

# The Discerner

the voice of... **Religion Analysis Service**

A QUARTERLY EXPOSING  
UNBIBLICAL TEACHING & MOVEMENTS

Volume 35, Number 2

April • May • June 2015

Eckankar  
Confucianism

Hare Krishna

Freemasons

Jehovah's Witnesses

Humanism

Jainism

Judaism

Neopaganism

MOONIES

Universalism

Wicca

Islam

**Exposed!**

MORMONS

BAHA'I FAITH

Buddhism

Scientology

Satanism

## In This Edition:

Dear Reader – Moral Direction! ..... 2  
*by Larry Sutherland*

With This Issue ..... 4

Accommodation or Compromise: The Ongoing  
Battle for the Bible ..... 5  
*by Steve Lagoan*

Darwin and the Races of Man ..... 16  
*by Shawn Stevens*

QUIZ on Animals in the Bible ..... 29



*"Hereby know we the spirit of truth  
and the spirit of error" 1 John 4:6*

# **The Discerner**

Volume 35, Number 2  
April • May • June 2015

## **Religion Analysis Service**

### **Board Members**

Rev. Steve Lagoon: President  
Rev. Laurence J. Sutherland: Vice-President  
and Editor of "The Discerner,"  
Steve Devore: Treasurer, Office Manager  
Scott Harvath  
George Welshons  
Rick Dack

PO Box 206  
Chaska, MN 55318  
**612-331-3342 / 1-800-562-9153**  
**FAX 612-331-3342**

info@ras.org <http://www.ras.org>  
Published Quarterly  
Price \$10.00 for 4 issues  
Foreign subscriptions \$14.00

## **Religion Analysis Service Board of Reference**

Dr. Norman Geisler  
Dr. James Walker  
Don Veinot  
Dr. Ron Rhodes  
Robert Bowman  
M. Kurt Goedelman



## **DEAR READER – MORAL DIRECTION!**

As I write these lines, we as a nation have just gone through some tumultuous and momentous times in our political, judicial, and social history. I refer to the Supreme Court's approval of the controversial Obama health insurance legislation and, on its heels, the court's sanction of same-sex marriage for all 51 states. It remains to be seen how all of this will work itself out, but evangelicals and conservatives are extremely concerned about the moral direction of our nation.

We wonder how the traditionally accepted definition of marriage since its Genesis foundation could be so completely altered within a few years in our 21st century AD. Liberals term this development the "new tradition," which is strange mathematics and semantics for God's age-preserving plan (of over 6,000 years) for the human race. I believe the answer for this lies in the whittling away of moral dimensions since the 1800s – the era of the so-called Enlightenment/Age of Reason in Europe that gradually eroded the authority and veracity of the Bible and, in its stead, the acceptance of human reasoning such as the Darwinian evolutionary worldview. The repercussions of these attacks on the Bible with their humanism, amoral education, and questionable scientific hypotheses have affected many countries and cultures, including the United States.

Having taught in a Christian Bible School in Germany for over 25 years, I feel especially drawn to quote from a German evangelical leader who is now living in the United States. Just a few days ago this leader wrote to hundreds of friends through his e-mail service. The following is my free translation of this message. (If an exact German wording is desired, please request such from me.)

“Today, President Obama again demonstrated how unbiblical he governs in this country which was founded upon biblical principles. Although the Bible incessantly condemns sin and the immorality of homosexuality (Leviticus 18:22, 20:13, 1. Corinthians 6:3-10, Romans 1:26-27, Jude 7, and 2. Peter 2:6-7), Obama believes exactly the opposite and condones sin. Many evangelicals and I are deeply troubled that the man who swore an oath and laid his hand upon the Bible at his inauguration now proclaims the exact opposite to what the Bible teaches. When he was elected six years ago, I was also happy that a black man finally had been chosen for the highest office in America. However, I did have some reservations as to his inexperience. His inexperience, however, in no way excuses his present repugnant positions.

Please pray for us, we who live in this country and must observe how this country under Obama’s leadership continues to descend into moral abyss. The founders of this land would be enraged to witness what is now happening. Also, at the present time pastors stand in danger of being penalized if they continue to preach biblical truths or refuse to bless same-sex marriages. Naturally we love them (those in these relationships) and I do too, since we are all humans. As is true of all people, we sin too. Jesus also loved sinners while He was on earth, but He hated and judged sin. Likewise we must hate and expose sin. According to the Bible homosexuality is sin, even as are lying, deception, thievery, adultery, etc. It appears that we are experiencing again the times of Sodom and Gomorrah.”  
(W. B., Florida)

This German-American man has served for some 50 years as an evangelist and missionary in Germany, Europe, China, and the United States.

May we live circumspectly and serve diligently in these days of confusion and lawlessness. May God give us wisdom and patience in these days of testing from so many directions.

*Laurence J. Sutherland*

## WITH THIS ISSUE

RAS has often analyzed and exposed The Worldwide Church of God or Armstrongism over the last 60 years. The WCG has been a source of formidable opposition to the Gospel with its strange muddling of eclecticism that combines the false teachings of Jehovah's Witnesses, Seventh Day Adventism, Mormonism, and a frightful dose of clever biblical error. Why do we again turn our focus on the teachings and lives of Herbert W. Armstrong and his successors, among them Peter Tkach? The investigation and revelations of *Transforming the Truth* by Peter Ditzel rehearse and reflect on reported changes toward more evangelical positions in fact and in practice. This might be considered a review of a cult reforming itself. The writer does admit to some positive changes in this organization, but glaring gaps still exist in WCG's doctrinal positions and in the integrity of its total transformation.

Our second investigation centers around the beginnings of evolution in the 1800s with questionable scientific studies by Charles Darwin, as he combined empirical research (Galapagos Islands) and ideology (faulty anthropology and biology). I find the tracking of the morphing of science with ideology by Canadian author Shawn Stevens as very careful and meticulous, especially as he deals with the German connection. In the 1970s while I studied at the University of Tuebingen in southern Germany, we were constantly bombarded with the political and religious ramifications of social Darwinism. *I would suggest that readers take their time as they peruse the literature that Shawn Stevens uses for his assessments. Social Darwinism appears to be interwoven in the total fabric of society and our basic world view.*

*The quiz on animals in the Bible should not be a hard test for seasoned Bible readers. How about testing children in the church or family with it?*

*Laurence J. Sutherland*

# ACCOMMODATION OR COMPROMISE: THE ONGOING BATTLE FOR THE BIBLE

by Steve Lagoon

One of the doctrines most precious to Bible-believing Christians is the doctrine of inerrancy. Essentially this means that we accept the Bible as the very word of God, and therefore trustworthy in all that it affirms and teaches (2 Timothy 3:16–17; 2 Peter 1:20–21).

## Defining inerrancy and Infallibility

Now the terms infallible and inerrant are sometimes used synonymously and at other times they are distinguished. Kevin Bauder says, “Nor is it relevant that the NAE statement refers to infallibility rather than inerrancy. Most evangelicals of the 1940’s simply did not distinguish these concepts.”<sup>1</sup>

But as times moved on, some scholars began to distinguish the terms infallibility and inerrancy. When they are distinguished, usually inerrancy is the stronger term. That is, sometimes infallibility is meant to mean that the Bible is true and without error when it speaks to spiritual matters, but may contain mistakes in other matters such as geology, history, or science.

On the other hand, inerrancy usually means that the Bible is true or without error in all that it affirms including not only spiritual matters, but geological, historical, or scientific. Kevin Vanhoozer notes that:

The problem, however, is that that many people in my context (North American evangelicalism) use the term *infallibility* as a contrast term to *inerrancy*, meaning something like ‘true in matters of faith and practice.’ In other words, in my context, *infallibility* often means ‘limited inerrancy’ (i.e. limited to matters concerning God and Salvation).<sup>2</sup>

Because of the variation in usage, one must be careful when studying this issue in how the terms are being used and defined being aware that sometimes infallibility is used with essentially the same

1 Kevin T. Bauder, in *The Spectrum of Evangelicalism*, Andrew David Naselli & Collin Hansen, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan, 2011) 189.

2 Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Five Views of Biblical Inerrancy*, J. Merrick, Stephen M. Garrett, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan Publishing, 2013) 188.

meaning as inerrancy and at other times it is used for a more limited sense of infallibility that applies only to spiritual matters addressed in the Bible.

### **Inerrancy Logically flows from Inspiration**

Harold Lindsell describes well how the truth of Scripture's inspiration logically leads to inerrancy:

However limited may have been their knowledge, and however much they erred when they were not writing sacred Scripture, the authors of Scripture, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, were preserved from making factual, historical, scientific, or other errors . . . God the Holy Spirit by nature cannot lie or be the author of untruth. If the Scripture is inspired at all it must be infallible.<sup>3</sup>

Likewise, Mennonite scholar J. Otis Yoder:

Biblical inerrancy means the Bible contains no error. It is without error in faith and fact. If we have the self-disclosure of the holy God, it cannot be mixed with error. Error and truth cannot be contained in the same document which claims to be a self-disclosure of a holy, righteous God. If error is mixed with truth, then that is deception which violates the character of God.<sup>4</sup>

### **The Baby in the Crib Analogy**

I once had a pastor in the American Baptist USA tradition tell me, "If you love the Bible, you have to throw away that inerrancy stuff." He held to the view that the Bible's relationship to revelation or truth was comparable to how a cradle holds a baby. The Bible may well contain errors, but within it there is God's truth.

There are at least two obvious problems with this analogy. First, it is difficult to accept that God allows fallible truth to be contained in his word along with His truth. How can this be a trustworthy guide for His saints?

More importantly, there is the question of how the Christian is to determine which parts of the Bible are inspired truths from God and which parts are the fallible errors of men.

---

3 Harold Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible: The Book that Rocked the Evangelical World*, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan Publishing House, 1976, 1981)30-31

4 J. Otis Yoder & Harold S. Martin, *Biblical Inerrancy and Reliability*, Harrisonburg VA (Fellowship of Concerned Mennonites, 1985) 9.

Harold Martin explains:

If in the Scripture God is not always speaking (The Scriptures are partly of God and partly the ideas of mere men), then the reader himself is required to determine where God speaks and where He does not. This makes an idol out of the human mind.<sup>5</sup>

### **The View of Religion Analysis Service**

It should be clear from the outset that *Religion Analysis Service* affirms belief in the full inerrancy of Scripture. Of course, this inerrancy is true of the original auto graphs and to our Bibles today as they faithfully represent the original autographs.

In other words, we endorse the view of Scripture that the apostle Paul held, “And we also thank God continually because, when you received the word of God, which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men, but as it actually is, the word of God” (1 Thessalonians 2:13).

We agree with Harold Martin:

The inspiration and authority of the Bible is the foundation upon which the entire edifice of Christian truth is standing. If this foundation falters the whole Christian faith goes with it. Thus it is against this foundation, the reliability of Scripture, that Satan launches his most vicious attacks.<sup>6</sup>

### **Inerrancy as the Historic View of the Christian Church**

There can be no question that this has been the view of the historic Christian Church all down through the centuries, even if the modern term of inerrancy was not itself used.

Southern Baptist leader R. Albert Mohler Jr. stated: “Only since the very end of the seventeenth century, with the rise of biblical criticism, has the belief in the inerrancy of Scripture been widely challenged among Christians.”<sup>7</sup> In *The Battle for the Bible*, Harold Lindsell stated: “From the historical perspective it can be said that for two thousand years the Christian church has agreed that the Bible is completely trustworthy; it is infallible or inerrant.”<sup>8</sup>

5 J. Otis Yoder & Harold S. Martin, *Biblical Inerrancy and Reliability*, Harrisonburg VA (Fellowship of Concerned Mennonites, 1985) 38.

6 J. Otis Yoder & Harold S. Martin, *Biblical Inerrancy and Reliability*, Harrisonburg VA (Fellowship of Concerned Mennonites, 1985) 30.

7 R. Albert Mohler Jr., *Five Views of Biblical Inerrancy*, J. Merrick, Stephen M. Garrett, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan Publishing, 2013) 41.

8 Harold Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible: The Book that Rocked the Evangelical World*, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan Publishing House, 1976, 1981) 19.

But in the modern period, many Christians in the mainline protestant traditions have abandoned the inerrancy of Scripture in reaction to the many false claims of higher criticism and evolutionary science.

### **Enemies in the Camp**

What is even more troubling is when those in fundamentalist and evangelical circles begin to make the same compromises on Scripture that their counterparts in the mainline liberal churches have done. While desiring to still be identified as conservative and Bible believing, yet they find ways to interpret the Scriptures that are a sell-out to the claims of Scripture itself.

It seems that each generation of conservative Bible believing Christians will have to fight the fight anew to defend the authority, reliability, and inerrancy of the Scriptures. In the last generation, Harold Lindsell's book *The Battle for the Bible* was "The book that rocked the evangelical world." Looking back, Mohler says:

Revisionist evangelicals have argued that the doctrine of the Bible's inerrancy can or should be abandoned in light of modern challenges or postmodern structures of thought. Heated costly battles over biblical inerrancy marked evangelicalism in the 1970s and thereafter. The strident warning issued in the 1970s by Harold Lindsell, a former editor of *Christianity Today*, in *The Battle for the Bible* presaged the battle lines that continue today. Though Lindsell was often criticized as alarmist at the time, developments within the evangelical world vindicated his warnings in short order.<sup>9</sup>

### **The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy**

Roger Nicole tells us:

On October 26–28, 1978, the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy held a summit meeting near the Chicago airport. At that time it issued a statement on biblical inerrancy which included a Preamble, a Short Statement, Nineteen Articles of Affirmation and Denial, and more ample Exposition . . . A draft committee of Drs. Edmund P. Clowney, Norman L. Geisler, Harold W. Hoehner, Donald E. Hoke, Roger R. Nicole, James I. Packer, Earl D. Radmacher, and R. C. Sproul labored hard.<sup>10</sup>

---

9 R. Albert Mohler, in *The Spectrum of Evangelicalism*, Andrew David Naselli & Collin Hansen, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan, 2011) 90.

10 R. C. Sproul, *Explaining Inerrancy*, 1980 by the International Council of Biblical Inerrancy/ Orlando FL (Ligonier Ministries, 1996) 5.



Their efforts led to the *Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy* which has become a standard guide for many in the evangelical movement. It is essential for our pastors and leaders to study this document and materials that flowed from it such as *Explaining Inerrancy*<sup>11</sup> by R. C. Sproul; *Inerrancy*<sup>12</sup> edited by Norman Geisler, and *Inerrancy and the Church*<sup>13</sup> edited by John D. Hannah. These works contain a wealth of scholarship giving reasons for the faith we have in God's word.

### **What's Happening in the Evangelical Seminary?**

Sadly, these attacks on scriptural inerrancy are increasingly being taught by professors in our conservative seminaries. Such professors have essentially capitulated to evolutionary science and hence have rejected a literal interpretation of Genesis.

In addition to the acceptance of evolution, another common idea among these teachers is that the creation and flood stories of Genesis are simply reflections of the cultural environment in which they were written, a product of their time, in short myths.

It must be repeated that we are not concerned that evangelical students are informed about these theories, but what is troubling is that these attacks on the veracity of Genesis are being taught as truth in Evangelical schools.

Harold Martin captures these concerns:

Many who are paid to stand in our pulpits and to teach in our colleges, whose duty it is to teach and to proclaim God's truth, are instead sowing seeds of unbelief, and in the name of science and of scholarship these persons are gradually destroying the faith of those to whom they minister.<sup>14</sup>

### **The Edenic Battlefield**

Perhaps ground one for this battle between those who espouse inerrancy, and those compromising evangelicals is how they interpret the early chapters of Genesis. It is amazing to me that self-identified evangelicals are debating whether Adam and Eve were literal, real, and historical persons or not.

---

11 R. C. Sproul, *Explaining Inerrancy*, 1980 by the International Council of Biblical Inerrancy/ Orlando FL (Ligonier Ministries, 1996)

12 *Inerrancy*, Edited by Norman L. Geisler, Grand Rapids MI (Academie Books, 1980).

13 *Inerrancy and the Church*, Edited by John D. Hannah, Chicago IL (Moody Press, 1984).

14 J. Otis Yoder & Harold S. Martin, *Biblical Inerrancy and Reliability*, Harrisonburg VA (Fellowship of Concerned Mennonites, 1985) 30.

For instance, in *Four Views on The Historical Adam*, the book's editors Matthew Barrett and Ardel Caneday assess the views of scholars within the evangelical movement. About Peter Enns, they say:

Enns instead argues that 'the special creation of the first Adam as described in the Bible is not literally historical.' Enns has been at the forefront of the discussion over Adam in part because of his contention that the apostle Paul should be viewed as a first-century man who incorrectly believed in Adam's historicity.<sup>15</sup>

Indeed, Enns makes his view of inerrancy clear, "Put another way, inerrancy is a theory . . . Inerrancy should be amended accordingly or, in my view, scrapped altogether."<sup>16</sup>

Barrett and Caneday add, "Denis O. Lamoureux, agrees with Enns and Collins in rejecting a historical Adam."<sup>17</sup> Lamoureux himself states: "Real history in the Bible begins roughly around chapter 12 with Abraham. Like many other evangelical theologians, I view Genesis 1–11 as a unique type of literature (literary genre) that is distinct from the rest of the Bible . . . I do not believe that Adam was historical."<sup>18</sup>

And again, they state:

Various interpretations are given of Adam and Eve. Typically, they are seen as a group of people or as names (symbols) used to refer to humanity as a whole, but not as a single pair from whom all humanity originates. Rau identifies several advocates of this view, including Howard Van Till and Kenneth Miller as well as Francis Collins and the BioLogos Foundation.<sup>19</sup>

They sum up Greg Boyd's position, "Boyd argues that our faith is secure whether or not there was a historical Adam."<sup>20</sup>

---

15 *Four Views on the Historical Adam*, Matthew Barrett & Ardel Caneday, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan, 2013) 27. They cite the Peter Enns quote from: Peter Enns, *The Evolution of Adam: What the Bible Does and Doesn't Say About Human Origins*, Grand Rapids MI (Brazos Press, 2012) xvi.

16 Peter Enns, *Five Views of Biblical Inerrancy*, J. Merrick, Stephen M. Garrett, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan Publishing, 2013) 84.

17 *Four Views on the Historical Adam*, Matthew Barrett & Ardel Caneday, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan, 2013) 27.

18 *Four Views on the Historical Adam*, Matthew Barrett & Ardel Caneday, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan, 2013) 44.

19 *Four Views on the Historical Adam*, Matthew Barrett & Ardel Caneday, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan, 2013) 21.

20 *Four Views on the Historical Adam*, Matthew Barrett & Ardel Caneday, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan, 2013) 34.

It is important to remember that all these scholars are not considered liberals, *but evangelical scholars teaching at “conservative” Bible colleges and seminaries!*

The denial that Adam and Eve were literal historical founders of the human race is incredible in light of the clear teaching of the Bible. To the people of Athens, the apostle Paul declared, “From one man he made every nation of men, that they should inhabit the whole earth” (Acts 17:26).

To the Romans Paul said, “Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men . . . Nevertheless, death reigned from the time of Adam”(Romans 5:12,14).

Peter Enns suggests that Paul was just plain wrong, though his writings were inspired by God, or God-breathed if you will. We cannot fathom that God would allow Paul to write and teach falsehood under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Peter Enns stated, “The premise that such an inerrant Bible is the only kind of book God would be able to produce, or the only effective means of divine communication, strikes me as assuming that God shares our modern interest in accuracy and scientific precision.”<sup>21</sup>

We can either choose to follow the uninspired teachings of Peter Enns or the God inspired teachings of the apostle Paul. We can bow with Enns at the altar of modern naturalism or bow before our holy God. The choice should be clear.

## **The Conservative Reaction**

Thankfully, there are many in our current generation dedicated to the truth of the inerrancy of Scripture. A great place to become informed on this movement is the *Defending Inerrancy* website (<http://defendinginerrancy.com/>) which contains great articles and links to conferences promoting biblical inerrancy.

This website agrees that one of the major battlegrounds over the question of Biblical reliability is the proper interpretation of the biblical book of Genesis. For instance, Dr. William C. Roach says:

Scholars claim research indicates humanity is merely the byproduct of evolution or that Adam is merely a hominoid representative for the rest of humanity. Others will claim Jesus was merely reflecting

---

21 Peter Enns, *Five Views of Biblical Inerrancy*, J. Merrick, Stephen M. Garrett, General Editors, Grand Rapids MI (Zondervan Publishing, 2013) 84.

the cultural customs of his day, or Paul was merely a pre-literate man saturated in the false views of his day; therefore, he was not really qualified to speak about the historical Adam or the truthfulness of gender roles.<sup>22</sup>

That ideas like these are penetrating evangelical institutions of higher learning should be raising great alarm. Too often, evangelicals our compromising on truth in order to find more acceptance in academia.

### **A Personal Example**

Let me give you a personal example from my own experience. While working on my Master of Divinity degree, one of my professors was teaching a view of Genesis that rejected the literal view of Adam and Eve as actual historical persons. In a private conversation, I asked what I thought was the obvious question. Didn't Jesus treat the stories of creation including Adam and Eve as real historical events, even basing his marriage teachings upon them?

The Professor's answer threw me for a curve, as much for its cleverness as for its horrifying implications. He said that Jesus was merely accommodating to the beliefs of his first century (or second Temple period) Jewish audience. Since they believed in a literal interpretation of Genesis, it was simply practical or prudent to go along with their mistaken beliefs in order to teach his views concerning the sacredness of marriage (Matthew 19:1–12).

In other words, rather than correcting what he knew was their false understanding or interpretation of Genesis, Jesus not only left them in their ignorance, but used their wrong understanding as a basis for his teaching. Yes, such things are actually being taught in our evangelical colleges and seminaries.

### **There Be Dragons!**

I quote at length Garrett Deweese's assessment to the so-called accommodations of Jesus:

Thus some Christians have maintained that moral understanding can grow, mature, and become more refined, through years of thoughtful reflection on moral philosophy. So presumably, we should realize that we may well be more enlightened with respect to many contemporary issues than were the New Testament authors.

---

<sup>22</sup> Dr. William C. Roach, John MacArthur's Recent Conference on Inerrancy, <http://defendinginerrancy.com/2015-inerrancy-summit/>

The upshot of this approach is that the ‘authority’ of Jesus (or Scripture) is subject to revision as contemporary culture ‘advances’ . . . Two strategies are on offer that allow an interpretation to reject what seems to be explicit teaching and still affirm Jesus’ authority. The first says that Jesus knew that some of what he said was false, but he was accommodating his teaching to the common cultural beliefs of his day [the 2nd approach is to appeal to the kenosis of Christ to show he actually didn’t know he was wrong due to his self-limitation during the incarnation.] . . .

Accommodation? It might well be that Jesus (and indeed the Holy Spirit), inspiring the authors of the books of the Bible, accommodated his teachings to popular belief . . . Parents often accommodate beliefs of their children (whether to Santa Claus, or where babies come from, or Uncle Dave being as strong as a Superhero), without thereby endorsing them as true. So too, the claim goes, Jesus sometimes accommodated the false beliefs of his audience in his teachings. And the same would go for the inspired writers of Scripture.

We need to tread very carefully here; *this is territory that should be marked as some medieval maps were, with the warning, ‘there be dragons!’* . . . And if he knows it to be false, it’s a deception. He is either asserting what he knows to be false (and thus a lie), or using an unsound argument (and thus sophistry). In that case, I’ll say that it is not a benign but a *malign accommodation*.<sup>23</sup>

## What About Jonah?

I asked the same professor about the prophet Jonah since Jesus refers to him and uses his example as a prophetic illustration of His own coming death, burial, and resurrection:

He answered, ‘a wicked and adulterous generation asks for a miraculous sign! But none will be given it except the sign of Jonah. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of a huge fish, so the Son of Man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh will stand up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah’ (Matthew 12:39–41).

My professor suggested that Jesus was again merely accommodating to the beliefs of that culture though He knew full well that the story of Jonah was nothing but a big fish story for pious teaching, but not ever meant to be taken as literal history.

---

23 Garrett J. DeWeese, *Doing Philosophy as a Christian*, Downer’s Grove IL (Inter-Varsity Press, 2011) 97-98.

This is an amazing hermeneutical tool for those Bible scholars who had been formally embarrassed by the miraculous narratives in the Bible. No longer need they be ridiculed by their fellow biblical scholars in academia. No, all they have to do is reinterpret historical narratives into a different genre, and claim that they are still being true to God's word.

### **The Magic Hermeneutical Wand**

Just wave the genre wand and presto, history becomes mere story. Oh, but Genesis sure seems like history. But our compromising professors tell us that it is a different kind of history written from the point of view of ignorant men unaware of modern science, much less of modern standards of history.

In other words, much of early Genesis was simply lifted from the cultural environment of the ancient Near East and modified by the editors of the Torah. Since the author(s) of Genesis were writing from their pre-scientific ignorance, their narrative of origins cannot be taken seriously, most especially because they collide head on with the one source of truth they accept without exception . . . evolutionary science.

And so evolutionary scenarios for origins are enshrined as inerrant while the Biblical account of Origins is set aside as nothing more than ancient tales from ignorant men.

What does all this mean for inerrancy? Everything, for it assumes that Genesis was not the product of a man writing under the inspiration of God, writing just what God wanted him to reveal to mankind, but is instead just a good inspirational story with some kernel of truth that can be gleamed from the errant shell.

### **We Must Decide**

I do not at all object to being taught about these views of Genesis. But what I object to is that these views are being taught as truth in evangelical institutions. These supposed new hermeneutical tools are in truth merely ways to sneak dead liberalism into the backdoor of evangelicalism.

The great theologian Gresham Machen battled these same issues of accommodation during the modernist controversies of the of the 1920s and 1930s and his word are prophetic for today:

Our principal concern just now is to show that the liberal attempt at reconciling Christianity with modern science has really relinquished

everything distinctive of Christianity . . . In trying to remove from Christianity everything that could possibly be objected to in the name of science, in trying to bribe off the enemy by those concessions which the enemy most desires, the apologist has really abandoned what started out to defend.<sup>24</sup>

### **Deconstruction, Reconstruction, and Faithfulness**

While I was going through college and seminary, I often heard the doctrine of inerrancy attacked and even ridiculed in light of the challenges from postmodern thinking. Indeed, at one institution, I was encouraged to go through a process of deconstruction in which one systematically rejected all their conservative ideas about the Bible, chief among them that allegedly worn out monstrosity called inerrancy.

May it never be! Rather, it is my prayer that these sincere men I studied with will eventually go through a process of reconstruction and return to the Bible and truths that God has revealed. To our readers, we encourage you to retain your faith in God' word and not be upset by those who wish to distort God's word.

*Steve Lagoon*

---

24 J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism*, Grand Rapids MI (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1923) 6.

# DARWIN AND THE RACES OF MAN

by Shawn Stevens of Zion Christian Ministry

Visit: [zionchristianministry.com](http://zionchristianministry.com)

Many have written about the early evolutionist, Charles Darwin, critiquing his scientific work on the origin of species and natural selection. In this book, we will examine the fruit of his teaching. Did Darwin's teaching give rise to a philosophy of good will towards one's fellow man? Or was the foundation of Darwin's teaching a mixture of science and racism? There are many who will be offended at a book like this and that is because we are going to take a look at another face of Darwinism. This is a face that many have tried to conceal. Nevertheless, history itself reveals to us a disturbing picture of social Darwinism which is rooted in racism, and has fed racism, even to the extreme of ethnic cleansing and genocide.

In 1859, Darwin published his famous book *On The Origin Of Species*. Although not all of his ideas were original, the publishing of this book really represents the launching of the *theory of evolution*. Although this is well-known, most people are unaware that the full title of Darwin's book was *On The Origin Of Species : The Preservation Of Favored Races And The Struggle For Life*. The "Origin" book didn't particularly deal with human life but, instead, theorized about the process of evolution on its widest biological scale. However, in 1871, Darwin printed another book, titled *The Descent Of Man*, in which he applied his theories to human life. Through this book, Darwin spread the idea of there being different races of people. These races included primitive and lower races as well as advanced and higher races.<sup>1</sup> Because of this, the late Harvard University professor, Stephen J. Gould, said; "Biological arguments for racism may have been common before 1859, but they increased by orders of magnitude following the acceptance of evolutionary theory."<sup>2</sup>

It would be hard to overstate the degree of frenzy that Darwin's material stirred up within the scientific community. However, this evolutionary theory did not simply stay in the scientific arena. It received great attention from social commentators and political leaders. It came to be believed that black people evolved from less intelligent gorillas, while orientals evolved from a species of orangutans and caucasians came from chimpanzees, allegedly the most intelligent of all primates.<sup>3</sup> A worldwide effort was launched to study and gather supposed "missing link" specimens. Different countries were eager to prove that their race of humanity evolved



before other races. Germans boasted the “Neanderthal” fossils while the British made a similar boast with “Piltdown Man.”<sup>4</sup> There is documented evidence that the remains of possibly 10,000 Australian aborigines, another people group which were considered primitive, were taken to museums in England for research to try to substantiate missing link evidence. The United States was also deeply involved in this same pursuit. In fact, the Smithsonian Institution in Washington has the remains of over 15,000 individuals. Where did these remains come from? They were obtained by widespread grave-robbing practices, as well as by actual hunting of aboriginal people. An 1866 memoir from Korah Wills, a mayor in Queensland, Australia, tells of how he hunted and killed tribesmen for the purpose of gathering specimens. Museums were not only interested in bones but, in some cases, in fresh skins which were stuffed and made into evolutionary displays.<sup>5</sup>

Because Darwin suggested that the evolution of humans resulted from the enlargement of the human brain, the skulls of some supposedly primitive specimens were studied and compared. It came as a shock to anthropologists that the brain of statesman Daniel Webster was smaller than that of one of these specimens.<sup>6</sup>

Evolutionary theory flourished in America. What was the early fruit of evolutionary theory in America? Evolutionary theory quickly found its way into school textbooks and with it came the belief that there were multiple races of man. In 1925, a school biology textbook titled, *A Civic Biology Presented In Problems*, taught children the following:

*The Races of Man. At the present time there exist upon the earth five races ... the highest type of all, the Caucasians, represented by the civilized white inhabitants of Europe and America.*<sup>7</sup>

From this, we see both the root and the fruit of Darwinian evolution in the American educational system.

Perhaps one of the saddest stories in the progression of evolutionary theory is that of Ota Benga. He was born in 1881 in Central Africa and lived as a hunter of animals. Ethnically he was a pygmy, a husband and a father of two. One day, after returning to his village from a successful elephant hunt, he discovered that his wife, children and friends had been murdered and mutilated by representatives of the Belgian government. He was later captured and sold into slavery. In 1904, he was brought to the United States by Samuel Verner. Being a pygmy, his physical features made him unique and of interest to Westerners. Ota was 4'-11" tall and weighed 103 pounds. He was often referred to as “the boy” even though he had been a husband and

father. His intelligence levels were studied and compared to defective caucasians in society. As well, how he responded to pain was studied.<sup>8</sup> *The Scientific American* of July 23, 1904, printed this report on pygmies:

*They are small, ape-like, elfish creatures ... they live in absolute savagery, and while they exhibit many ape-like features in their bodies, they possess a certain alertness which appears to make them more intelligent than other Negroes ... the existence of the pygmies is of the rudest; they do not practice agriculture, and keep no domestic animals. They live by means of hunting and snaring, eking this out by means of thieving from the big Negroes, on the outskirts of whose tribes they usually establish their little colonies, though they are as unstable as water, and range far and wide through the forests. They have seemingly become acquainted with metal only through contact with superior beings.*<sup>9</sup>

At the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair, Ota was put on display as an "emblematic savage." The exhibit was set up to display the stages of evolution, with the darkest blacks set apart from the caucasians. The crowds came, some to take pictures and others to prod and harass Ota. He was grabbed and pushed by many bullies who came to see the exhibit.

The exhibit at the St. Louis World's Fair was not the only display that Ota was forced to participate in. Dr. Hornady, the director of the Bronx Zoological Gardens (New York), decided to put Ota on display in a cage that he shared with park apes. This display ran for days and was hugely popular. On September 16, 1906, as many as 40,000 people came to the zoo. Because crowds had been so rough with Ota, a police officer was assigned to guard him and protect him from all of the manhandling that he was being subjected to.<sup>10</sup>

While many were relishing the abuse of Ota, one group of Black Christian ministers spoke out in his defense. The *New York Times* of September 10, 1906, printed Reverend Gordon's comments; "Our race ... is depressed enough without exhibiting one of us with the apes."<sup>11</sup> However, on September 12, the *Times* printed this response; "The reverend colored brother should be told that evolution ... is now taught in the textbooks of all the schools, and that it is no more debatable than the multiplication table."<sup>12</sup>

Eventually, Ota was released and received some help from a series of institutions and several sympathetic individuals. He was taught to read and was given employment in a tobacco factory. Sadly, Ota never fully recovered from all the trauma and abuse in his life. He remained

deeply depressed and forlorn. He spoke about wanting to return to his homeland. On March 20, 1916, he ended his life with a revolver.<sup>13</sup>

On the last page of Charles Darwin's book, *The Descent of Man*, Darwin said that he would prefer to be descended from a monkey rather than to be descended from a savage.<sup>14</sup> Darwin did not invent racism, but it was his theory that gave racism such a platform and such a supposed legitimacy. By theorizing that different ethnic groups evolved into humans at different times, feelings of racism were reinforced with the scientific rhetoric that he propounded. At the center of this theory was the teaching that there were different races of man.

What does the Bible have to say about the issue of race? God's Word teaches us that all humanity descended from one man and one woman, Adam and Eve. We read; "And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living." (Genesis 3.20). Eve is the mother of all peoples. We also read; "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;" (Acts 17.26). Here, Scripture clearly puts all of humanity on one frame. Every nation of men was made from one blood. Therefore, we should look upon others who are not from our own particular ethnic group as relatives.

At this point, some will say, "Haven't people used the Bible to condone racial hatred throughout the centuries?" Yes, sadly, this has occurred but, actually, it is a case of people misusing the Bible to condone such feelings. The Scriptures lay a clear foundation for the racial equality of humanity. They teach that humanity came from one original couple and from "one blood." They teach that man was created in the image of God and that Jesus Christ died on behalf of all fallen men. Any man or woman, from any ethnic background, may come to God through repentance and faith in Jesus Christ and be made a child of God. The Bible, when it is believed and followed, promotes love and restoration for every tribe and tongue of mankind.

Are physiological differences between the peoples of different ethnic groups some indication of evolutionary superiorities or inferiorities? No, they are not. This is one of evolution's greatest fallacies. People from different ethnic groups may have very different cultural characteristics but physiologically we are not dramatically different from each other. We all have the same biological system and psychological aspects of human thought can be studied across ethnic lines. What physiological differences we do have are simply the result of genetics. Genetic information in the DNA of the original couple,

Adam and Eve, had great diversity. With the growth of the human population, that diversity has expressed itself in different features. Over time, the breeding of people with similar features has led to groups of people exhibiting similar features. However, it must be stressed that these features are only skin-deep. When we consider the totality of a person's body, and not just their surface, skin level, we must admit that people are far more similar to each other than they are different. Skin color results simply from different amounts of melanin in the skin, but skin is essentially the same across ethnic lines. That is because we are made from one blood and there is only one race, the human race.

When we study the fruits, or results, of Darwin's theory of evolution, it is sad enough to see how individuals, such as Ota, were abused. It is sad enough to see this, but even more horrifying is what evolutionary theory, when followed to its logical end, has produced through the lives of many world dictators. In the 19th century, enormous efforts were made by secularists such as Herbert Spencer, Thomas Huxley, and others, to debunk Christianity, the Bible and faith in God. In turn, Darwinistic evolution supplanted a biblical world view of creation in the minds of very many people who were flowing in this influence. Darwinistic evolution became a critically important foundation for secular philosophies such as, liberalism, communism, fascism and nazism.

It is common knowledge that Lenin and Karl Marx were atheists. They built the political philosophy of communism upon the idea of class struggle, revolution and the communal reorganization of society to the benefit of its working population. However, the underlying platform for this was atheism and evolution which, at a fundamental level, removed the sanctity of human life. Lenin had dedicated his life to a communist philosophy which he knew could only be established by violent revolution.<sup>15</sup> He tirelessly appealed to the people to rise up and support him in the overthrow of the Tsar and, later, the provisional government of Alexander Kerensky. Christian faith was a roadblock to Lenin's plan. Jesus Christ taught peace and self-sacrifice and this clashed with Lenin's revolutionary plans. Communism could only rise up from a foundation of atheism and Darwinism provided the platform to legitimize, in the eyes of the people, this foundation. Through the difficult transition into communism, Lenin had assured the people that a freer state was around the corner for them. However, communism evolved into a police state which increasingly monitored and controlled its people.<sup>16</sup> By jettisoning Christianity and exalting atheism, the values of communism allowed for the mass

genocides that history records under the rule of individuals such as Joseph Stalin.

Joseph Stalin had joined the Bolsheviks and risen to the position of General Secretary of the party's central committee in 1922. He was a ruthless leader, known for his purges, and he launched a policy of collectivization which was the consolidation of peasant farms into state-run enterprises. Russian peasants were stripped of their land and livestock and many were deported to forced-labor camps. The death toll of Russian peasants during these years, as a result of Stalin's brutal coercion, is staggering. In 1945, Stalin conceded to Winston Churchill that 10 million people had died in the process of collectivization.<sup>17</sup>

Another communist dictator, who responded in a similar way as Joseph Stalin, was Mao Tse-tung. His rule was the bloodiest in all of history. It is believed that he is responsible for the deaths of between 40 to 70 million people. Mao (1893-1976) was a founding member of the Chinese Communist Party who, in 1927, led an abortive revolt against the nationalist Kuomin Tang. He retreated to northwestern China, solidified control of that region, and for many years wrestled with the Kuomin Tang. In 1949, shortly after World War II, Mao was successful in defeating the Kuomin Tang and bringing China under communist rule. He then became the chairman of the new People's Republic of China (1949).<sup>18</sup> Mao was fascinated with Darwin and evolutionary theory. In his book, *The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung*, Stuart R. Schram says that Mao "devoured" Darwin's book, *The Origin of Species*.<sup>19</sup>

Darwin's influence spread in Germany, partly because of the influence of a man named Ernst Haeckel. Haeckel was a huge fan of Darwin and had the pleasure of meeting Darwin in 1866. Haeckel wrote a two-volume work called *Generelle Morphologie*. In it, he argued for everything from the universal relevance of Darwinism to the formation of a liberal nation state. Haeckel believed in the superiority of the Germanic people and, also, in combatting Christian faith.<sup>20</sup>

Earlier, I said that this book would reveal a different face of Darwinism from what is commonly presented today. Why is it so? Why is there so little information on the negative fruits of Darwinian evolution in our textbooks today? The modern study of history, because of the nature of its study, which explores the social effects of philosophies upon societies, does give some commentary on the racial effect of Darwin's evolutionary theory. Academically, this is known as social Darwinism. History textbook writers do provide

some discussion on social Darwinism, briefly linking it to Western expansion and imperialism. However, why are we usually given only a rough outline of the information? Why is this topic something rarely plumbed by historians? Is it because it is not of historical significance? Or, is it because it presents an embarrassing picture of Darwinism and raises too many questions about the spread of evolutionary theory? If the racial basis and fruits of Darwinism receive brief treatment by the community of academic historians, how much less treatment is this topic given by the community of academic scientists? How many science textbooks reveal to students the roots and fruits of racism in Darwinistic evolution? How come the story of Ota is so unknown? Why is the record of the race for the “missing links” specimens rarely spoken of?

Charles Darwin promoted racism. He would rather have descended from an ape than from those he called “savages.” He believed that all people were not equal and were actually comprised of different races. However, the academic community has puffed Darwin up to be a brilliant discoverer and innovator, far ahead of his time. It has championed him as a great voice for reason and science. I recently (2010) visited a public high school library and noticed a number of books on Charles Darwin. Flipping through them, I came across more of this puffing-up of the man. One even read: “Darwin never finished his ‘big book’, but neither was he forced to give up his life’s work, and the renown that deservedly accompanied it.”<sup>21</sup> One university science textbook reverences him for his understanding of where his teaching on evolution and natural selection would lead, saying that he saw this “with an accuracy that continues to startle modern biologists.”<sup>22</sup> Another university textbook says that Darwin “presented his reasoning with immaculate logic and an avalanche of supporting evidence.”<sup>23</sup> *I disagree with these three claims that Darwin deserved renown for his theory and that his theory was accurate or logical. I believe that Darwin’s theory became renowned, not for its scientific merit but for political reasons.*

I have mentioned the philosophical basis that Darwinism has provided for some of the world’s worst dictators. Reo M. Christenson said: “Finally as the social Darwinists saw it, survival of the fittest brings evolution – and progress – to the world of politics no less than to the world of biology.”<sup>24</sup> It is, in large part, because Darwinism moved into the world of politics that we have seen such brutality in regimes that made Darwinism their base. H. G. Wells has said:

*They soon got beyond the first crude popular misconception of Darwinism, the idea that every man is for himself alone. But they struck at the next level. Man, they decided, is a social animal like*

*the Indian hunting dog. He is much more than a dog – but this they did not see. And just as in a pack it is necessary to bully and subdue the younger and the weaker for the general good, so it seemed right to them that the big dogs of the human pack should bully and subdue. Hence a new scorn for the ideas of democracy that had ruled the earlier nineteenth century, and a renewed admiration for the overbearing and the cruel.*<sup>25</sup>

This is the view that the strong in society should suppress others and advance themselves.

While Darwinian evolution affected the world view of communists from Lenin to Stalin to Mao, it also influenced and provided a foundation for the naziism of Adolf Hitler. To trace this development, we need to look at the development of the social Darwinism of Germany's philosophical writers contemporary to Darwin and beyond. Perhaps the first German writer to incorporate Darwinism into philosophy was the liberal politician, Bartholomaus von Carneri. Carneri was followed by another influential writer, Albert E. F. Schaffle, who wrote a four-volume work called *Structure and Life of the Social Body*. Friedrich Hellwald, in 1875, wrote *History of Culture*, also explaining history from a Darwinian point of view. These early writers, and others, began spreading social Darwinism in Germany.

The early German social Darwinists were to be followed by others who proposed a new ethic for society. German Darwinian biologist, Arnold Dodel, said: "The new world view actually rests on the theory of evolution. On it we have to construct a new ethics ... All values will be revalued."<sup>26</sup> The new ethics proposed by Darwinists placed the process of evolution as the highest good. What that meant was, society, not just species within biology, functioned by the survival of the fittest. Institutions which sought to help or strenghten the weak in society were viewed as unnatural and counter-productive to the natural unfolding of evolution. Consequently, social Darwinists attacked Christian faith with venom. Values, such as loving one's enemies and turning the other cheek, were opposite to evolutionary process and, consequently, seen as an agent for the retarding of progress and advancement.

Initially, social Darwinists interpreted the process and progress of evolution to be the elimination of those in society who suffered physical or mental handicaps. Social Darwinists also believed that criminals represented less-developed humanity. Anthropologist, Felix von Luschan, in a speech delivered in 1909, said: "The sick, the weak, the dumb, the stupid, the alcoholic, the bum, the criminal; all these



are inferior compared with the healthy, the strong, the intelligent, the clever, the sober, the pure.”<sup>27</sup> University professor, Karl Vogt, argued: “If it is a capital offense in the civilized world to kill one’s old lame father, there are Indian tribes in which this is considered an entirely praiseworthy deed of a son.”<sup>28</sup> Inflammatory statements, such as these, were used to soften people up to the idea of eliminating the disabled and unproductive. Haeckel even went so far as to say, concerning physically or mentally handicapped children: “A small dose of morphine or cyanide would not only free this pitiable creature itself, but also its relatives from the burden of a long, worthless and painful existence.”<sup>29</sup> He argued that the decision not to kill the “defective” children was based on emotion and not reason.<sup>30</sup>

It is not surprising that social Darwinists also advocated for abortion. Helene Stocker, speaking in a 1913 conference, argued that those embracing a scientific worldview couldn’t escape the question of who should be given a right to birth. She said: “Because we want higher humans, we need eugenics and race hygiene.”<sup>31</sup> In 1909, she also said in a speech: “Children from parents with infectious diseases, or children of the chronically ill, as well as children of those with heart or mental illnesses should not be permitted to be born.”<sup>32</sup>

While social Darwinists in Germany began by advocating the elimination of or, at least, the unaiding of the handicapped, elderly and unborn, it quickly moved to devaluing other peoples. Richard Weikart explains:

*The disabled and criminals were not the only ones whose lives were devalued by Darwinian- inspired social thought. Many social Darwinists and eugenicists consigned most of the world’s population to the realm of the ‘inferior.’ They regarded non-European races as varieties of the human species — or sometimes even as completely separate species – that were not as advanced in their evolutionary development as Europeans.*<sup>33</sup>

Many social Darwinists believed that Darwin had proven inequality in humans, even racial inequality. Even Darwin himself taught that certain races had lower intellect and moral faculties than did Europeans. He believed that there was a gap between the “highest races” and the “lowest savages” (his term). He even attributed characteristics such as selfishness, cowardice and laziness to heredity. He rejected the belief that education, the environment and training could shape human nature.<sup>34</sup> Richard Weikart says further: “This had dire consequences for racial thought, since all attempts to bring European culture to the ‘uncivilized’ peoples of the world would be futile, if it were true. Darwin was not original in formulating these



ideas, to be sure, but he and many Darwinists vigorously promoted this kind of biological racism, and most biological racists after Darwin saw his theory as confirmation of their position.”<sup>35</sup>

One notorious social Darwinist who promoted this kind of racism was the already mentioned Haeckel. He taught that different human people groups were, in fact, different species. In 1868, he wrote about 10 distinct species of humans, which he listed in order of their alleged superiority and inferiority. In his popular book, *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, he displayed 12 facial profiles starting with one representing the European and then descending to an East Asian, a Fugian, an Australian, a black African and a Tasmanian. On his chart, the Tasmanian greatly resembled the profile of a gorilla.<sup>36</sup> Haeckel made the audacious claim that “The difference between the reason of a Goethe, Kant, Lamarck, Darwin and that of the lowest primitive human, a Vedda, Akka, Australian Negro, and Patagonian, is much greater than the gradual difference between the reason of the latter and the ‘most rational’ mammal, the anthropoid apes and even [other] apes, dogs and elephants.”<sup>37</sup> Haeckel even suggested to a Mr. H. Rohleder that he had tried to inseminate a chimpanzee with sperm from a black African.<sup>38</sup>

Another social Darwinist, Oscar Peschel, made the horrible assertion that “The Negro is far removed from the European and close to the ape through its small build, through the relatively small breadth of its skull, through its relatively small upper limbs, and further the relatively short length of the thigh ... Also the Negro is more animal ...”<sup>39</sup> Because of opinions such as these, Richard Weikart says: “Historically Darwinism and biological racism are linked tightly together, as many historians have demonstrated. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, we almost always find them in tandem.”<sup>40</sup>

While social Darwinists in Germany began this devaluing of the weak and handicapped, then progressed to devaluing other ethnic groups in favor of Europeans, some of them moved from this to particularly exalting the German heredity over others. One author from the time, Alfred Ploetz, after reading Darwin, Haeckel and other biologists and authors, dedicated his life task to help German people attain German purity.<sup>41</sup> Peschel argued that Otto von Bismarck’s effort of unifying the German states through war with Austria was justified because “Even we in Germany should view the most recent events [i.e., the war] as a lawful evolutionary process ... 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 grave.”<sup>42</sup>

The call to militarism for the purpose of one ethnic group exerting itself over another was given alleged scientific support from Darwin. Darwin himself said in his book, *Descent of Man*: “At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout the world the savage races.”<sup>43</sup> He also said: “The more civilized so-called Caucasian races have beaten the Turkish hollow in the struggle for existence. Looking to the world at no very distant date, what an endless number of the lower races will have been eliminated by the higher civilized races throughout the world.”<sup>44</sup>

During World War I, social Darwinists continued to exalt German ethnicity over others. In 1917, Haeckel said: “A single well-educated German warrior, though unfortunately they are now falling in droves, has a higher intellectual and moral value of life than hundreds of the raw primitive peoples, which England and France, Russia and Italy set against us.”<sup>45</sup> Haeckel also made it clear that he supported colonial acquisition in Africa and German annexation in Europe.<sup>46</sup> Even an offensive quote, such as this, is surpassed by the horrific words of Klaus Wagner who taught that, in the struggle between Europeans, Asians and Africans, “Only one group can remain as ruler. The two others will be destroyed, where they are in the way of the stronger race, and enslaved, where they can serve them... We Germans have the power to destroy and smash the might and future of the two other groups, if we clearly see this necessity, vigorously arm ourselves, and keep our blood pure...”<sup>47</sup>

Social Darwinism found fertile soil in Germany. Not only did it flourish, but it intermixed itself with eugenics, German nationalism and militarism. It would be hard to exaggerate the extent to which the early German social Darwinists influenced their society with these views. This type of writing was accepted by many from various levels of society and gained great popularity. Commenting on the pervasive influence of social Darwinism in Germany between the 1890s and early 1900s, Richard Weikart says:

*By the 1890s and early 1900s Darwinism had become well-entrenched in Germany. Racial theorizing, most of which was laced with Darwinian rhetoric, was heating up, capturing the imagination of ever wider audiences. Earlier most discussions of racial struggle and extermination were tucked away in brief passages in longer articles or books on various topics (Gumplowicz was an exception), but in the 1890s and especially after 1900 there was a proliferation of books and articles discussing racial struggle. For some thinkers race became the universal key to interpreting history, society, and culture.*<sup>48</sup>

From this we see that social Darwinism, mixed together with eugenics and German nationalism, was allowed to spread like cancer throughout pre-nazi Germany.

With the entrance of Adolf Hitler into German history, Darwinism was catapulted to an even uglier height. By Hitler's time a whole new generation of social Darwinists had risen up. Names, such as, Jorg Lanz von Liebenfels, Guido von List and Josef Reimer are all possible influences. A former roommate of Hitler claims that Hitler often visited the library in Vienna, where he read huge amounts of material. In his book, *Mein Kampf*, Hitler does mention the social Darwinist Georg von Schonerer and Stewart Chamberlain. Because Hitler so rarely refers to the names of others whom he studied, one can't be precisely sure of all of his influences. However, the influence of Charles Darwin is unmistakable. Hitler taught that the triumph of the strong over the weak was simply a process of nature.<sup>49</sup> Even more offensive still are his words, taken from *Mein Kampf*, in which he says:

*If reproduction as such is limited and the number of births decreased, then the natural struggle for existence, which only allows the strongest and healthiest to survive, will be replaced by the obvious desire to save at any cost even the weakest and sickest; thereby a progeny is produced, which must become ever more miserable, the longer this mocking of nature and its will persists ... . A stronger race (Geschlecht) will supplant the weaker, since the drive for life in its final form will decimate every ridiculous fetter of the so-called humaneness of individuals, in order to make place for the humaneness of nature, which destroys the weak to make place for the strong.<sup>50</sup>*

Also, in *Mein Kampf*, he explains that his worldview "by no means believes in the equality of races, but recognizes along with their differences their higher or lower value, and through this knowledge feels obliged, according to the eternal will that rules this universe, to promote the victory of the better, the stronger, and to demand the submission of the worse and weaker."<sup>51</sup>

Hitler, and the Nazi Party in Germany, was voted into power by the people. Their regime was a popular one in its early beginings. Hitler soon turned a free state into a police state, vigorously controlled by secret police. The media was filled with his propaganda which included the endorsement of racism. Jews were rounded up and sent to concentration camps. Hitler began expanding Germany by annexing surrounding countries. His policy, wherever naziism was established, was Darwinian eugenics. Findley and Rothney write: "Hitler was a 'social Darwinist,' who applied to human life the

evolutionary vision of nature as a struggle amongst species for the survival of the fittest. For Hitler, history was a struggle for survival among biologically distinct races.<sup>752</sup> As he expanded militarily and pushed this policy, it was only a matter of time until the allied countries of the world rose up against him. World War II was a horrifying war in which it is estimated that over 50 million people lost their lives.

Today, the name of Charles Darwin is puffed to greatness in the Western world. He is considered to be a brilliant man whose openness led to scientific breakthroughs. Academics praise him for overcoming the narrow-mindedness of his day and being open to a different worldview. However, the 'openness' of Darwin was actually narrow-mindedness to an incredible extreme. Darwin was a racist. He said he would rather have descended from a monkey than from those he considered "savages." Yet those people, whom he excluded, stereotyped and dismissed, were real people like Ota. Ota's family was killed and he was enslaved. For many, he made an entertaining display at the world's fair in St. Louis and in other places where he was penned up. When ministers spoke out against his treatment they were told "evolution ... is now taught in the textbooks of all the schools, and that it is no more debatable than the multiplication table." Those ministers did not accept this answer and many reject it today, also. Ota ended his life by suicide. Sadly, the damage that Darwinism did to him, personally, did not stop there. Darwinism gave a scientific rhetoric and a scientific justification for racism. It also gave a platform for world dictators to build a rule of terror upon.

Men took Darwin's teachings to their logical extreme. This extreme brought millions into communism, naziism and world war. Today, Darwinism is still at work in the minds of men and women of power and influence. Darwin's teaching has been passed on to men and women and children as a precious gift. May God protect us from the fruit of its deception in our generation of the world community. May others have the courage to call Darwinism for what it is. May we uncover the biblical truth that all men and women were created and come from one blood. All men and women are a part of the one human race.

*Shawn Stevens*

*Editor's Note: The author Shawn Stevens submits a full page of detailed notes concerning quotes in this article. These are available upon request from the RAS office.*

## QUIZ: ANIMALS IN THE BIBLE

1. A common designation for Job's "monster of the deep"?  
\_\_\_\_ a. Leviathan                      \_\_\_\_ c. The Dragon  
\_\_\_\_ b. sturgeon                        \_\_\_\_ d. Rhinoceros
2. Symbolizes the innocence of the Messiah.  
\_\_\_\_ a. a white horse                  \_\_\_\_ c. a sheep  
\_\_\_\_ b. a he-goat                        \_\_\_\_ d. a lamb
3. The people of Gadara were concerned about their  
\_\_\_\_ a. cattle                              \_\_\_\_ c. goats  
\_\_\_\_ b. sheep                              \_\_\_\_ d. pigs
4. Occupied the ruins of Babylon for centuries  
\_\_\_\_ a. jackals                            \_\_\_\_ c. rabbits  
\_\_\_\_ b. wild horses                      \_\_\_\_ d. wolves
5. David killed this animal with his bare hands  
\_\_\_\_ a. bear                                \_\_\_\_ c. panther  
\_\_\_\_ b. leopard                            \_\_\_\_ d. hyena
6. Symbolized the Persian Empire  
\_\_\_\_ a. bear                                \_\_\_\_ c. panther  
\_\_\_\_ b. tiger                                \_\_\_\_ d. lion
7. A donkey spoke to this man  
\_\_\_\_ a. Joshua                              \_\_\_\_ c. Nebuchadnezzar  
\_\_\_\_ b. Balaam                            \_\_\_\_ d. Belshazer
8. Animals were created  
\_\_\_\_ a. the third day                      \_\_\_\_ c. the sixth day  
\_\_\_\_ b. the fourth day                    \_\_\_\_ d. the second day
9. Aaron fashioned an idol in the form of a  
\_\_\_\_ a. horse                                \_\_\_\_ c. goat  
\_\_\_\_ b. bull                                 \_\_\_\_ d. rat
10. Which animals seem to specialize in eating tender grapes?  
\_\_\_\_ a. wild asses                        \_\_\_\_ c. the bulls of Bashan  
\_\_\_\_ b. wild dogs                         \_\_\_\_ d. foxes





RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.  
PO BOX 206  
CHASKA, MN 55318-0206  
ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

NON-PROFIT ORG  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
TWIN CITIES, MN  
PERMIT NO. 90795

=====  
Important – If your mailing label  
reads June 2015, your subscription  
has expired with this issue. Please  
renew now!  
=====