

Darwin's Theory of Evolution

--A Notion Rooted Deep in Racism, but not in Science!

Everyone is aware that Darwin's "The Origin of Species" (*Origin*) stands as the historic basis for the theory of evolution taught in the public schools throughout America. While the relative merits of the theory are widely studied today, what is not so commonly known (and **never** studied) is the fact that the mindset of the theory's author, as well as that of his contemporary supporters, was blatant racism. Not only was Darwin a raging racist, it was racism that drove him to initiate his *Origin* and "The Descent of Man" (*Descent*) studies, and forced him to his racist conclusions.

The following quotes and thoughts are provided to show that both the theory of evolution itself, and the men responsible for devising and propagating it, were raging racists.

- The first hint that Darwin was a racist can be seen in the subtitle selected for his "*Origin*." The words chosen were: "The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life". Whom do you suppose Darwin tagged the "Unfavored Races?" This subtitle has been eliminated from all modern printings of the book, but it remains on the original.
- If there is any doubt that Darwin was a raging racist, these words should leave no doubt: "At some future period (Darwin writes), not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes ... will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest Allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as the baboon, instead of as now between the Negro or Australian and the gorilla." (*Charles Darwin, The Descent of Man 2nd ed* (New York: A. L. Burt Co., 1874), p. 178).
- "No rational man (writes Thomas Huxley, a contemporary evolutionist), cognizant of the facts, believes that the average Negro is the equal, still less the superior, of the white man. And if this be true, it is simply incredible that, when all his disabilities are removed, and our prognathous relative has a fair field and no favor, as well as no oppressor, he will be able to compete successfully with his bigger-brained and smaller-jawed rival, in a contest which is to be carried out on by thoughts and not by bites." (*Thomas H. Huxley, "Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews"* (New York: Appleton, 1871) p. 20. *Huxley was arguing that blacks could not compete intellectually with Caucasians, even under equal and fair conditions.*)
- A half century later, Darwin follower Henry Fairfield Osborn writes: "The Negroid stock is even more ancient than the Caucasian and Mongolian, as

may be proved by an examination not only of the brain, of the hair, of the bodily characters such as the teeth, the genitalia, the sense organs, but of the instincts, the intelligence. The standard of intelligence of the average Negro is similar to that of the eleven-year-old youth of the species *Homo sapiens*. (*Henry Fairfield Osborn, "The Evolution of the Human Races," Natural History, Jan./Feb. 1926. Reprinted in Natural History 89 (April 1980): 129.*).

- It should be no surprise that no lesser racist villain than Adolf Hitler picked up on Darwin's evolutionary theories. Karl Schleunes writes: "Darwin's notion of struggle for survival was quickly appropriated by the racist ... such a struggle, legitimized by the latest scientific views, justified the racists' conception of superior and inferior peoples ... and validated the conflict between them." (*Karl A. Schleunes, The Twisted Road To Auschwitz (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1970)*p. 30 , 32. Cited by J. Bergman, "Eugenics and Nazi Racial Policy," p. 118.)
- Before 1859 (before Darwin's *Origin*), many scientists had questioned whether blacks were of the same species as whites, but they had no scientific basis for that notion. Things changed once Darwin presented his racist evolutionary schema. Darwin stated that African-Americans could not survive competition with their white near-relations, let alone being able to compete with the white race. According to Darwin, the African was inferior because he represented the "missing-link" between ape and Teuton. (*John C. Burham, Science, vol. 175 (February 4, 1972)* p.506).

It is a simple fact that America was substantially racist in the 1920's. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that the secularist movement of the day quickly espoused Darwin's racist evolutionary theories. Educational theorists such as John Dewey, playing off the fallout from the Scopes trial, were able to make Darwin's theory the mantra of public education philosophy.

We are now (hopefully) in the post-racist period in America. Thinking people cringe at Darwin's hatred for the African peoples. Thinking people view it as a disgrace that his racist theories are still being taught in the public schools.

Furthermore, serious scholarship now laughs at Darwin and his theory of natural selection on the scientific level. Stuart A. Kauffman (a premier scholar *outside* the circles of our schools of education) writes: "Natural selection, operating on variations which are random with respect to usefulness, appears a slim force for order in a chaotic world. ... Our legacy from Darwin, powerful as it is, has fractures as its foundations" (p.643, The Origins of Order, New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

It just makes sense that theory as fundamentally flawed, and blatantly racist, as is Darwin's theory of evolution (particularly as it relates to origin and natural selection), has no place being foisted upon the youth of our land today.

I say up with education; up with truth; up with sound scholarship; but down with racism, and definitely down with Darwin. It is time for a change. It is time to "Out the '**Darweenies**.'" (See below for a short summary of other quotes regarding the

un-scientific nature of Darwin's theories.)

1. "(Michael Denton, Molecular Biologist (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Adler and Adler, 1985):

"Considering the way the prebiotic soup is referred to in so many discussions of the origin of life as an already established reality, it comes as something of a shock to realize that there is absolutely no positive evidence for its existence." (p.261)

"The complexity of the simplest known type of cell is so great that it is impossible to accept that such an object could have been thrown together suddenly by some kind of freakish, vastly improbable, event. Such an occurrence would be indistinguishable from a miracle." (p.264)

"It is astonishing to think that this remarkable piece of machinery, which possesses the ultimate capacity to construct every living thing that ever existed on Earth, from giant redwood to the human brain, can construct all its own components in a matter of minutes and weigh less than 10 - 16 grams. It is of the order of several thousand million million times smaller than the smallest piece of machinery every constructed by man." (p.338)

"The twentieth century would be incomprehensible without the Darwinian revolution. The social and political currents which have swept the world in the past eighty years would have been impossible without its intellectual sanction. ... The influence of the evolutionary theory on fields far removed from biology is one of the most spectacular examples in history of how a highly speculative idea for which there is no really hard scientific evidence can come to fashion the thinking of a whole society and the social and moral transformation it caused in western thought, one might have hoped that Darwinian theory ... a theory of such cardinal importance, a theory that literally changed the world, would have been something more than metaphysics, something more than a myth." (p. 358)

2. "Evolution is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless." (Professor Louis Bounoure, Former: President of the Biological Society of Strassbourg, Director of the Strassbourg Zoological Museum, Director of Research at the French national Centre of Scientific Research, writing in "The Advocate," March 8, 1984, p. 17)
3. Dr. Colin Patterson, Senior Paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, London, writes: "One of the reasons I started taking this anti-evolutionary view, was ... it struck me that I had been working on this stuff for twenty years and there was not one thing I knew about it. That's quite a shock to learn that one can be so misled so long. ...so for the last few weeks I've tried putting a simple question to various people and groups of people. Question is: Can you tell me anything you know about

evolution, any one thing that is true? I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time and eventually one person said, 'I do know one thing -- it ought not to be taught in high school.'" (Keynote address at the American Museum of Natural History, New York City, 5 November, 1981)

4. "Scientists who utterly reject Evolution may be one of our fastest-growing controversial minorities... Many of the scientists supporting this position hold impressive credentials in science." (Larry Hatfield, "Educators Against Darwin," Science Digest Special, Winter, 1979, pp.9ff)
5. "One is forced to conclude that many scientists and technologists pay lip-service to Darwinian theory only because it supposedly excludes a Creator..." (Dr. Michael Walker, Senior Lecturer, Anthropology, Sydney Un Quadrant, Oct., 1982, p.44)
6. "Today our duty is to destroy the myth of evolution, considered as a simple, understood, and explained phenomenon which keeps rapidly unfolding before us. ... The deceit is sometimes unconscious, but no always, since some people, owing to their sectarianism, purposely overlook reality and refuse to acknowledge the inadequacies and falsity of their beliefs." (Pierre-Paul Grasse, Past-President, French Academy of Science, "Evolution of Living Organisms," Academic Press, New York, 1977, p.8)
7. Wolfgang Smith, Mathematician and Physicist, Prof. of Mathematics, Oregon State University, Former Math Instructor at MIT, writing in "Teilhardism and the New Religion: A Thorough Analysis of the Teachings of Darwin" (Tan Books and Publishers, 1988, pp.1,2) writes: "Today, a hundred and twenty-eight years after it was first promulgated, the Darwinian theory of evolution stands under attack as never before. ... The fact is that in recent times there has been increasing dissent on the issue within academic and professional ranks, and that a growing number of respectable scientists are defecting from the evolutionist camp. It is interesting, moreover, that for the most part these 'experts' have abandoned Darwinism, not on the basis of religious faith or biblical persuasions, but on strictly scientific grounds, and in some instances regrettably, as one could say. ...We are told dogmatically that Evolution is an established fact; but we are never told who has established it, and by what means. We are told, often enough, that the doctrine is founded upon evidence, and that indeed this evidence 'is henceforward above all verification, as well as being immune from any subsequent contradiction'; but we are left entirely in the dark on the crucial question wherein, precisely, this evidence consists."
8. "In fact, evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists accepted it and many are prepared to 'bend' their observations to fit in with it." (H.J. Lipson, F.R.S, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution,"

Physics Bulletin, Vol. 31, 1980)

9. "Scientists who go about teaching that evolution is a fact of life are great con-men, and the story they are telling may be the greatest hoax ever. In explaining evolution we do not have one iota of fact." (Dr. T.N. Tahmisan, Physiologist, Atomic Energy Commission. As quoted in: "Evolution and the Emperor's New Clothes, 3D Enterprises Limited, 1983, Title Page)
10. "I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it's been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books of the future. Posterity will marvel that so very flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has." (Malcom Muggeridge, Well-known Journalist and Philosopher, Pascal Lectures, University of Waterloo)
11. "After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science found itself in the unenviable position of having to create a mythology of its own: namely, the assumption that what, after long effort could not be proved to take place today, had, in truth, taken place in the primeval past." (Loren Eiseley, PhD., writing in "Anthropology -- The Immense Journey," Random House, NY, 1957, p. 199)
12. The following citations are from I.L. Cohen's "Darwin Was Wrong - A Study in Probability," New Research Publications, Inc., 1984. Cohen is a Mathematician, Researcher, a Member of the New York Academy of Sciences, and an Officer of the Archaeological Institute of America.)

"In a certain sense, the debate transcends the confrontation between evolutionists and creationists. We now have a debate within the scientific community itself; it is a confrontation between scientific objectivity and ingrained prejudice - between logic and emotion - between fact and fiction." (pp.6,7)

"...In the final analysis, objective scientific logic has to prevail - no matter what the final result is - no matter how many time-honored idols have to be discarded in the process." (p.8)

"...After all, it is not the duty of science to defend the theory of evolution, and stick by it to the bitter end - no matter what illogical and unsupported conclusions it offers. ... If in the process of impartial scientific logic, they find that creation by outside superintelligence is the solution to our quandary, then let's cut the umbilical cord that tied us down to Darwin for such a long time. It is choking us and holding us back." (pp. 214-215)

"... every single concept advanced by the theory of evolution (and amended thereafter) is imaginary as it is not supported by scientifically established facts of microbiology, fossils, and mathematical probability concepts. Darwin was wrong." (p.209)

"... The theory of evolution may be the worst mistake made in

science." (p. 210)

Darwin's Theory of Evolution is **blatantly** racist, and it is **bad science**. It is time for "seed" change in education. It is time to stand up, to wise up, and to "Out the **'Darweenies.'** Our children deserve it.

--Mike Carrier, MA (New York University, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences)

(Note: When Darwin refers to "races" here, there can be no doubt that what was intended was a meaning quite similar to the current meaning of the term. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, historically the term at that time meant: "A group of persons, animals, or plants, connected by common decent or origin." It is also clear, when taken in the context of his entire work, Darwin intended the term rendered in the English as "race" to mean basically the same thing as it means in current usage. You must remember, that while *Origin* did not specifically include a direct treatment of Darwin's notion of mankind's history, he fully intended us to make that connection. In fact, Darwin himself inextricably connected mankind's descent to his ground-laying work in *Origin*. He writes that through his *Origin* "[Much] light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history" (*Origin* p. 407). Darwin himself further tied the knot with his words in his second edition of *Descent*: "...this [referring to the quote from *Origin*] implies that man must be included with other organic beings in any general conclusion respecting his manner of appearance on the earth" ("The Descent of Man, by Charles Darwin," Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1998, p. 1). There is no doubt that Darwin viewed his *Origin* as a two-part series, as *Origin/Descent*. ...And that once he completed his total task, he intended that *Origin* should never be read without *Descent*. This effort was actually referred to as "one long argument" by Ernst Mayr in his so-titled book, "One Long Argument: Charles Darwin and the Genesis of Modern Evolutionary Thought" (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991). In *Origin* Darwin was merely laying the groundwork for *Descent*. He knew that politically, that was the only way he could accomplish his task. Dr. H. James Brix writes in his Introduction of a recent publication of *Descent* that "...Darwin had not included a treatment of the birth and history of humankind in *Origin*, because he feared adding to the sharp ridicule that would surely surround his scientific theory..." ("The Descent of Man, by Charles Darwin," Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1998, p. xvii.). I am convinced that it is safe to say that the *only* right way to regard *Origin* is as *Origin/Descent*. Only then can Darwin be fully (read "rightly") understood. To regard *Descent* merely as afterthought, or as a separate collection of subsequent thoughts, would be to miss the whole point Darwin was trying to make. It is totally obvious in the second part of his work that the so-called "savage races" were, in his racist mind, destined for annihilation, for he writes in *Descent* that: "At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes ... will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest Allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as the baboon, instead of as now between the Negro or Australian and the gorilla." ("The Descent of Man, by Charles Darwin," Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1998, pp.162,163.). [\(Back to text\)](#)