fallen on “the fields of life” (*The Glass of Fashion: Some Social Reflections*, 1921).

The preface to Begbie’s book warned:

“Darwinism not only justifies the sensualist at the trough and Fashion at the glass; it justifies Prussianism at the cannon’s mouth and Bolshevism at the prison-door. If Darwinism be true, if Mind is to be driven out of the universe and accident accepted as a sufficient cause for all the majesty and glory of physical nature, then there is no crime or violence, however abominable in its circumstances and however cruel in its execution, which cannot be justified by success, and no triviality, no absurdity of Fashion which deserves a ensure...”

One book that effectively documents the destructive moral/social influence of Darwinism is *From Darwin to Hitler: Evolutionary Ethics, Eugenics, and Racism in Germany* by Richard Weikart (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004).

Weikart observes:

“Just because Darwinism does not lead inevitably to Nazism does not mean that we can strike Darwinism off the list of influences that helped produce Hitler’s worldview and thus paved the way to the Holocaust. ... No matter how crooked the road was from Darwin to Hitler, clearly Darwinism and eugenics smoothed the path for Nazi ideology, especially for the Nazi stress on expansion, war, racial struggle and racial extermination. ...

“If one concentrates on anti-Semitism, surely an important part of Hitler’s worldview, then there does not seem to be any direct connection between Darwinism and Nazism. ... However, if we focus more narrowly on the question of ethics, the value of human life, and racism, as I will do in the succeeding pages, the historical connections appear more significant. Sheila Faith Weiss, after adequately demonstrating the Darwinian roots of eugenics, is probably right when she contends, ‘Finally, one might add, to categorize people as “valuable” and “valueless,” to view people as little more than variables amenable to manipulation for some “higher end,” as Schallmayer and all German eugenicists did, was to embrace an outlook that led, after many twists and turns, to the slave-labor and death camps of Auschwitz”’ (pp. 4, 6).

Another book that documents the intimate association between Darwinism and Hitler is *The Scientific Origins of National Socialism* by Daniel Gassman.

“[Hitler] stressed and singled out the idea of biological evolution as the most forceful weapon against traditional religion, and he repeatedly condemned Christianity for its opposition to the teachings of evolution. ... For Hitler, evolution was the hallmark of modern science and culture, and he defended its veracity as tenaciously as Haeckel” (Gassman, p. 168).

In *The Nazi Doctor: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide*, Robert Lifton explains how Darwinist Ernst

Haeckel's racism and devaluation of life resulted in the destruction of conscience among Nazi doctors.

“Haeckel embraced a widely held nineteenth-century theme ... that each of the major races of humanity can be considered a separate species. ... Haeckel went so far as to say, concerning these ‘lower races’ (‘wooly-haired’ Negroes), that since they are ‘psychologically nearer to the mammals (apes and dogs) than to civilized Europeans we must, therefore, assign a totally different value to their lives’” (p. 125).

As Shawn Boonstra observes:

“To suggest that atheism or Darwinism had nothing to do with it is just as ludicrous. It was not the Bible that gave the operators of the death camps the rationale they needed to justify the mass execution of ‘inferior’ races. The belief that some races were genetically inferior--maybe even a different species--didn't come from the Christian scriptures. ... Let's be honest about it; the Bible did not fuel those ideas; they were fueled by the apostles of Darwin, the sketches of Haeckel, and the writings of the atheist philosopher Nietzsche” (*Out of Thin Air*, p. 53).

Influence on Criminal Justice

The following is adapted from John West, *Darwin Day in America*, chapters 3-5:

Sociologist J.P. Shalloo said it was the “world-shaking impact of Darwinian biology, with its emphasis upon the long history of man and the importance of heredity for a clear understanding of man’s biological constitution,” that finally opened the door to a truer understanding of crime (West, pp. 58, 59).

Darwin’s influence on criminal justice began in the late 19th century with the “new school of criminal anthropology,” which “sought to use modern science to identify crime.”

It was an application of Darwinism to the criminal justice field. The foundational philosophy is that man is an animal and is a product of his evolutionary path and his environment. There is no God, no absolute law, and no moral accountability. Man is not a creature made in God’s image with a free will.

Italian criminologist Cesare Lombroso’s *Criminal Mind* (1876) was a pioneering book in this field. “Lombroso and his disciples contended that criminal behavior could be explained largely as a throwback to earlier stages of Darwinian evolution.” This is called *atavism*. One of Lombroso’s disciples, James Weir, said, “Atavism has hurled him [the persistent criminal] back thousands and thousands of years, and has placed him beside his pithecoïd [ape] ancestor.”

Lombroso attributed crime largely to organic factors, environment, and “congenital impulsiveness.” The goal should not be to punish but to cure. This was the beginning of the emphasis on rehabilitation in contrast to justice.

“Lombroso was a seminal figure in the founding of the scientific study of crime. Perhaps his most important role was helping to inaugurate criminology’s quest for the Holy Grail--

the search for the material basis of crime. Although many of Lombroso's particular findings were quickly superseded, the professional literature of the last hundred years is littered with studies purporting to identify the biological, chemical, psychological, and environmental causes of crime. That literature makes for interesting reading, because it shows the lengths to which social scientists were willing to go in applying the tenets of scientific materialism, even on the thinnest of evidence" (West, p. 53).

William Noyes wrote, "In the process of evolution, crime has been one of the necessary accompaniments of the struggle for existence" ("The Criminal Type," *Journal of Social Science*, April 1888).

Enrico Ferri argued that "it was no longer reasonable to believe that human beings could make choices outside the normal chain of material cause and effect." He "looked forward to the day when punishment and vengeance would be abandoned and crime would be treated as a 'disease.'"

Criminal science is deeply influenced by modern psychology, with its view that man is an evolved animal and is not accountable to an absolute moral law. Sigmund Freud viewed man as a creature controlled by the unconscious which was formed through past experiences in this life as well as "prehistoric experiences" from his distant evolutionary past.

Summing up the view of modern psychology as a whole, John Staddon, professor of psychology at Duke University, said:

"Nearly all psychologists believe that behavior is completely determined by heredity and environment. A substantial majority agree with Skinner that determinism rules out the concept of personal responsibility. This opposition between determinism and responsibility is now widely accepted, not just by behaviorists but by every category of mental-health

professional” (“On Responsibility and Punishment,”
The Atlantic Monthly, Feb. 1995, pp. 89, 90).

“Regardless of the particular models adopted, criminologists almost universally agreed that free moral agency had nothing to do with crime, and that it was therefore nonsensical to talk as if criminals were somehow morally blameworthy for their actions” (West, p. 58).

John Cuber said: “Some criminals may commit criminal acts as a result of a chain of circumstances over which they have had no real opportunities to exert control. ... The better acquainted one becomes with the environmental forces which operate through culture and unique experience the less inclined he is to speak glibly about a person’s ‘responsibility’” (*Sociology: A Synopsis of Principles*, 1947).

Psychology’s influence on the criminal justice system has been magnified through the psychologizing of sin, e.g., drunkenness as alcoholism, drug abuse as illness, sex crimes as disease.

For example, in 1997 Mary Kay Letourneau, a married teacher who had a sexual relationship with a sixth-grade boy, was treated on her first offense with kid gloves because of psychology. She was found to have “bipolar disorder, which leads people to engage in risky behavior regardless of their consequences.” Supposedly, she has a “love button and a hypersexual button in her brain,” and “when it’s pressed, there is little room for self-reflection.” Because of this Darwinian psychological mumbo-jumbo her seven-and-a-half-year prison term was suspended and she received outpatient treatment in a sex-offender program. This is called the “rehabilitative ideal” of modern criminal justice. Of course, therapy didn’t work and her “hypersexual button” eventually sent her to prison.

The concepts of probation and parole are derived from the rehabilitation emphasis. “The ‘soft’ side of rehabilitation could be seen in the expanded use of parole and probation,

reforms long championed by advocates of the scientific approach to crime” (West, p. 81).

A 1964 textbook for parole and probation officers stated that there is no such thing as a “free deliberating sort of criminal” and claimed that the root causes of crime are “man’s natural desires for security, love, approval, and new experiences.” Thus, it’s all about self-esteem and man’s pursuit of it and the problems that come when he is thwarted in that pursuit. The textbook cautioned probation and parole officers against “the sin of being perceived as condemning or judgment.”

The concept of an “insanity” defense was also derived from humanistic psychology.

The new Darwinian view is brashly opposed to the old “religious” view of man as a free moral agent.

Sociologist J.P. Shalloo complained that the doctrine of the sinfulness of criminals “probably set back our understanding of human conduct at least 500 years.”

Criminologist Nathaniel Cantor ridiculed “the grotesque notion of a private entity, spirit, soul, will, conscience or consciousness interfering with the orderly processes of body mechanisms. ... The mechanisms of human behavior, though perhaps more complex, are subject to the same laws of cause and effect as the sun, moon, and other stars” (*Crime, Criminals, and Criminal Justice*, 1932, p. 265).

The modern “scientific” Darwinian criminal justice system has given us such things as lobotomy as a way to control behavior. Developed in America by neurologist Walter Freeman, lobotomy involved driving an ice pick into the brain just over the eyelid and then moving it around to destroy tissue in the prefrontal lobes. By the 1960s lobotomy went high tech and electrodes were used to destroy the brain tissue. It was considered a panacea for mental illness and criminal tendencies. Between the 1940s and 1960s many

prisoners were lobotomized. “Psychosurgeons were claiming for themselves a godlike power to redesign the human brain.”

Electro-shock therapy was another attempt to control the mentally ill or criminal “animal.”

Once that was debunked, the psychologists and criminal scientists lurched on to the next panacea, which was psychoactive drugs.

Today children as young as two years old are routinely prescribed Ritalin and similar behavioral therapy drugs. By 2000, an estimated four million American children were on the drug and in some schools the proportion of students on prescriptive psychoactive drugs was 30 or 40 percent.

Parents can even face legal threats if they refuse the recommendation of public school officials to put their children on Ritalin.

“In New York state, Michael and Jill Carroll wanted to take their seven-year-old son off of Ritalin for a two-week trial period because of the drug’s serious side effects. They were reported to the state for child abuse by school authorities, and they then had to fight to clear themselves in family court. According to New York City attorney David Lansner, the Carrolls’ experience is not unique. A member of Colorado’s state board of education has described similar stories from her state in testimony before Congress” (West, pp. 100, 101).

“The tendency to reduce all behavioral problems to brain disorders that should be solved primarily through drugs is indicative of just how uncritically our society has embraced the philosophy of scientific materialism” (West, p. 101).

The Law

The practice of basing legal opinions on case study and legal precedent, rather than on a strict interpretation of the foundational legal documents, a practice which has made the judge the authority, was established by Christopher Langdell, an evolutionist who was made the dean of Harvard Law School in 1870 under Unitarian Darwinist Charles Eliot.

“This approach allowed the judges to become the lawgivers, instead of relying on the time-honored dependence on absolute principles of law--as defined by nature and nature’s God and codified principally in William Blackstone’s famous *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (first published in 1765). Langdell was followed by Roscoe Pound, both of whom became known as ‘legal positivists.’ Their most prominent disciple was probably Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, the man chiefly responsible for undermining the longstanding absolutes of the Constitution in Supreme Court decisions” (Henry Morris, *The Long War Against God*, p. 308).

In a speech in 1985, Chief Justice William Brennan, Jr. said that the “theory” of evolution is driving the new legal philosophy and that it is part of the cultural war against “the fetters of original intent or the literal words of the Constitution.” He said this “evolutionary process is inevitable and, indeed, it is the true interpretative genius of the text” (John Eidsmoe, “Creation, Evolution and Constitutional Interpretation,” *Concerned Women*, Sept. 1987, p. 8).

This, in turn, led to wretched legal decisions with far-reaching moral consequences such as the legalization of abortion, the removal of God from the public schools, the overturning of laws against homosexuality, and the dramatic weakening of the nation’s pornography laws.

Morality

The Western sexual revolution is based on the Darwinian philosophy that man is merely an animal and there is no absolute code of morality to which he is accountable; morality evolved and is always relative.

In Darwin's day conservative Christians warned that evolutionary theories "would impair the welfare of society ... break down the best and holiest sanctions of moral obligation, and ... give a free rein to the worst passions of the human heart" (Adrian Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 38).

Adam Sedgwick, professor of geology at Cambridge, warned Darwin about trying to divorce nature from the "moral or metaphysical" and prophesied that if such a break were made "humanity would suffer a damage that might brutalize it, and sink the human race into a lower grade of degradation than any into which it has fallen since its written records tell us of its history" (Himmelfarb, p. 269).

Even Charles Lyell, the father of uniformitarian geology, was "tormented" over the fear that Darwin's doctrine would result in "human degradation." He "agonized about the moral consequences," fearing that "humanity would lose its noble rank and submerge in brutal nature" (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 442).

Countless others issued the same warning, and this is exactly what has happened. The ascent of atheistic evolution has been accompanied by unspeakable degradation and brutalization, from Stalin to Hitler to Mao to Pot Pol, from legalized abortion to child pornography. If man is an animal there is no reason why he should not pursue any inclination, and if there is no righteous Creator there is no basis for absolute morality.

Charles Darwin and Thomas Huxley believed that a moral code could be maintained even if one rejects the Bible and believes in naturalistic evolution, but they were wrong. There

is no basis for absolute morality if there is no law-giving God. If man is a product of the blind forces of nature, he is no better than an animal and there is no ultimate reason why he should not act out any and every impulse.

Huxley lived to despise the nihilistic culture that he helped create. One evening the flamboyant homosexual Oscar Wilde came to Huxley's house with a coterie of his daughter Nettie's "self-obsessed hedonist" artsy friends. Wilde came "with his risqué quips," projecting all the "petulances and flippancies of the decadence, the febrile self-assertion, the voluptuousness, the perversity of the new Hedonism" (Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 540). Huxley responded, "That man never enters my house again."

In 1877, Annie Besant and Charles Bradlaugh were convicted of indecency for publishing a pamphlet advocating birth control. The British court characterized this pamphlet as not only indecent but also "lewd, filthy, bawdy and obscene." They were sentenced to six months in jail. Darwinism changed that type of thinking! By 1921, there was a birth control league operating in England and America. Darwinism had so dramatically changed society by the first half of the 20th century that not only birth control but abortion was legalized. It was legalized first in 1920 in Lenin's Soviet Union where evolution was the state religion. Today a Western court would probably not call anything "lewd, filthy, bawdy, and obscene," and certainly not birth control.

Finnish Sociologist Edward Westermarck (1862-1930), author of *History of Human Marriage* (1921), was inspired by Darwin in his doctrine of moral relativism.

"Directly inspired by Darwin's *Descent of Man*, Estermarck believed that marriage, as well as other human sexual behaviors, had developed through natural selection. ... Westermarck embraced moral relativism and cast doubt on the validity of certain Judeo-Christian sex taboos, including homosexuality and even

bestiality. Westermarck predicted for the future ‘that in questions of sex people will be less tied by conventional rules and more willing to judge each case on its merits, and that they will recognise greater freedom for men and women to mould their own amatory life’” (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 270).

Westermarck was right in his prediction. Each generation since Darwin has been “less tied by conventional rules” and has given “greater freedom for men and women to mould their own amatory life.”

Darwinism is a fundamental philosophical plank in the modern pop culture with its “do your own thing” philosophy.

Two of the great influencers of modern morality were Margaret Mead and Alfred Kinsey, both of whom were Darwinists.

Margaret Mead became the darling of the sexual revolution with the publication of her Darwinian book *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928), a supposed scientific study proving that a stone age tribe in Samoa had no code of ethics, participated in casual sex, and suffered no guilt or stress. The latter was alleged to be the result of a lack of religion’s restrictive morality.

It turned out that Mead’s work was based on a lie and the Samoans in question, in fact, do have a strict moral code and a firm commitment to monogamy and fidelity in marriage.

After three failed marriages, Mead died in 1978 in the arms of a psychic faith healer.

As for Alfred Kinsey, it is impossible to calculate his influence as one of the fathers of the sexual revolution. *Time* magazine reported that Kinsey was hailed “as one of the greatest scientists since Darwin.” Someone said that the Kinsey Report “has done for sex what Columbus did for geography.”

The following is excerpted and adapted from *Darwin Day in America*:

“By the 1940s [Kinsey] had obtained funding for an extensive study of human sexual behavior from the National Research Council (an arm of the National Academy of Sciences), which in turn received its money for the project from the Rockefeller Foundation. It was this work on sex that would make Kinsey a household name.

“In 1948 he released *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, a mammoth volume containing more than eight hundred pages of graphs, charts, and descriptions of nearly every conceivable sexual practice among white American males. Unveiled with a publicity barrage that would have dazzled Madison Avenue, the book soon became the talk of the nation. ...

“Kinsey treated the ‘human animal’ as merely another type of mammal whose mating behavior could be fully explained in terms of biology and conditioning. Kinsey believed that biology had made the ‘human animal’ sexually omnivorous.

“Based on interviews with thousands of Americans, Kinsey claimed that half of all white married males had extramarital intercourse at some point in their marriages, and ‘about 69 per cent of the total white male population ultimately has some experience with prostitutes.’ Kinsey further reported that ‘37 per cent of the total male population has at least some overt homosexual experience’ ... In addition, ‘10 per cent of the males are more or less exclusively homosexual.’ ...

“Kinsey denied absolute morals and mocked the concept of ‘abnormal,’ writing, ‘... there is no scientific reason for considering particular types of sexual activity as intrinsically, in their biologic origins, normal or abnormal.’

“Kinsey dismissed as childish those who believed bestiality was immoral, and he suggested that taboos against bestiality originated in ‘superstition.’

“He tended to regard all [traditional American sex] taboos as illegitimate efforts to repress man’s biological nature.

“When it came to adult-child sex, Kinsey downplayed its seriousness and undermined the reasons for punishing it. In his view, the emotional upset caused by a child’s sexual contact with an adult was no more serious than the fright displayed by children ‘when they see insects, spiders, or other objects against which they have been adversely conditioned.’ Kinsey implied that the trauma of child-adult sexual contacts did not lie in the molestation itself but in the social disapproval that surrounded it. **‘If a child were not culturally conditioned, it is doubtful if it would be disturbed by sexual approaches...’** Kinsey suggested that the real blame for the trauma of child-adult sex should be assigned to ‘the emotional reactions of the parents, police officers, and other adults who discover that the child has had such a contact.’ Such reactions ‘may disturb the child more seriously than the sexual contacts themselves.’

“Kinsey also crusaded for greater leniency when it came to sex offenders, including those accused of child molestation, exposing themselves to children, extramarital activity, and bestiality.

Kinsey Debunked

“In retrospect, the uncritical embrace of Kinsey and his research was based more on fantasy than fact, as researcher Judith Reisman has extensively documented in her book *Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences* (2000). Perhaps the most egregious falsehood was the public image of Kinsey as the typical American family man.

“According to biographer James Jones, Kinsey expected his closest associates to engage in sex with each other and with each other’s wives. Not only that--they were expected to perform sexual acts on film while Kinsey watched. ... One wife of a Kinsey colleague complained of ‘the sickening pressure’ to have sex on film. ‘I felt like my husband’s career at the Institute depended on it,’ she recalled.

“Kinsey himself pursued ever more destructive sexual practices [sodomasochistic homosexuality].

“He clearly had a personal stake in trying to justify his own private sexual demons to the world as something healthy and normal.

“Despite allowing his children to attend Sunday school, he hated ‘the Judaeo-Christian sexual tradition,’ and **he told his associate Clarence Tripp that ‘the whole army of religion ... is our central enemy.’ ... When asked once by Wardell Pomeroy whether he ‘really believed in God,’ Kinsey snapped, ‘Don’t be ridiculous. Of course not.’** A thorough-going scientific materialist, Kinsey dismissed the idea that life could continue after death. ‘I believe that when you’re dead, you’re dead, and that’s all there is.’

“Although Kinsey wrapped himself in the mantle of scientific respectability, his research turned out to be classic junk science.

“The Achilles’ heel of Kinsey’s study was its unrepresentative sample. ... One of the primary goals of the book [*Sexual Behavior*] was to convince people that a large proportion of the population engaged in practices typically regarded as abnormal or immoral. Yet Kinsey’s sample was in no way representative of the general male population. ...

“[Of the 4,120 men interviewed] 1,400 were convicted sex offenders in penal institutions, 199 were sexual psychopath patients, 329 were prisoners who were not

convicted of sex offenses, several hundred were juvenile delinquents or otherwise 'aberrant' boys, 450 were homosexuals recruited from 'homosexual communities,' and an unspecified number were members of the 'Underworld' (bootleggers, con men, dope peddlers, gamblers, hold-up men, pimps, prostitutes, etc.).

"Judith Reisman has concluded that various deviant populations probably account for approximately 86 percent of the 4,120 males who actually appear in the tables of Kinsey's book. ... there is no question that the sample was blatantly unrepresentative of the population as a whole.

"Just how radically skewed Kinsey's sample was finally became apparent as social scientists started to ask questions about sex practices in large, randomly sampled national surveys. While Kinsey claimed that 'about 69 per cent of the total white male population ultimately has some experience with prostitutes,' current survey data indicate that the proportion ... is 18.6 percent. ... According to recent survey research, the proportion of married males seventy and over who have ever had extramarital intercourse is 9.5 percent... But that was nothing compared to Kinsey's wildly overblown statements about homosexuality. Contrary to his claim that '10 per cent of the males are more or less exclusively homosexual...' recent research indicates 'that only about 2-3% of sexual active men ... are currently engaging in same gender sex' and as few as 1 percent of men over eighteen identify themselves as 'gay.'

Kinsey Remains Influential

"Unfortunately, the recent debunking of Kinsey's research has done little to undo its widespread impact on American public policy. For decades, Kinsey's data were largely accepted as good science, and as a result exerted a profound influence on the American legal and

educational systems. In the field of criminal justice, Kinsey's ideas were cited to justify decriminalizing or reducing the penalties of a wide range of sex crimes...

"When the American Law Institute developed the Model Penal Code (MPC) in the 1950s, it repeatedly cited Kinsey's research to justify eliminating or reducing the penalties for various sex crimes.

"Despite recent withering critiques of Kinsey's research methods, his work remains culturally influential. Hollywood celebrated it in the 2004 film *Kinsey*, starring Liam Neeson, and Kinsey's research continues to be drawn on by many legal scholars, judges, and social scientists. From 1982 to early 2000, there were nearly 5,800 citations of Kinsey in law reviews and journals abstracted in the Social Science Citation Index and the Science Citation Index" (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, chapter 12, "Junk Science in the Bedroom," pp. 271-290).

Kinsey and his Darwin-taught views had a powerful influence on the sex-education movement within the public school system. This began with the founding in 1964 of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) to provide sex instruction from kindergarten through high school.

"During the 1960s, SIECUS put out a series of study guides to help educators develop new sex-education curricula. These guides were later collected and published as essays in the book *Sexuality and Man* (1970). **Relying largely on Kinsey's research (which they cited repeatedly), the SIECUS study guides followed Kinsey in invoking the authority of science to legitimize as normal sex behaviors traditionally regarded as abnormal or inappropriate.** In 'Sexuality and the Life Cycle,' SIECUS board members Lester Kirkendall and Isadore Rubin cited Kinsey's data collected from pedophiles to establish that children are sexual beings from infancy and that

preadolescent sexual activities are perfectly natural among children. ... In the SIECUS guide to homosexuality, Isadore Rubin similarly invoked [Darwinian] science to dismiss the views that homosexuality was a mental illness, maladaptive, or contrary to nature. ... Unquestionably the most disturbing SIECUS study guide was ‘Sexual Encounters between Adults and Children’ by SIECUS board member John Gagnon and William Simon. Gagnon and Simon consistently downplayed the negative consequences of child-adult sex, urged leniency for child molesters, and discouraged parents from reporting the sexual abuse of their children to police” (*Darwin Day in America*, pp. 295, 296).

Ever since the 1960s Darwinian social scientists have been using the public school system to brainwash generation after generation of students in the doctrine of moral relativism and sexual liberty. A 1971 SIECUS book, co-edited by SIECUS cofounder Lester Kirkendall, was well titled *The New Sexual Revolution*. The theme was that every sexual behavior exhibited by animals should be considered permissible and that traditional “religious” taboos are products of superstition. Kirkendall stated that he would like to drop the word “morality.”

Parents who have criticized sex education had been maligned as mean-spirited villains and “fundamentalist extremists” in bondage to outdated legalistic views.

In 1981, a group of sex education scholars published *Sex Education in the Eighties*. In one essay, Mary Calderone called for “the acceptance of the sexuality of children and infants” and said that children from their earliest years had to be trained for sexual pleasure. Even three year olds must be taught to “achieve ownership of their own bodies” and educated in how to “use their third human endowment, their sexuality.” Floyd Martinson said that incest could be a positive experience as long as it is practiced in “an educated, sophisticated, and carefully responsible manner.” Pedophilia

need not create sexual trauma for the children. Another contributor counseled shifting the focus of sex education to younger children “before ignorance, fear, and guilt lead to poor judgment in sexual behaviors.”

In spite of the push back in the 1980s and 1990s by the “abstinence” movement, sex education in the public schools has continued to advance decade after decade along Darwinian, morally relativistic lines.

With the decriminalizing and mainstreaming of homosexuality, lesbianism, and transvestism an accomplished fact in American society by the first decade of the 21st century, after a half century battle, the next battleground appears to be pedophilia. We have often said that if homosexuality is normalized, it will be impossible to treat any deviancy as immoral. If something as entirely unnatural as homosexuality is accepted, then *anything* must eventually be accepted. If it is alright for a man to marry a man simply because he is “attracted to” men, then what is to keep a man from having sex with a child or a dog or whatever he pleases, as long as there can be some pretense that the object of his lust doesn’t object? Alfred Kinsey showed the way that this can be accomplished by pretending that children are not so much traumatized by sexual predators as by the shock of parents and judicial investigators. He claimed that children are only disturbed by sexual encounters because of “cultural conditioning.”

As we have seen, Kinsey pioneered the attempt to decriminalize pedophilia in the 1940s and 1950s. This unspeakably vile campaign has made tremendous headway and is picking up steam within the perverted moral environment that Darwinism has helped create. A group of doctors and psychiatrists are using the same strategy that was successfully employed to normalize homosexuality in the public schools. The advocacy group B4U-ACT, which promotes pedophilia as just one more alternative sexual orientation, is pushing for the American Psychiatric

Association to remove pedophilia from the list of mental defects, just as that organization did with homosexuality in the 1970s. The adult-child sex campaign wants to replace the term “pedophile” with the more innocent sounding “minor-attracted people.” Proponents include Dr. John Sadler of the University of Texas and Fred Berlin of Johns Hopkins University. J. Matt Barber, vice president of Liberty Counsel Action, says B4U-ACT is “the North American Man-Boy Love Association all dolled up and dressed in the credible language of the elitist Ph.Ds. ... These are the people who are the disciples of Alfred Kinsey” (*WorldNetDaily*, Aug. 22, 2011).

Darwinism is not the only factor in the modern sexual revolution; societies have been rebelling against God’s moral laws since the first city was built by Adam’s eldest son Cain, a murderer and a polygamist (Genesis 4:16-24). But there can be no doubt that turning man into an animal officially and “scientifically” has provided a major justification for man to live as an animal.

Influence on Commerce

Darwinism justifies the pursuit of wealth at any cost as an outworking of the human animal's innate desires and the "survival of the fittest."

"Darwin's cosmology sanctioned an entire age of history. Convinced that their own behavior was in consort with the workings of nature, industrial man and woman were armed with the ultimate justification they needed to continue their relentless exploitation of the environment and their fellow human beings without ever having to stop for even a moment to reflect on the consequences of their actions" (Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny*, p. 108).

John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie, called "Robber Barons" in the famous book by that title, were committed Darwinians.

Rockefeller wrote that his ruthless business practices were "merely the working-out of a law of nature and a law of God" (William Ghent, *Our Benevolent Feudalism*, 1902, p. 29). His son, John D. Rockefeller Jr., told a YMCA meeting that "the growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest" (John West, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 107).

Andrew Carnegie described his conversion to Darwinism as follows, "I got rid of theology and the supernatural but I had found the truth of evolution" (*Autobiography*, 1920, p. 327). Carnegie said, "While the law [survival of the fittest] may sometimes be hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department" (Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, p. 45

Ruthless railroad magnate James J. Hill declared that "the fortunes of railroad companies are determined by the law of the survival of the fittest" (Hofstadter, p. 45).

The “progressive” movement which had such a dramatic and lasting social/political effect on America, was Darwinian. During his presidential campaign in 1912, Woodrow Wilson invoked Darwinism “to justify an evolutionary understanding of the U.S. Constitution that would allow the federal government to dramatically expand its powers over the economy.” He said, “living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice” (Wilson, *The New Freedom*).

Thus, society and its laws must evolve rather than remain anchored to “unchanging precepts” like the Bible and the U.S. Constitution. Wilson said, “All progressives ask or desire is permission--in an era when ‘development,’ ‘evolution,’ is the scientific word--to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle.”

Influence on Advertising

The modern advertising industry has a Darwinian foundation. It is based on the principle that man is an animal to be manipulated and it flies in the face of absolute moral laws such as “thou shalt have no other gods before me,” “thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” “thou shalt not covet,” “thou shalt not bear false witness,” and “thou shalt not steal.”

Modern advertising uses the concepts and tools of humanistic psychology which, as we have seen, in turn is deeply influenced by Darwinism. These include the Freudian unconscious, the Adlerian inferiority complex, the reptilian brain, self-esteemism, unconditional love, and unconditional forgiveness.

Modern advertising uses such things as color, sound (particularly music), smell, perpetual sales, and the appeal to self-preservation, pride, pleasure, self-esteem, sex, or any other base motive that appeals to man’s fallen nature. It is no accident that beautiful, sensually-clad women are used to sell everything from electric shavers to motorcycles.

Everything is part of the advertising program: naming, labeling, packaging, lighting, presentation, direction of foot traffic, you name it.

Advertising manuals promoting the psychological approach have proliferated since the early 20th century. Typical is this type of statement: “Sales and marketing is psychology in practice; understanding this fact can increase your sales and make your job a lot easier” (*Psychology in Sales*, Suite 101).

John Watson, founder of the behavioral school of psychology, taught advertisers that they could sell products “by linking them through conditioning to the primal reactions of love, fear, and rage in consumers.”

Ernest Dichter, a pioneer in the field of depth psychology, taught advertisers to tap into the subconscious. He regarded

advertising agencies as “one of the most advanced laboratories in psychology.”

Advertisers have studied every aspect of human emotion and desire. There was even an extensive study of the female cycle to determine how to pitch products to the woman depending on her emotional condition. “The agency found that at one stage women are ‘likely to feel creative, sexually excitable, narcissistic, giving, loving, and outgoing,’ while at another stage they are ‘likely to need and want attention and affection ... and to have everything done for them’” (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, p. 183).

A “psychogalvanometer” was invented to measure small changes in the amount of perspiration secreted by the skin as a result of emotional changes. This was used to determine which words carried “more emotional kick than others” to help advertisers create effective advertising campaigns.

In his chapter on “The Science of Business” in *Darwin Day in America* John Day writes:

“When Kellogg needed advice about Tony the Tiger, Seagrams wanted to know more about whiskey, and Samsonite wanted to understand the deeper meaning of luggage, they all called one man: Clotaire Rapaille, Boca Raton marketing guru extraordinaire. A native of France, Rapaille has parlayed a master’s degree in psychology and a doctorate in medical anthropology [Darwinianism] from the Sorbonne into a lucrative career in the high-stakes world of corporate advertising. Featured by such news outlets as CNN, the *New York Times*, and *Newsweek*, Rapaille has assembled an elite client list straight from the Fortune 500.

“Rapaille specializes in blending biology, psychoanalysis, and cultural anthropology to tell corporate executives how their products connect with consumers ‘deepest yearnings.’ ...

“While Rapaille’s claims may seem off-the-wall, he stands in a long line of psychologists and other

scientists who have tried to fuse advertising with what they saw as the insights of modern science, especially efforts to view human beings as nothing but the passive products of their biology and environment.

“The attempt to create a truly ‘scientific’ advertising was already wide-spread by the early 1900s. The ‘scientific method has been the secret of modern progress,’ wrote Herbert Casson in *Ads and Sales* (1911). ‘It first revolutionized botany, geology, astronomy, chemistry, physics, etc. ... And now the next great step, in the general swing from metaphysics to science, is to apply the principles of Efficiency to the selling and advertising of goods.’ ...

“The psychology offered up to advertisers was usually based on a blend of materialism and reductionism. [Harvard’s Hugo Munsterberg, in *Business Psychology* (1922)] insisted that man’s mental life could be reduced completely to the physical processes of the brain. ...

“Early psychologists writing about advertising often emphasized the importance of human ‘suggestibility.’ ...

“The ad men’s fixation on human instincts was dehumanizing in that it offered a truncated view of the human person, downplaying to the point of irrelevancy the part of man’s nature that used to be regarded as his crown: his rationality. The view of consumers as little more than animals was widespread among advertising experts. ...

“By the 1950s, the result was increased interest in probing consumers’ physical and even subconscious responses to advertising messages in order to find more sophisticated ways to condition their behavior.

“Perhaps the most powerful lingering influence of scientific materialism on the advertising industry is the centrality of ‘branding’ in the modern economy. Corporations can spend hundreds of millions of dollars

not to show why their products are objectively superior to other products but merely to implant in consumers' brains a positive feeling about a certain brand name. ... At its core, corporate branding efforts are little more than the conditioning process championed by the behaviorists, which is why in the 1980s Coca-Cola executive Joel S. Dubow dubbed famed Russian behaviorist Ivan Pavlov 'the father of modern advertising' (Eric Clark, *The Want Makers*, 1989, p. 67]. Dubow explained, 'Pavlov's unconditioned stimulus (UCS) was a spray of meat powder which produced salivation ... But if you think what Pavlov did, he actually took a neutral object and, by associating it with a meaningful object, made it a symbol of something else; he imbued it with imagery, he gave it added value. And isn't that what we try to do in modern advertising?' ...

"By treating consumers as animals to be conditioned rather than as rational beings to be persuaded, the scientific ad men essentially reduce human beings to the level of lab rats. Instead of appealing to the better angels of human nature, they target people's lowest material appetites. ... Scientific materialism shapes our mental imagery and interior life through the omnipresence of modern advertising" (John Day, *Darwin Day in America*, pp. 175-186).

A 21st century commercial mall is a temple dedicated to the application of Darwinian principles to the field of advertising.

Influence on Art

Darwin's influence on modern art has been dramatic. It reflects the moral relativism and the nihilism or meaninglessness of life without God.

“Man is dead’ is a theme that is common to modern art. Man is dead. He is nothing but a machine, a very complex machine, an absurd machine” (H.R. Rookmaaker, *Modern Art and the Death of A Culture*, p. 129).

There was Expressionism with its “no definite philosophy, no rules” (Rookmaaker, p. 103).

There was Abstraction, with its goal of “getting rid of all traditional ways of thinking” (Rookmaaker, p. 110).

There was Cubism, with the only reality being that of the artist's mind and even that not being a product of free will. As a Cubist wrote in 1912, “... there is nothing real except the coincidence of a sensation and an individual mental direction ... we can only have certitude with regard to the images which they produce in the mind” (Rookmaaker, p. 125).

There was Dada, with its “nihilistic, destructive movement of anti-art, anti-philosophy” (Rookmaaker, p. 130).

There was Surrealism, with its rejection of rationalism. For them, “fear, agony, despair and absurdity were the real realities” (Rookmaaker, p. 143). Surrealism is “against nation, God and reason”; it seeks to “liberate man from convention, culture and society.” It is the search for “complete freedom.” It is about anarchy, absurdity, irrationality, alienation.

“Surrealism was a movement ... yet its influence has been great, and it has pervaded much of the expression of our age. Almost all artistic activity since that time has had some sort of surrealist tinge” (Rookmaaker, p. 145).

About Way of Life's eBooks

Since January 2011, Way of Life Literature books have been available in eBook format. Some are available for purchase, while others are available for free download.

The eBooks are designed and formatted to work well on a variety of applications/devices, but not all apps/devices are equal. Some allow the user to control appearance and layout of the book while some don't even show italics! For best reading pleasure, please choose your reading app carefully.

For some suggestions, see the reports "iPads, Kindles, eReaders, and Way of Life Materials," at www.wayoflife.org/database/ebook.html and "About eBooks, eReaders, and Reading Apps" at www.wayoflife.org/help/ebooks.php.

Powerful Publications for These Times

Following is a selection of the titles published by Way of Life Literature. The books are available in both print and eBook editions (PDF, Kindle, PUB). The materials can be ordered via the online catalog at the Way of Life web site -- www.wayoflife.org -- or by phone 866-295-4143.

FUNDAMENTAL LESSONS IN HOW TO STUDY THE BIBLE. This very practical course deals with requirements for effective Bible study, marking your Bible, and rules of Bible interpretation. 174 pages

THE BIBLE VERSION QUESTION ANSWER DATABASE, ISBN 1-58318-088-5. This book provides diligently-researched, in-depth answers to more than 80 of the most important questions on this topic. A vast number of myths are exposed, such as the myth that Erasmus promised to add 1 John 5:7 to his Greek New Testament if even one manuscript could be produced, the myth that the differences between the Greek texts and versions are slight and insignificant, the myth that there are no doctrines affected by the changes in the modern versions, and the myth that the King James translators said that all versions are equally the Word of God. It also includes reviews of several of the popular modern versions, including the Living Bible, New Living Bible, Today's English Version, New International Version, New American Standard Version, The Message, and the Holman Christian Standard Bible. 423 pages

CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIAN MUSIC: SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED AND SOME WARNINGS GIVEN, ISBN 1-58318-094-x. This book expounds on five reasons why we are opposed to CCM: It is worldly; it is ecumenical; it is charismatic; it is experience-oriented; and it weakens the fundamentalist stance of churches. We give examples of how changes are occurring in formerly fundamentalist churches through the instrumentality of contemporary music. The rest of the book deals with

questions that are commonly asked on this subject, such as the following: What is the difference between using contemporary worship music and using old hymns that were interdenominational? Didn't Luther and the Wesleys use tavern music? Isn't the issue of music just a matter of taste? Doesn't the Bible encourage us to use cymbals and stringed and loud sounding instruments? What is wrong with soft rock? Didn't God create all music? Love is more important than doctrine and standards of living, isn't it? Since God looks on the heart, why are you concerned about appearance? Isn't Christianity all about grace? What about all of the young people who are being saved through CCM? 190 pages

THE FOREIGN SPIRIT OF CONTEMPORARY WORSHIP MUSIC. This hard-hitting multi-media video presentation, published in March 2012, documents the frightful spiritual compromise, heresy, and apostasy that permeates the field of contemporary worship music. By extensive documentation, it proves that contemporary worship music is impelled by “another spirit” (2 Cor. 11:4). It is the spirit of charismaticism, the spirit of the latter rain, the spirit of the one-world church, the spirit of the world, the spirit of homosexuality, and the spirit of the false god of *The Shack*. The presentation looks carefully at the origin of contemporary worship in the Jesus Movement of the 1970s, examining the lives and testimonies of some of the most influential people. Nearly 60 video clips and hundreds of photos are featured. It is available on DVD and as an eDownload from the Way of Life web site.

ISRAEL: PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE, ISBN 978-1-58318-116-4. This is a package consisting of a 234-page illustrated book, a DVD series, and a series of Powerpoint/Keynote presentations for teachers. The package covers all of the major facets pertaining to ***FUNDAMENTAL LESSONS IN HOW TO STUDY THE BIBLE.*** This very practical course deals with requirements for effective Bible study, marking your Bible, and rules of Bible interpretation. 174 pages

BIBLE TIMES AND ANCIENT KINGDOMS: TREASURES FROM ARCHAEOLOGY. ISBN 978-1-58318-121-8. This is a package consisting of a book and a series of PowerPoint and Keynote (Apple) presentations which are a graphical edition of the book. The PowerPoints are packed with high quality color photos, drawings, historic recreations, and video clips. Bible Times and Ancient Kingdoms is a course on Bible geography, Bible culture, and Bible history and has a two-fold objective: to present apologetic evidence for the Bible and to give background material to help the student better understand the setting of Bible history. We cover this fascinating history from Genesis to the New Testament, dealing with the Table of the Nations in Genesis 10, the Tower of Babel, Ur of the Chaldees, Egypt, Baal worship, the Philistines, the Canaanites, David's palace, Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, Ahab and Jezebel, the fall of the northern kingdom of Israel, the Assyrian Empire, Hezekiah and his times, Nebuchadnezzar and his Babylon, the Medo-Persian Empire, Herod the Great and his temple, the Roman rule over Israel, and the Roman destruction of Jerusalem. Many of the archaeological discoveries from the past 200 years, which we relate in the course, are so fascinating and improbable that they read like a novel. It is easy to see God's hand in this field, in spite of its prevailing skepticism. The course also deals with Bible culture, such as weights and measures, plant and animal life, Caesar's coin, the widow's mite, ancient scrolls and seals, phylacteries, cosmetics, tombs, and the operation of ancient lamps, millstones, pottery wheels, and olive presses. The course begins with an overview of Israel's geography and a timeline of Bible history to give the student a framework for better understanding the material. Each section includes maps to help the student place the events in their proper location. The course is packed with important but little-known facts that illuminate Bible history and culture. The preparation for the book is extensive, the

culmination of 40 years of Bible study, teaching, and research trips. In this context the author built a large personal library and collected information from major archaeological museums and locations in North America, England, Europe, Turkey, and Israel. We guarantee that the student who completes the course will read the Bible with new eyes and fresh enthusiasm. 500 pages book + DVD containing 19 PowerPoint presentations packed with more than 3,200 high quality color photos, drawings, historic recreations, and video clips.

THE BIBLE VERSION QUESTION ANSWER DATABASE, ISBN 1-58318-088-5. This book provides diligently-researched, in-depth answers to more than 80 of the most important questions on this topic. A vast number of myths are exposed, such as the myth that Erasmus promised to add 1 John 5:7 to his Greek New Testament if even one manuscript could be produced, the myth that the differences between the Greek texts and versions are slight and insignificant, the myth that there are no doctrines affected by the changes in the modern versions, and the myth that the King James translators said that all versions are equally the Word of God. It also includes reviews of several of the popular modern versions, including the Living Bible, New Living Bible, Today's English Version, New International Version, New American Standard Version, The Message, and the Holman Christian Standard Bible. 423 pages

CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIAN MUSIC: SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED AND SOME WARNINGS GIVEN, ISBN 1-58318-094-x. This book expounds on five reasons why we are opposed to CCM: It is worldly; it is ecumenical; it is charismatic; it is experience-oriented; and it weakens the fundamentalist stance of churches. We give examples of how changes are occurring in formerly fundamentalist churches through the instrumentality of contemporary music. The rest of the book deals with questions that are commonly asked on this subject, such as

the following: What is the difference between using contemporary worship music and using old hymns that were interdenominational? Didn't Luther and the Wesleys use tavern music? Isn't the issue of music just a matter of taste? Doesn't the Bible encourage us to use cymbals and stringed and loud sounding instruments? What is wrong with soft rock? Didn't God create all music? Love is more important than doctrine and standards of living, isn't it? Since God looks on the heart, why are you concerned about appearance? Isn't Christianity all about grace? What about all of the young people who are being saved through CCM? 190 pages

THE FOREIGN SPIRIT OF CONTEMPORARY WORSHIP MUSIC. This hard-hitting multi-media video presentation, published in March 2012, documents the frightful spiritual compromise, heresy, and apostasy that permeates the field of contemporary worship music. By extensive documentation, it proves that contemporary worship music is impelled by “another spirit” (2 Cor. 11:4). It is the spirit of charismaticism, the spirit of the latter rain, the spirit of the one-world church, the spirit of the world, the spirit of homosexuality, and the spirit of the false god of *The Shack*. The presentation looks carefully at the origin of contemporary worship in the Jesus Movement of the 1970s, examining the lives and testimonies of some of the most influential people. Nearly 60 video clips and hundreds of photos are featured. It is available on DVD and as an eDownload from the Way of Life web site.

THE FUTURE ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE. ISBN 978-1-58318-172-0. New for November 2012. One of the many reasons why the Bible is the most amazing and exciting book on earth is its prophecies. The Bible unfolds the future in great detail, and *The Future According to the Bible* deals in depth with every major prophetic event, including the Rapture, the Judgment Seat of Christ, the Tribulation, the Antichrist, Gog and Magog, the Battle of Armageddon, the Two Witnesses, Christ's Return, Muslim nations in prophecy,

the Judgment of the Nations, the resurrection body, the conversion of Israel, the highway of the redeemed, Christ's glorious kingdom, the Millennial Temple, the Great White Throne judgment, and the New Jerusalem. The first two chapters deal at length with the amazing prophecies that are being fulfilled today and with the church-age apostasy. Knowledge of these prophecies is essential for a proper understanding of the times and a proper Christian worldview today. The 130-page section on Christ's kingdom describes the coming world kingdom in more detail than any book we are familiar with. Every major Messianic prophecy is examined. Prophecy is a powerful witness to the Bible's divine inspiration, and it is a great motivator for holy Christian living. In this book we show that the Lord's churches are outposts of the coming kingdom. The believer's position in Christ's earthly kingdom will be determined by his service in this present world (Revelation 2:26-27; 3:21). The book is based on forty years of intense Bible study plus firsthand research in Israel, Turkey, and Europe.

ISRAEL: PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE, ISBN 978-1-58318-116-4. This is a package consisting of a 234-page illustrated book, a DVD series, and a series of Powerpoint/Keynote presentations for teachers. The package covers all of the major facets pertaining to Israel in a professional, technologically cutting-edge way: geography, culture, archaeology, history, current events, and prophecy. The series begins with an amazing aerial flyover over the land of Israel.

KEEPING THE KIDS: HOW TO KEEP THE CHILDREN FROM FALLING PREY TO THE WORLD, ISBN 978-1-58318-115-7. This book aims to help parents and churches raise children to be disciples of Jesus Christ and to avoid the pitfalls of the world, the flesh, and the devil. The book is a collaborative effort. It contains testimonies from hundreds of individuals who provided feedback to our questionnaires on this subject, as well as powerful ideas gleaned from interviews with pastors, missionaries, and

church people who have raised godly children. The book is packed with practical suggestions and deals with many issues: Conversion, the husband-wife relationship, the necessity of permeating the home with Christian love, mothers as keepers at home, the father's role as the spiritual head of the home, child discipline, separation from the pop culture, discipleship of youth, the grandparents' role in "keeping the kids," effectual prayer, and fasting. 531 pages

MUSIC FOR GOOD OR EVIL (4 DVDs). This video series for July 2011 is a new replacement for previous presentations we have produced on this subject. The series, which is packed with graphics, video and audio clips, has seven segments. I. Biblical Principles of Good Christian Music: II. Why We Reject Contemporary Christian Music. III. The Sound of Contemporary Christian Music. IV. Transformational Power of CCM. V. Southern Gospel. VI. Marks of Good Song Leading. VII. Questions Answered on Contemporary Christian Music.

ONE YEAR DISCIPLESHIP COURSE, ISBN 978-1-58318-117-1. (new title for 2011) This powerful course features 52 lessons in Christian living. It can be broken into sections and used as a new converts course, an advanced discipleship course, a Sunday School series, a Home Schooling or Bible Institute course, or preaching outlines. The lessons are thorough, meaty, and very practical. There is an extensive memory verse program built into the course, and each lesson features carefully designed review questions. 221 pages

THE PENTECOSTAL-CHARISMATIC MOVEMENTS: THE HISTORY AND THE ERROR, ISBN 1-58318-099-0. This book begins with the author's own experience with the Pentecostal movement. The next section deals with the history of the Pentecostal movement, beginning with a survey of miraculous signs from the second to the 18th centuries. We deal with Charles Parham, Azusa Street Mission, major Pentecostal healing evangelists, the Sharon

Schools and the New Order of the Latter Rain, the Word-Faith movement and its key leaders, the Charismatic Movement, the Roman Catholic Charismatic Renewal, the Pentecostal Prophets, the Third Wave, the Laughing-Drunken Revival of Toronto, Pensacola, Lakeland, etc., and the recent Pentecostal scandals. The last section deals with the theological errors of the Pentecostal-Charismatic movements. 317 pages

REPENTANCE AND SOUL WINNING, ISBN 1-58318-062-1. This is an in-depth study on biblical repentance and a timely warning about unscriptural methods of presenting the gospel. The opening chapter, entitled “Fundamental Baptists and Quick Prayerism: A Faulty Method of Evangelism Has Produced a Change in the Doctrine of Repentance,” traces the change in the doctrine of repentance among fundamental Baptists during the past 50 years. 2008 edition, 201 pages

SEEING THE NON-EXISTENT: EVOLUTION’S MYTHS AND HOAXES, ISBN 1-58318-002-8. (new title for 2011) This book is designed both as a stand alone title as well as a companion to the apologetics course *AN UNSHAKEABLE FAITH*. The contents are as follows: Canals on Mars, Charles Darwin and His Granddaddy, Thomas Huxley: Darwin’s Bulldog, Ernst Haeckel: Darwin’s German Apostle, Icons of Evolution, Icons of Creation, The Ape-men, Predictions, Questions for Evolutionists, Darwinian Gods, Darwin’s Social Influence.

SOWING AND REAPING: A COURSE IN EVANGELISM. ISBN 978-1-58318-169-0. This new course (for 2012) is unique in several ways. *It is unique in its approach*. While it is practical and down-to-earth, it does not present a formulaic approach to soul winning, recognizing that individuals have to be dealt with as individuals. The course does not include any sort of psychological manipulation techniques. It does not neglect repentance in soul winning, carefully explaining the biblical definition of repentance and the place of

repentance in personal evangelism. It explains how to use the law of God to plow the soil of the human heart so that the gospel can find good ground. *The course is unique in its objective.* The objective of biblical soul winning is not to get people to “pray a sinner’s prayer”; the objective is to see people soundly converted to Christ. This course trains the soul winner to pursue genuine conversions as opposed to mere “decisions.” *The course is also unique in its breadth.* It covers a wide variety of situations, including how to deal with Hindus and with skeptics and how to use apologetics or evidences in evangelism. There is a memory course consisting of 111 select verses and links to a large number of resources that can be used in evangelism, many of them free. The course is suitable for teens and adults and for use in Sunday School, Youth Ministries, Preaching, and private study. OUTLINE: The Message of Evangelism, Repentance and Evangelism, God’s Law and Evangelism, The Reason for Evangelism, The Authority for Evangelism, The Power for Evangelism, The Attitude in Evangelism, The Technique of Evangelism, Using Tracts in Evangelism, Dealing with Skeptics. 104 pages, 8x11, spiral bound.

THINGS HARD TO BE UNDERSTOOD: A HANDBOOK OF BIBLICAL DIFFICULTIES, ISBN 1-58318-002-8. This very practical volume deals with a wide variety of biblical difficulties. Find the answer to the seeming contradictions in the Bible. Meet the challenge of false teachers who misuse biblical passages to prove their doctrine. Find out the meaning of difficult passages that are oftentimes overlooked in the Bible commentaries. Our objective is to help God’s people have confidence in the inerrancy of their Bibles and to protect them from the false teachers that abound in these last days. Jerry Huffman, editor of *Calvary Contender*, testified: “You don’t have to agree with everything to greatly benefit from this helpful book.” Fourth edition April 2006, 385 pages

AN UNSHAKEABLE FAITH: A CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS COURSE, ISBN 978-1-58318-119-5. (new

title for 2011) The course is built upon nearly 40 years of serious Bible study and 30 years of apologetics writing. Research was done in the author's personal 6,000-volume library plus in major museums and other locations in America, England, Europe, Australia, Asia, and the Middle East. The package consists of an apologetics course entitled *AN UNSHAKEABLE FAITH* (both print and eBook editions) plus an extensive series of Powerpoint/Keynote presentations. (Keynote is the Apple version of Powerpoint.) The 1,800 PowerPoint slides deal with archaeology, evolution/creation science, and the prophecies pertaining to Israel's history. The material in the 360-page course is extensive, and the teacher can decide whether to use all of it or to select only some portion of it for his particular class and situation. After each section there are review questions to help the students focus on the most important points. The course can be used for private study as well as for a classroom setting. Sections include The Bible's Nature, The Bible's Proof, The Dead Sea Scrolls, The Bible's Difficulties, Historical Evidence for Jesus, Evidence for Christ's Resurrection, Archaeological Treasures Confirming the Bible, A History of Evolution, Icons of Evolution, Icons of Creation, Noah's Ark and the Global Flood.

WAY OF LIFE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE BIBLE & CHRISTIANITY, ISBN 1-58318-005-2. This lovely hardcover Bible Encyclopedia contains 640 pages (8.5X11) of information, with more than 6,000 entries, and 7,000 cross-references. It is a complete dictionary of biblical terminology and features many other areas of research not often covered in Bible reference volumes. Subjects include Bible versions, Denominations, Cults, Christian Movements, Typology, the Church, Social Issues and Practical Christian Living, Bible Prophecy, and Old English Terminology. An evangelist in South Dakota wrote: "If I were going to the mission field and could carry only three books, they would be the Strong's concordance, a hymnal, and the *Way of Life Bible*

Encyclopedia.” Missionary author Jack Moorman says: “The encyclopedia is excellent. The entries show a ‘distilled spirituality.” A computer edition of the Encyclopedia is available as a standalone eBook for PDF, Kindle, and ePub. It is also available as a module for *Swordseacher*.

Way of Life Literature
P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061
866-295-4143, fbns@wayoflife.org
www.wayoflife.org

This book is published for free distribution in eBook format. It is available in PDF, MOBI (for Kindle, etc.), and ePUB formats from the Way of Life web site. See the Free Book tab - www.wayoflife.org.

Darwin's Social Influence
Copyright 2011 by David W. Cloud