

CHARLES DARWIN AND "THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES":
Dispelling Fourteen Myths About Darwin

Summary. The life of Charles Darwin and his preparation for his most influential book, *The Origin of Species*, are typically recounted in tales that are largely erroneous. Darwin is usually presented as a young divinity student who over many years and under the weight of compelling scientific evidence, gradually "lost his faith" in the Bible. *The Origin of Species* is presented as a seminal scholarly work which immediately became overwhelmingly popular and which trounced the Bible with its superior erudition. **The elements of such tales are so close to falsehood as to render such accounts of Darwin's life and work little more than "urban legends."**

1. Myth: Darwin was a divinity student and therefore a serious Christian. The truth is that Darwin was neither serious nor a Christian. At best, he was a nominal "cultural" Christian in divinity school only on the orders of his domineering father. His belief in the Bible was likewise only nominal.

The fact that Darwin began his university studies by studying for the ministry hardly shows any devotion to Christianity. Darwin was born in 1809, so was beginning his ministerial studies in the late 1820s. In the England of that day, being a divinity student meant one planned to minister in the Anglican Church, the state-run Church of England. **There was no requirement that the would-be minister be truly converted.** Though there were (and still are to a lesser degree today) genuine Christians in the Church of England, to a large extent that Church was (and is) merely a state-run corporation managed by the Crown which provided careers for those not inclined to be industrious in the work place. As historian Gertrude Himmelfarb notes:

"The final recourse of Victorian society for the maintenance of dullards and misfits was the church. Young men with no other discernable calling were graced with the highest calling of all. That the church was, at the same time, the refuge of the talented and brilliant did not in any way hinder it from performing the humble but useful service of relieving despairing fathers of surplus sons. So it is not as absurd as might at first appear that Dr. Darwin [Darwin's father] should have conceived the plan of making Charles a clergyman."¹

If Darwin was at this time not yet a conscious rebel, nevertheless he was not a believer either, "his `disposition to doubt' being as little violent as his disposition to believe. His was the indifference of orthodoxy."² **Darwin was typical of many in the early 1800s who gave lip service to biblical creation and the other tenets of orthodoxy, but without any real conviction motivated by true conversion.**

Such "belief" amounted to an acceptance of orthodoxy by default, and explains why, when the evolutionary competitor to biblical creation arrived on the scene with *The Origin of Species*, creation was so quickly dropped. Indeed, by the mid-1800s the cultural lip-service toward biblical creation was so superficial that Darwin's evolution displaced it in less than a decade, a point to which we will return later.

Darwin himself acknowledged in later years that his orthodoxy had not been genuine: "Looking back on this episode after half a century, Darwin reflected how illogical it had been of him to say `that I believed in what I could not understand and what is in fact unintelligible'."³ It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Darwin's incomprehension of orthodoxy was due to lack of genuine conversion.⁴

In sum, Darwin did not turn from Christian faith to evolutionism. He was not a Christian when he was exposed to evolutionism, and thus had no genuine faith to lose.

2. Myth: Darwin "lost his faith" because of compelling evidence for evolution. Through a fortuitous sequence of events, Darwin was allowed to sail around the world as a naturalist aboard the *Beagle* when he was in his early twenties. He took with him the *Principles of Geology* by Charles Lyell first published in 1830. When Darwin read Lyell's *Principles*, **he was readily turned from the Bible because he had no genuine Christian faith to start with.**⁵

In fact, Lyell claimed he paved the way for Darwin. After the *Origin of Species* had become very popular and Darwin very famous, Lyell's work was partly forgotten. When the German evolutionist Ernst Haeckel⁶ in his *History of Creation* remembered Lyell's contribution to evolutionary thought, Lyell wrote Haeckel a letter of thanks, bitterly complaining that, "Most of the geologists forget that anything was written between the time of Lamarck [1801] and the publication of our friend's *Origin of Species* [1859]. ... I had certainly prepared the way in this country [England], in six editions of my work ... for the reception of Darwin's gradual and insensible evolution of species, and I am very glad that you noticed this."⁷

Darwin also acknowledged his debt to Lyell, for without Lyell's teaching of geological evolution, the public would have been unready to accept Darwin's biological evolution: "I never forget that almost everything which I have done in science I owe to the study of [Lyell's] great works."⁸

But Lyell's agenda was to discredit the Bible under the guise of "science." Lyell was not formally trained in any science, but was a lawyer and only an amateur geologist.⁹ (For that matter, Darwin was never formally trained in science either - something to think about the next time an evolutionist belittles a creationist for "lacking credentials"!)

Lyell's real "hidden agenda" was revealed in personal letters published after his death. He wrote that he had "driven" the biblical Flood "out of the Mosaic record."¹⁰ He also revealed his plan for undermining the Bible. He would not make a frontal attack against the Scripture, but "conceived the idea ... that if ever the Mosaic chronology could be set down [discredited] without giving offense, it would be in an historical sketch ..."¹¹ Lyell's reference to "an historical sketch" meant a work about "historical geology" written from an evolutionary viewpoint.¹² His *Principles of Geology* was the fulfillment of this plan.

In sum, Lyell using his legal skills would manufacture an opus presenting the alleged evolutionary version of the earth's geological past. He would lead his readers to doubt the chronology of Moses and the Bible as a whole without directly

attacking it and without even naming it. With his *Principles of Geology*, published while he was only in his early thirties, he succeeded beyond his wildest dreams.

We are not left to wonder if Lyell was conscious of his indirect, deceitful maneuver against the Bible. He employed the same tactic generally, rarely asserting dogmatically what he wanted readers to believe, but cleverly allowing them to reach his conclusions on their own. Indeed, he wrote of his use of this tactic to encourage belief in biological evolution, "I left this rather to be inferred, not thinking it worthwhile to offend a certain class of persons by embodying in words what could only be a speculation."¹³

Charles Darwin, therefore, was converted to evolutionism by a lawyer with an antipathy for the Bible and especially for the chronology of the Bible - a lawyer, furthermore, who admitted in private correspondence that evolution was only a "speculation"!

3. Myth: Darwin was a great scientist. Darwin was a patient but not outstanding researcher. His methods did not meet even the standards of his day. **He did not experiment professionally, but was better at theorizing,** a fact possibly attributable to his lack of any formal training in science. Himmelfarb bluntly describes at length Darwin's lack of scientific expertise: "His attitude toward his experiments and instruments was ... far removed from the modern ideal ...

"There was some excuse for the elaborate improvisation he had resorted to on the *Beagle* ... where an object was noted to be the 'length one handkerchief and half'; or the size of a river as being larger or smaller than the Severn at home. But at Down, where there was no such excuse, he extemporized in the same way. His three-foot rule was old and battered, the common property of the household; the seven-foot deal rod used in measuring plants had been roughly calibrated by the village carpenter; while for millimeter measurements he used paper rules. His weighing scales were faulty, and his chemical balance dated from his childhood experiments with his brother in the garden shed. For liquid-capacity measurements he used an apothecary's measuring glass, roughly and unevenly graduated. He had two micrometers which gave differing results, and took his equivalent of inches and millimeters from an old book where, as one of his children later discovered, it was incorrectly given.

"... It was not one or two but almost all of his instruments that were obviously and needlessly faulty. ... The simple truth seems to be, as his son found, that it apparently never occurred to him that his instruments were anything but precise. ... It may be that many of his experiments required no great precision, but it was not on this assumption that he acted. On the contrary, he took great pains to be precise, to obtain perfect measurements with his imperfect seven-foot ruler, and to get the fluid line to correspond exactly with the incorrect graduations on his beaker. ...

"It is not expected of Darwin that he should have been troubled by thoughts of fallibility, relativity, or indeterminacy; but only that he should have observed the standards of his own time. And it was by these standards that he was in arrears.

Nineteenth-century science was sufficiently aware of the desirability of precision and standardization to make Darwin's tool chest seem distinctly unprofessional. In this, as in other respects, he gives the appearance of an amateur, an amateur even for his own day."¹⁴

Darwin published many books and articles besides the *Origin*;¹⁵ one is led to wonder, how many measurements and scientific conclusions in any of these works were correct? were these all tainted by his faulty laboratory techniques? Even more to the point, why did and why does the Establishment honor a person such as Darwin who did not uphold even the scientific standards of the 1800s?¹⁶ The only answer seems to be that in his evolutionary speculations, **Darwin was articulating the very theories which the Establishment held dear, and his science - or lack of it - didn't really matter.** All this, despite the claim of evolutionism to be "scientific."

4. Myth: Darwin originated the concept of natural selection. This myth has been perpetuated by the most eminent of evolutionists who ought to know better. For instance, Julian Huxley dogmatized that "the universal principle of natural selection" was "Darwin's great discovery."¹⁷

Darwin did not originate the idea of natural selection. It was due to creationist Edward Blythe, who correctly viewed natural selection as a negative mechanism resulting in the elimination of weak genetic variants, not as evolution.¹⁸

In July 1837, Darwin began keeping a series of "secret" (i.e., private) notebooks on the ways in which species might undergo change. Evolutionist Loren Eiseley has pointed out that this coincided with the appearance of Blythe's articles on this topic in the British *Magazine of Natural History*. Given the wide readership of this magazine, and the similarity of Darwin's concepts compared with Blythe's ideas, Eiseley concludes that **it is a virtual certainty that Darwin began with Blythe's ideas on natural selection without giving credit to him.**¹⁹

Indeed, it has been claimed that in every book Charles Darwin wrote save one - a book on barnacles - he followed a technique of argumentation which had been exploited by his evolutionist grandfather Erasmus Darwin. One investigator has stated, for instance, that "the pages in *Zoonomia* [written by Erasmus Darwin] abound in sentences of the form: 'when we consider example 1; when we compare X with Y; when we think over example 2; we cannot but conclude that ...' and this is one of Charles Darwin's favorite ways of presenting his argument."²⁰

In other words, **Charles Darwin plagiarized from his grandfather, just as he plagiarized the "natural selection" concept from Edward Blythe.** Lest this be considered too hard a judgment against Darwin, it should be recalled that plagiarism is the use of knowledge or information without properly crediting the source, a condition implied for the *Origin* by the fact that the *Origin* contains absolutely no footnotes, no bibliography, and virtually no citations of any kind. In this deficiency, the *Origin* does not appear to meet even the standards of its own time.

Though in the Middle Ages the borrowing of ideas without attribution was considered an honor to the one whose ideas had been borrowed, by the nineteenth century, works intended as non-fiction such as the *Origin* typically contained careful documentation.

Darwin in general seemed to be very desirous that others should consider his ideas as original with him whether they were or not. He once claimed that until the publication of the *Origin*, there had been no talk of evolution "in the air," nor according to him were "men's minds prepared for it."²¹ Yet it is a well known fact that "it was in the air and men were prepared for it - the public for evolution in general, and the scientific community for some special theory that Darwin was known to be working on."²² Indeed, so well were men prepared that "it was, in fact, not in his lifetime but in a single decade that Darwin saw his ideas triumph."²³

Darwin's plagiarism of natural selection was therefore symptomatic of his broader tendency to misrepresent himself as an original thinker when he was not.

5. Myth: The Origin was published only after Darwin was sure he had accumulated compelling evidence for evolution.

In fact, he worked for over 20 years on the idea of natural selection as a mechanism for evolution, but did not publish, not so much because he was seeking to be cautious, but because of his retiring nature. He was goaded into publishing by the plans of Alfred Russell Wallace to publish first. Furthermore, Darwin considered the *Origin* only a preliminary study and planned a larger definitive volume which never materialized.

In a fever-induced trance in the jungles of Malaya, Wallace received in one afternoon the crux of the natural selection theory Darwin had been developing for 20 years;²⁴ what was the source of this information? This might appear to be a leading question, and certainly Wallace was aware of nascent evolutionary concepts which had been fashionable in European thought for many decades. However, Wallace was also a member of the Society for Psychical Research and was deeply involved in spiritism for many years.²⁵ How open was his mind to demonic input?

It was at first proposed that Wallace and Darwin be recognized as "co-discoverers" of evolution by natural selection, but spiritism was not respectable in most of Victorian England, and eventually the Establishment dropped Wallace's name from the theory. We are left with some extremely intriguing questions: Would Darwin have published the *Origin*, thereby giving evolutionism a patina of scientific respectability, had it not been for Wallace's timely revelations? And was the source of these revelations associated with Wallace's spiritism? These questions may never be answered with certainty, but one thing is sure - evolutionism is one of the most diabolical philosophies ever to afflict mankind.

6. Myth: The Origin sold out on its first day of sale, so it must have been a great book. The fact is that *The Origin of Species* was printed in a very small first edition of 1250 volumes which was "sold out" by the publication date (November 24, 1859) only in the sense that dealers had indicated they would buy it to market at retail.

Historian Himmelfarb points out that, "Darwin's biographers often speak as if the book was sold out in the bookstores on the first day of its sale. In fact, it was 'sold out' only so far as the publisher was concerned - that is, it was fully subscribed by the dealers."²⁶ Indeed, for not only the first day of sale but for some time, the sale of the *Origin* "was not, by the literary standards of the time, particularly impressive,"²⁷ although the sales were comparable with the sales of other works intended as non-fiction.

In Darwin's lifetime, six editions of the *Origin* were published. The last five British editions totalled only 54,000 copies.²⁸ Of the millions who came to believe in Darwin's theory, only a very small percentage read the *Origin*. As we will see, most people who became converts to evolution did so because of the influence of mouthpieces for evolution such as Lyell and others. The *Origin* remains one of a handful of works whose malevolent impact on mankind has been incalculable,²⁹ yet which most have not read. The *Origin* therefore belongs in the class of other "malevolent yet rarely read" books such as *Das Kapital* and *Mein Kampf*.

7. Myth: The Origin of Species gives evidence for evolution. This is not true. *The Origin of Species* does not present any evidence for evolution, only accounts of so-called "microevolution" such as animal breeding. Indeed, Darwin unashamedly used such cases in an attempt to imply that natural selection must be the mechanism for evolution: "Nature gives successive variations; man adds them up in certain directions useful to him. In this sense he may be said to have made for himself useful breeds. The great power of this principle of selection is not hypothetical. It is certain that several of our eminent breeders have, even within a single lifetime, modified to a large extent their breeds of cattle and sheep."³⁰

Darwin's characterization of selection as having "great power" is quite adroit, leaving the impression in the reader's mind that surely such a "principle" must be capable of much more than causing mere genetic variations in sheep or cattle. The first five chapters of the *Origin* are taken up with such examples which Darwin cleverly tries to associate with evolution.

The balance of the 15-chapter text presents little additional alleged evidence, but deals with difficulties of the evolutionary concept.³¹ Ironically, **Darwin acknowledges the difficulties but then fails to accept the impossibility of evolution which they imply.** As he leaves the first five chapters describing modern genetic variation and opens chapter six, he admits, "Long before the reader has arrived at this part of my work, a crowd of difficulties will have occurred to him. Some of them are so serious that to this day I can hardly reflect on them without being in some degree staggered ..."

At this point the naive reader might expect Darwin to begin questioning whether evolution could happen at all, but instead, Darwin pushes forward as if evolution were a virtual certainty: "... but, to the best of my judgment, the greater number [of difficulties] are only apparent, and those that are

real are not, I think, fatal to the theory."³² The most serious difficulty evident to a discerning reader is that up to this point Darwin has not presented a single case of evolution, yet Darwin writes as if this were not so serious after all. To reach this point, however, the inquiring but weary reader has had to slog through 140 pages of small print and lengthy sentences, and may be willing to grant on faith that Darwin must be right.

In chapter 10, after 130 additional pages of similar assertions, Darwin is finally claiming that, "By the theory of natural selection all living species have been connected with the parent-species of each genus, by differences not greater than we see between the natural and domestic varieties of the same species at the present day ..."

Darwin is now telling the reader that "microevolution" must be the basis for "macroevolution." He admits that the number of "transitional and intermediate links" must "have been inconceivably great," but this difficulty is, in his opinion, just as much a chimera as the others, for "assuredly, if this theory be true, such have lived upon the earth."³³

Through the balance of the book Darwin continues to infer evolution from the genetic variation of the barnyard.³⁴ In the *Origin* Darwin was presenting argumentation for evolution rather than evidence for it. The *Origin* is an apologetic, not a work of science. Himmelfarb observes that Darwin's "essential method was neither observing nor the more prosaic mode of scientific reasoning, but a peculiarly imaginative, inventive mode of argument."³⁵ "Imaginative" and "inventive" Darwin's argumentation may have been, but honest it was not.

Indeed, the confusion inherent in reading a work of argumentation posing as science may explain why the *Origin* has the reputation of being difficult to read and comprehend. Even Thomas Huxley, Darwin's staunchest defender, grumbled, "I have read ... the *Origin* for the sixth or seventh time, becoming confirmed in my opinion that it is one of the most difficult books to exhaust that ever was written."³⁶ Once one begins to read the *Origin* as argumentation for evolution rather than science, however, it becomes more comprehensible, for now one is reading it as it really is.

Since the *Origin* is argumentation rather than science, it often uses presuppositional words (may, maybe, could, might, should, possibly, probably, etc.) in sections designed to make evolutionism appear plausible without actually stating that it happened. Darwin was clever in this matter. His critics could never claim that he was dogmatically asserting that evolution must have occurred via natural selection, but he was guiding them into the presupposition that it *could* have happened:

"Indeed, our author makes at any time but little use of the verb 'to prove,' in any of its inflections. His formula is 'I am convinced,' 'I believe,' and not 'I have proved.' We are not finding fault with these more modest forms of expression; but we may be allowed, perhaps, to remark, that they are the formulae of a creed, and not of a scientific theory."³⁷

As already mentioned, much of the book is a discussion of present-day phenomena which have nothing to do with evolution except in the mind of a believer. This means that much of the book is written in the present tense as a

description of observations in the present. Presuppositional words are contained in sections attempting to reconstruct how evolution could have happened in the past.

For example, on two pages of speculation concerning how vestigial organs could form, 13 presuppositional words are used (may-9, probably-2, seems-1, implies-1).³⁸ It is difficult to escape the conclusion that in the *Origin*, evolution was implied to be true only because Darwin wanted it to be true.

8. Myth: Natural selection explains evolution. Darwin himself dropped the claims of evolution by natural selection in the last edition of the *Origin* published under his supervision.³⁹ This was the sixth edition which he edited by 1872 and which was published without further revision until 1882, the year of his death. This edition is not in print today, and the second edition, which promotes natural selection as the mechanism for evolution, is virtually always the one sold.⁴⁰

However, even the second edition contained the seeds of the eventual overthrow of natural selection as the evolutionary mechanism. Adhering to Darwin's strategy of argumentation, it presented natural selection simultaneously as the answer to how evolution occurs, but also as an "insuperably great" difficulty for evolution:

"Nothing can at first appear more difficult to believe than that the more complex organs and instincts have been perfected, not by means superior to, though analogous with, human reason, but by the accumulation of innumerable slight variations, each good for the individual possessor. Nevertheless, this difficulty, though appearing to our imagination insuperably great, cannot be considered real if we admit the following propositions, namely, that all parts of the organisation and instincts offer, at least, individual differences - that there is a struggle for existence leading to the preservation of profitable deviations of structure or instinct - and, lastly, that gradations in the state of perfection of each organ may have existed, each good of its kind. The truth of these propositions cannot, I think, be disputed."⁴¹

Darwin here admits that natural selection is beset with "insuperable difficulties," but that the difficulties "cannot be considered real" if we accept two propositions: (1) that significant differences can be produced in individuals by natural selection, and (2) that innumerable beneficial "gradations" have led to evolution. Darwin of course is arguing what he wishes to prove, and we have here nothing more than a circular argument.

Furthermore, as we will see, each of Darwin's "indisputable" propositions was called into question within only a decade after the *Origin* first saw the light of day. However, for many decades one would never have guessed that natural selection was at all uncertain, much less abandoned, by hearing the pronouncements of prominent evolutionists. Julian Huxley, the grandson of Thomas Huxley, for instance, dogmatized in 1959, the centennial year of the *Origin*, that "the principle of natural selection was established as the method of evolution."⁴² One would infer from this statement that the case for natural

selection had become stronger since Darwin's time. Not only that, Huxley opined, but "the universal principle of natural selection, is firmly and finally established as the sole agency of major evolutionary change."⁴³

The truth is that Darwin himself and others abandoned natural selection before Darwin's death in 1882. Despite the fact that Darwin ended his life disbelieving the theory he had done so much to advance, "Darwinism" continues to be the name applied to the concept that natural selection is the only, or at least a major, cause of evolution. The entire scientific community had rejected Darwinism by around 1900. Julian Huxley's assertion that natural selection is the "sole agency" of evolution must therefore be taken to be disingenuous at best and at worst, deliberately deceitful.

In 1867 an anonymous article appeared in the *North British Review* challenging Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection. It developed that the author was Asa Gray, an evolutionist and a former Darwin ally. In 1869 Darwin acknowledged that he had erred concerning his first proposition, and in the sixth edition of the *Origin* said:

"It should be observed that ... I speak ... not of any strongly-marked variation having been preserved. [This is a total reversal of his original position!] In former editions of this work I sometimes spoke as if this latter alternative had frequently occurred. I saw the great importance of individual differences, and this led me fully to discuss the results of unconscious selection by man, which depends on the preservation of all the more or less valuable individuals, and on the destruction of the worst. [He tries to equate selective breeding with natural selection by calling it 'unconscious.' This is a fallacy - every breeder is very conscious of selecting in the best breeds.] I saw, also, that the preservation in a state of nature of any occasional deviation of structure, such as a monstrosity, would be a rare event [He had realized early on that his first proposition was questionable.]; and that, if at first preserved, it would generally be lost by subsequent intercrossing with ordinary individuals. Nevertheless, until reading an able and valuable article in the *North British Review* (1867), I did not appreciate how rarely single variations, whether slight or strongly-marked, would be perpetuated."⁴⁴

Elsewhere in the sixth edition Darwin even more plainly rejected natural selection: "I have now considered enough, perhaps more than enough, of the cases, selected with care by a skillful naturalist, to prove that natural selection is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures; and I have shown, as I hope, that there is no great difficulty on this head."⁴⁵ Darwin hereby acknowledged that his second "indisputable" proposition had been disproved.

Darwin continued to reject natural selection as the means of evolution for the rest of his life. As noted above, the sixth edition of the *Origin* was published in the year of his death, 1882. Two years before this he wrote in a major scientific journal of the day, "The character of the abyssal fauna refuses to give the least support to the theory which refers the evolution of species to extreme variation guided only by natural selection."⁴⁶

It is important to note that Darwin never rejected evolution, but only natural selection as the cause for evolution. **What mechanism did Darwin adopt in place of natural selection?** The answer to this question is as startling as his rejection of natural selection itself: **Darwin turned to the discredited theory of the "inheritance of acquired characteristics" proposed by Lamarck in 1801!** He wrote, "As far as concerns myself, I believe that no one has brought forward so many observations on the effects of the use and disuse of parts, as I have done in my *Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication*; and these observations were made for this special project."⁴⁷ It is most significant that the book here named was published in 1868, showing that in less than a decade after the *Origin* first appeared, Darwin was changing his mind about the place of natural selection in evolution.

In sum, **Darwin ended his life embracing the Lamarckian theory** rather than the natural selection so often associated with him. Furthermore, **others knew of the change in Darwin.** Sir George Mivert observed "that in early editions of the *Origin* natural selection was supposed to be a sufficient cause for evolution but that in later editions of the *Origin* and in the *Descent of Man*, Darwin had relegated it to a subordinate position."⁴⁸ Mivert's assessment would seem to be actually too mild in the light of Darwin's total reversal.

Besides the mounting data contradicting any place for natural selection in evolution, Darwin may have been affected by his inability to convince any contemporary scientist that natural selection was a viable evolutionary mechanism. Darwin failed to convince even Charles Lyell. Darwin wished for Lyell's acceptance more than anyone else's⁴⁹ and once wrote Lyell, "I rejoice in my heart that you are going to speak out plainly about species."⁵⁰

Darwin eventually became frustrated with Lyell, writing him that, "I have been greatly disappointed that you have not given judgment and spoken fairly out what you think about the derivation of species."⁵¹ Lyell wrote back: "You ought to be satisfied, as I shall bring hundreds towards you who, if I treated the matter more dogmatically, would have rebelled."⁵² Though Lyell had reservations about natural selection, he was nevertheless satisfied to turn people away from the Bible to Darwin.

Even Thomas Huxley, Darwin's staunchest supporter, predicted a limited life for the belief in natural selection as an evolutionary mechanism: "I believe that, if you take it as the embodiment of an hypothesis, it is destined to be the guide of biological and psychological speculation for the next three or four generations."⁵³ Taking a generation as thirty years, Huxley gave evolution by natural selection a lifetime of roughly a century.⁵⁴

By around 1900 evolutionists considered mutations, not natural selection, to be the source of variations upon which natural selection would act to produce evolution. The resulting theory was modified through the decades and became known as the "neo-Darwinian synthesis," often shortened nowadays simply to "Darwinism."

As problematic data continued to accumulate, by the 1960s the neo-Darwinian synthesis was increasingly rejected, thus satisfying Huxley's prediction in a most interesting way. Since then many anti-Darwinian books have appeared challenging not the occurrence of evolution itself but the alleged importance of mutations and natural selection in causing any evolution.⁵⁵ (Of course, the great irony here is that **the *Origin* sixth edition would have to be considered one of the first anti-Darwinian books ever written!**) As it has become increasingly clear that impersonal phenomena cannot cause evolution, there has been a slow but steady shift away from atheistic evolution to a belief in evolution somehow directed by an "intelligent designer" who is a kind of New Age force, not the God of the Bible. "New Age evolution" would be an appropriate title for such a godless intelligent design theory.

In the long view of history, the path to New Age evolution was not opened recently. It began more than a century ago with Darwin's rejection of natural selection as the cause of evolution.

9. Myth: Darwin helped science by showing that species can change. An associated myth is that before Darwin, creationists believed that species never change, an idea called "the fixity of species." Both of these statements are false. Creationists before Darwin were well aware of species change via genetic variation, but they also maintained that beyond certain limits there is no change. The limits of change were associated with the Genesis "kinds," large groups of organisms to which many species belong.

Evolutionists before and after Darwin have twisted the creationist belief in stable Genesis "kinds" into the myth that creationists believe in the fixity of species. **However, the originator of modern binomial nomenclature, the creationist Carl Linnaeus, was 200 years ago aware that species change though "kinds" do not.**⁵⁶ As noted above, in the *Origin* Darwin documented instances of genetic variation as evidence of species change, but this knowledge was nothing new. Indeed, the very fact that Darwin tried to prove evolution with examples of genetic variation demonstrates that genetic variability was a universally recognized phenomenon in Darwin's day.

10. Myth: Evolutionism generated an explosion of scientific work; that is why disciplines like genetics have forged ahead. The truth is that evolutionism immediately led to the suppression of scientific work, namely, the genetic laws of Mendel. Mendel completed and published his laws in the 1860s, even as Darwinism was becoming acceptable, but Mendel's laws stipulated that genetic variation occurred only within limits, whereas evolutionism demanded random and limitless variation. Mendel's laws were so much at odds with evolutionism that they were ignored for some forty years. It was only after a rationale was developed for incorporating them into evolutionary theory that they became acceptable.

The fact is that genetics began to progress after the laws of the creationist Mendel were applied in scientific research. It is often claimed that Mendel's work was "forgotten" because he published in an "obscure journal," but

this is not true. His results appeared in the *Journal of the Brunn Society for the Study of Natural Science* in 1865. One-hundred twenty libraries received this journal, including libraries in England and the United States.⁵⁷ Another momentous discovery of the 1860s which opposed evolutionism was Pasteur's disproof of spontaneous generation.⁵⁸ Though the work of both Mendel and Pasteur had challenged evolutionism, "Mendel did not have the scientific stature of Pasteur and could safely be ignored."⁵⁹

Around 1900 the Dutch botanist Hugo de Vries put forth the theory that mutations are the source of evolutionary changes. With Mendel's laws no longer considered to be a threat to evolutionism, Mendel's work was rehabilitated from four decades of neglect. However, the four lost decades cannot be recovered.

Without the dead hand of evolutionism on science, what could have been accomplished? Could the structure of DNA have been elucidated in 1913 instead of 1953? Could disease cures now only dreamed of based on genetic research have already saved the lives of millions? No matter what "might have been," the stark possibility remains that evolutionism has resulted in death and disease for untold victims by delaying the progress of science.

11. Myth: Evolutionism is a harmless philosophy. In fact *The Origin* presents a racist view of existence. Even the title itself is racist. The full title is *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection: or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. Human evolution is not addressed in the *Origin*, only that of plant and animal life. However, **the teaching that certain "races" are favored means that others are not.** The ones that are not therefore must be unfit to survive the "struggle for life."

The text of the *Origin* reinforces these sentiments. For instance, extinction is said to be the fate of the "less-favoured forms,"⁶⁰ and life is said to be engaged in a "struggle for existence"⁶¹ - a struggle which the "less-favoured forms" are expected to lose. If these stark sentiments be extended to the human race, they are a bottomless pit of excuses for inflicting every conceivable cruelty on peoples perceived to be weak or ignorant, or simply in need of political "education."

Of course it is common knowledge that these evil sentiments have been applied by various dictators during the last century. **It will not do to claim that such evil men were only using evolution as an excuse for what they would have done anyway, because history reveals that the twentieth century has set the record for political murders.** With evolutionary ideas in their minds, dictators did what had not been done before, and what they might not have done otherwise. In sum, evolutionism not only provides a rationale for evil; it makes men evil.

Lest this seem to be too harsh a judgment, it is appropriate to note Darwin's own opinion of allegedly "inferior races": "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."⁶²

It is most important to observe that Darwin based this opinion on evolutionary thought. As we will see, Darwin was actually a mild-mannered man who outwardly exhibited Victorian civility and graciousness. If evolutionism could motivate Darwin to express such a deprecating view of fellow human beings made in the image of God, what could evolutionism do in the mind of a troubled youth such as Hitler or Stalin? History, of course, has given us the tragic answer to this question.⁶³

12. Myth: Darwin came from a conventional, possibly Christian family typical of Victorian England. Not so. Darwin's own family had a long history of supporting evolutionary thought. The Darwin family took pride in their heterodoxy. Darwin's father and grandfather were Masons who worked for the overthrow of biblical belief. Thus Darwin's pro-evolutionary effort was somewhat in the nature of a family tradition.

Freemasons themselves are proud of this fact. Albert G. Mackey, one of the more significant masonic authors, has noted, "Dr. Erasmus Darwin (1731-1802) was the first man in England to suggest those ideas which were later to be embodied in the Darwinian theory by his grandson, Charles Darwin (1809-1882), who wrote in 1859 *Origin of Species*. Before coming to Derby in 1788, Dr. Darwin had been made a Mason in the famous Time Immemorial Lodge of Cannongate Kilwinning, No. 2, of Scotland. Sir Francis Darwin, one of the Doctor's sons, was made a Mason in Tyrian Lodge, No. 253, at Derby, in 1807 or 1808. His son Reginald was made a Mason in Tyrian Lodge in 1840. The name of Charles Darwin does not appear on the rolls of the Lodge but it is very possible that he, like Francis, was a Mason."⁶⁴

Such information raises two questions: What is the position of Freemasonry on evolutionism, and what is the extent of Freemasonry's influence in conditioning people to accept evolutionism? As to the first question, Masonic authors have consistently affirmed their belief in evolutionism. Masonic author W.L. Wilmshurst has stated:

"This - the evolution of man into superman - was always the purpose of the ancient Mysteries, and the real purpose of modern Masonry is, not the social and charitable purposes to which so much attention is paid, but the expediting of the spiritual evolution of those who aspire to perfect their own nature and transform it into a more god-like quality."⁶⁵

"Man who has sprung from the earth and developed through the lower kingdoms of nature to his present rational state, has yet to complete his evolution by becoming a god-like being and unifying his consciousness with the Omniscient - to promote which is and always has been the sole aim and purpose of all Initiation."⁶⁶

It is important to note that this Masonic belief in evolutionism is quite old, predating the members of the Darwin family mentioned above.⁶⁷ Apart from any other influences, the Darwins and other members would have been exposed to evolutionary thought simply through their fellowship at the lodge.

To gauge the effectiveness of Freemasonry in shaping how people think, we can begin by noting that Masonic author Wilmshurst was born in 1867, yet his statements quoted above reflect a theology which is like the modern New Age, with man becoming a "god-like being." **Thus it is apparent that Freemasonry was promoting not only evolutionism but also the New Age before either philosophy had the grip on the average mind it has today.** Given the current popularity of these philosophies, it is certainly possible that Freemasonry has had at least a part in generating public belief in these ideas.

Investigative journalist Stephen Knight has posed the question whether in England, the land of Darwin's birth and initial influence, "Does Freemasonry have an influence on life ... as many people believe?"⁶⁸ He then recounts a number of cases of Freemasons having the power to prevent the publication of books they do not wish to see published, including his own.⁶⁹ If Freemasonry is able to block the publication of certain books, has it ever aided the success of others who agree with its belief system?

While it may never be known to what extent if any Freemasonry directly aided Darwin and the rise of evolutionism in the 1800s, Stephen Knight concludes that Freemasonry does in general have worldwide influence: "The Supreme Council in London is one of many Supreme Councils in various parts of the globe, of which the senior is the Supreme Council of Charleston, USA, which effectively operates a worldwide network of Freemasons in the most powerful positions in the executive, legislature, judiciary and armed forces as well as the industry, commerce and professions of many nations."⁷⁰

Since Knight's assessment includes by implication the media and the educational establishments, Freemasonry certainly has a part in buttressing evolutionism today. It is also apparent that the evolutionary beliefs of the Darwin family were in full agreement with Masonic beliefs and may have been aided and abetted by those beliefs.

Incidentally, though Darwin's wife is sometimes described as "Christian," in fact she was a Unitarian, so the Darwin family was truly devoid of biblical influence while being open to the pagan belief system of Freemasonry.

13. Myth: Darwin was a mild, well-adjusted family man. There are elements of truth in this myth; Darwin was mild-mannered, and his wife was devoted to him. But Darwin - intentionally or not - attempted to apply the racist principles of evolution by in-breeding in his own family. He married a first cousin on the belief that since they were both of superior "stock" their children would benefit.

Such a marriage would be illegal in most countries today, and even in Darwin's time was relatively rare. While his choice in marriage may have been a symptom of the class prejudices which were common then, it is significant that when he married in 1839, he had already been fully influenced by Lyell toward evolutionism. Indeed, he had been keeping his "secret" notebooks on natural selection for nearly two years, and the possibility cannot be dismissed that he was conditioned

to conduct a "breeding experiment" to produce a "most favoured race" when he married Emma.

However that may be, the result of their union was a collection of misfits, both physical and mental. Of the ten children, "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 the age of fifteen in 1859. Three of his six sons suffered such frequent illness that Darwin regarded them as semi-invalids while his last son, Charles Jr., was born mentally retarded and died in 1858, nineteen months after birth."⁷¹

14. Myth: Darwin became a Christian on his deathbed.

This story has been spread by well-meaning Christians. If only it were true! According to this myth, a certain Lady Hope visited Darwin in the fall of 1881 a few months before his death in 1882. Lady Hope noticed Darwin reading the Bible, whereupon Darwin told her he had recanted all evolutionary theory, now believed in the Bible, and furthermore was on his way to heaven. The story was later morphed into a version recalling Darwin's supposed conversion a few hours before his death - the "last hours" story. Most evidence appears to indicate this didn't happen.

There was indeed a real Lady Hope who was a contemporary of Darwin.⁷² Hypothetically they could have met, but **up to her death in 1922 Lady Hope asserted that such a meeting had never taken place.**⁷³ Even if they had met, Darwin's correspondence up to his death shows no change in his evolutionary or spiritual views. Unfortunately, there is not a shred of genuine evidence that Darwin became a Christian on his deathbed or at any other time, so far as can be ascertained from his writings or the testimony of acquaintances.⁷⁴

For instance, shortly before he died, Darwin revealed himself to be a staunch evolutionist when he wrote, "Though no evidence worth anything has as yet, in my opinion, been advanced in favour of a living being developed from inorganic matter, yet I cannot avoid believing the possibility of this will be proved some day in accordance with the law of continuity."⁷⁵

This is a staggering confession: Darwin says there is no evidence for chemical evolution, then says he believes in it anyway! Clearly, Darwin near death was exercising a strong faith, but in evolutionism, not in Jesus Christ.

Evidence points to Darwin's wife Emma having started the conversion myth before her death in 1897. It is known that Emma attempted to make changes in Darwin's autobiography to conceal Darwin's heterodoxy and "to maintain a good and proper image of the family name,"⁷⁶ a desirable thing in Victorian England. Though she was a Unitarian, she was also concerned about the moral implications of evolutionism.⁷⁷ As investigator Ian Taylor has noted, "It seems quite possible, then, that a person who might be prepared to delete certain pages from history might equally well be prepared to add pages to it. The suspicion thus points to Emma Darwin herself as the author of the 'last hours' story."⁷⁸

It is true that Darwin was not an atheist. He was very clear on this point, asserting that, "In my most extreme

fluctuations I have never been an atheist in the sense of denying the existence of God. I think that generally (and more and more as I grow older), but not always, that an Agnostic would be the more correct description of my state of mind."⁷⁹ He went further and at another time stated, "... I feel compelled to look to a First Cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called a Theist."⁸⁰

Of course, being a theist does not make one a creationist or a Christian, and this must be kept in mind when reading the final sentence of the *Origin*: "There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being evolved."⁸¹

While this statement seems to give some lip service to God as Creator, we should observe that the credit for the beauty and wonder of life goes to evolution. However, the Bible gives the Creator credit for how "wonderfully" we are made (Ps. 139:14), so Darwin here is not really honoring God but displacing Him.

We are left with the suspicion that **Darwin inserted this superficially pious statement at the end of the *Origin* to appease the sensitivities of those who might otherwise be offended by atheistic evolution.** In fact, Darwin confirmed that this is the case by writing, "For to my mind to say that species were created so and so is no scientific explanation, only a reverent way of saying it is so and so."⁸² In other words, the last sentence of the *Origin* provides a "reverent" patina for the atheistic evolution contained therein.

Sadly, as he aged Darwin moved steadily away from Christianity. While the death of a loved one often moves the bereaved toward a faith in Christ, the death of his father moved Darwin farther from Christ: "I can indeed hardly see how anyone ought to wish Christianity to be true; for if so, the plain language of the text seems to show that the men who do not believe, and this would include my father, brother, and almost all my best friends, will be eventually punished, and this is a damnable doctrine."⁸³ Rather than seeing in his father the spiritual danger he himself was in, Darwin turned the tables and called biblical doctrine "damnable."

Apparently connected with Darwin's spiritual sickness was a chronic invalidism which lasted for nearly all of his adult life. Darwin had been quite robust when young and was capable of sailing on the *Beagle* for several years without any effect on his health. However, "the ill health that was to make of him a recluse had set in almost as soon as the *Beagle* berthed."⁸⁴

For over forty years Emma and Charles "made a norm out of sickness as others did out of health,"⁸⁵ with Darwin suffering from symptoms so severe that "the whole of [an] elaborate schedule was devised to give him a total of four hours of work a day - at most, because the schedule prevailed only on his good days. On his bad days, which might seize him

as often as twice a week, all pretense of work was abandoned."⁸⁶

There seemed to be no organic cause for Darwin's malady. **Most interestingly, the symptoms worsened when he was thinking most about evolution, and abated when he was older and was no longer so engaged in evolutionary thought.**⁸⁷ The implication that Darwin's symptoms were psychosomatic and caused by his "birthing" of evolutionary thought is of course unpleasant to strong believers in evolutionism. It has been claimed by such a believer that Darwin's illness was organic after all with no psychosomatic aspect.⁸⁸

On the other hand, medically-based analyses of Darwin's symptoms have confirmed that **Darwin, while fundamentally robust, was mentally and spiritually tortured:** "Although his stomach, heart, skin, and cerebral symptoms were nonspecific, the characteristics of these symptoms to fluctuate in intensity, to undergo sudden exacerbations and remissions, and to run an overall course which was essentially nondeteriorative are indicative of psychic (as opposed to organic) causes."⁸⁹

Another analysis concluded: "The case for a psychoneurosis is first that the symptoms suggest it, and, taken in their entirety, they fit nothing else. Second, there is no evidence that any physical signs were ever found as they should have been after forty years of organic disease, and Darwin consulted the best physicians of his day. ... Third, the circumstances precipitating the attacks are right. Fourth, the illness got better towards the end of his life, which is quite unlike organic disease. Lastly, no other diagnosis that has been proposed, or that I can think of, fits all the facts."⁹⁰

Incredibly, we have Darwin's own testimony that thinking about evolutionary processes made him sick. In the *Origin*, Darwin employs his familiar form of argumentation (first mentioning insuperable difficulties, then dismissing them) to rationalize how natural selection should have produced the eye:

"To suppose the eye with all its inimitable contrivances ... could have formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree. ... Reason tells me, that if numerous gradations from a simple and imperfect eye to one complex and perfect can be shown to exist, each grade being useful to its possessor, as is certainly the case; ... then the difficulty of believing that a perfect and complex eye could be formed by natural selection, though insuperable by our imagination, should not be considered as subversive of the theory."⁹¹

However, in his private correspondence Darwin revealed the psychosomatic effects of such argumentation: "It is curious that I remember well times when the thought of the [evolution of the] eye made me cold all over but I have got over this stage of the complaint, and now small trifling particulars of the structure often make me uncomfortable. The sight of a feather in a peacock's tail whenever I gaze at it [and think of how it could evolve], makes me sick."⁹²

It is evident that at the most superficial level, Darwin was terrified that his theory of evolution by natural selection would be disproved, as indeed it was during his lifetime. As

early as 1863 even he was having doubts about his theory.⁹³ However, the possibility cannot be dismissed that Darwin was also susceptible to spiritual agony due to his constant opposition to the Word of God.

Conclusions. Darwin's life is a tragic example of the spiritual disaster a young person can encounter when exposed to a wrong influence, as Darwin was to Lyell's work. The Establishment's acceptance of *The Origin of Species* is a demonstration of how books are often exploited to launch humanist agendas, not because the books prove the humanist case, but because the books say what infidels want to hear and want others to believe. Books confer credibility. Christians should write and publish, too.

In addition to these general conclusions, the following specific conclusions follow from the facts presented above:

1. Darwin in his youth was never more than a "cultural" Christian; he could not have "lost" a faith he did not have.
2. Darwin was turned to evolutionism by Lyell, a lawyer whose agenda was to oppose the Bible.
3. Darwin was not a great scientist; he was a mediocre researcher even by the scientific conventions of his own day.
4. Darwin did not originate the concept of natural selection; he plagiarized it from Edward Blythe.
5. Darwin was goaded into publishing the *Origin* via Wallace, a spiritist who received the natural selection theory in a fever-induced trance in a single afternoon (as opposed to Darwin's 20 years of study).
6. The small first-day printing of the *Origin* did not sell out and the *Origin* was not a best-seller.
7. The *Origin* provides no evidence for evolution, only descriptions of genetic variation; the *Origin* is argumentation, not science.
8. Darwin rejected natural selection as a mechanism for evolution before the *Origin* was a decade old.
9. Darwin did not discover that species can change; this was known by Linnaeus and was generally accepted knowledge before the *Origin*.
10. Evolutionism has hindered science; Mendel's laws were suppressed because they challenged evolutionism.
11. Evolution is not a harmless philosophy; it is at root a racist philosophy; even Darwin was a racist.
12. Darwin did not come from a conventional Victorian family; they had a long history of opposing the Bible.
13. Darwin practiced evolutionary in-breeding in his own family with illness and early death as the results.
14. Darwin did not become a Christian on his deathbed; he was an invalid from the time he accepted evolutionism and rejected the Bible.

These facts demonstrate that in every point evolutionism is an empty fraud masquerading as science. Evolutionism is a religious agenda foisted upon humankind by those with an antipathy toward God and the Bible. It is a travesty that any Christian would give credence to it.

- 1 Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, Norton, 1968, first published in 1959, p. 31. Though Himmelfarb has a Roman Catholic background and at times seems to be quite critical of Darwin, she in fact admires him immensely. This is most obvious by her use of complimentary terms such as "hero" (pp. 1, 2) and "charm" (p. 146) in describing him.
- 2 *ibid.*, p. 64, quoting George Darwin, "Recollections," Cambridge University manuscript.
- 3 Charles Darwin, "Autobiography," Cambridge University manuscript; in *ibid.*, p. 32;
- 4 For more evidence regarding Darwin's lack of genuine conversion, see **Myth #14**.
- 5 Gertrude Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, p. 97, notes, "Toward the end of the voyage he announced to a friend that he had become a zealous disciple of Lyell ..."
- The first edition of the *Principles* was published in two volumes, the first in 1830 and the second in 1832. Darwin sailed with the *Beagle* on December 27, 1831, so had initially only the first volume with him which he had obtained the previous summer. To a second edition Lyell added a third volume published in 1833. A total of eleven editions were published, the last in 1872, before Lyell's death in 1875.
- 6 Haeckel in 1868 publicized his "biogenetic law," which states that "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny," meaning that an embryo in the womb grows through stages which retrace its supposed evolutionary history. Haeckel supported his "law" by fraudulent embryo drawings. The fraud was exposed in 1874 by the German embryologist Wilhelm His, but Haeckel's fraud continues to be taught in modern texts as fact.
- The concept of "gill slits" in the developing human embryo is a product of Haeckel's fraud, the alleged gill slits supposedly showing that we evolved from fishes. Modern biology texts persist in teaching this idea although humans have no gill slits at any stage of embryonic growth. See for example Peter H. Raven and George B. Johnson, *Biology*, Times Mirror/Mosby, 1989, p. 1110.
- Haeckel's fraud was widely publicized, especially after he was called to appear before a scientific "court of inquiry" to answer the fraud charges. The continued presentation of the biogenetic law, therefore, can be considered only deliberate deception by modern evolutionists who ought to know better.
- 7 K.M. Lyell (ed.), *Life, Letters and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, John Murray, 2 vols., 1881, Vol. 2, pp. 436-437. K.M. Lyell was Charles Lyell's sister-in-law who edited his papers for publication after his death. See also Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, p. 261. Lyell wrote the cited letter to Haeckel in 1868, before Haeckel's fraud had been exposed. Nevertheless, it is significant that the strongest supporter Lyell could find for his ideas at this time was a person as devoid of ethics in research as Ernst Haeckel.
- Lyell's influence on Darwin was well known in Darwin's circle of friends. Thomas Huxley, who styled himself "Darwin's bulldog" in his defense of Darwin against detractors, wrote, "Lyell, for others as for myself, was the chief agent in smoothing the road for Darwin" (Francis Darwin [ed.], *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, D. Appleton, 1897, Vol. 1, p. 176).
- 8 Francis Darwin, (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, D. Appleton, 2 vols., 1893 and 1897, Vol. 2, p. 374. Darwin also wrote, "I always feel as if my books came half out of Lyell's brain, and that I never acknowledge this sufficiently ... for I have always thought that the great merit of the *Principles* was that it altered the whole tone of one's mind, and therefore that, when seeing a thing never seen by Lyell, one yet saw it partially through his eyes" (Francis Darwin and A.C. Seward [eds.], *More Letters*, 1903, Vol. 2, p. 117; in Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, p. 97).
- In addition, Huxley wrote, "Darwin's greatest work is the unflinching application to biology of the leading idea and the method applied in the *Principles* to geology" (Thomas Huxley, *Darwiniana*, 1893, p. 268; in Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, p. 97).
- 9 K.M. Lyell, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, title page, and Vol. 2, title page. On these title pages Charles Lyell's only title is given as "Bart.," short for "barrister" or lawyer. He had no credentials in science. Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, p. 85, comments that Lyell "was by profession a lawyer, who studied

geology during the holidays when the courts were not in session and when he was not pursuing his side hobbies of conchology, zoology and botany; and whose eyesight was so bad that he had for a time to interrupt both his professional [legal] and amateur [geological] activities."

Lyell argued for geological evolution as a lawyer, not as a scientist, building a case for the possibility of geological evolution without presenting any direct evidence for it. Later in life Lyell wrote of biological evolution and followed the same technique of indirect argument: "He could not refer to any particle of a fact which would give any indication of how a species could be 'created' by natural law. He wanted his readers to gather such an idea, but he wanted to avoid the scientific odium of proposing it as a part of science" (Henshaw Ward, *Charles Darwin and the Theory of Evolution*, New Home Library, 1943, p. 436; in Robert T. Clark and James D. Bales, *Why Scientists Accept Evolution*, Baker, 1966, p. 23).

10 K.M. Lyell, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 253. Lyell wrote this letter to Gideon Mantell, the finder in 1822 of the first fossils eventually recognized as belonging to a dinosaur dubbed *iguanodon*.

The subtitle of *Principles of Geology* illustrated Lyell's desire to replace biblical Flood catastrophism with uniformitarianism: "An attempt to explain the former changes of the earth's surface by reference to causes now in operation," a perfect definition of uniformitarianism. Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, p. 84, notes that catastrophism was a "simpler" and "more economical" view, whereas uniformitarianism involved "abstract theory and speculation," an assessment which remains accurate.

11 *ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 271.

12 Historical geology is the study of the earth's geological past and can be (and should be) approached from the standpoint of biblical creation and the Flood. Today, however, there is no creationist historical geology textbook on the market, but this was not the case before Lyell published his *Principles*. The Reformation in the 1500s had generated a veritable flood of biblical scholarship, and by the 1600s many books about what is now called "historical geology" had appeared and were widely read in the scientific community of the day. Since historical geology was then (rightly) seen as closely linked with the biblical record, phrases such as "the sacred theory of the earth" were commonly used to describe the discipline now called "historical geology."

Several of these old creationist books are available in reprint form today, e.g., Thomas Burnet, *Sacred Theory of the Earth*, Southern Illinois University, 1965, first published in 1691, 412 pp.; John Ray, *Three Physico-Chemical Discourses*, Arno press, 1978, first published in 1713, 456 pp.; William Whiston, *A New Theory of the Earth*, Arno Press, 1978, first published in 1696, 388 pp.; and John Woodward, *An Essay Towards a Natural History of the Earth*, Arno Press, 1978, first published in 1695, 277 pp.

Modern evolutionists like to claim that there was no understanding of geology and hardly any understanding of science in general before evolutionism captured the mind of Western culture. This claim is a pure fiction. The real truth is that evolutionism displaced an advancing biblically-based science which had been progressing for over two centuries.

13 K.M. Lyell, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 467. Darwin observed Lyell employing this tactic: "Lyell is most firmly convinced that he has shaken the faith in the Deluge far more efficiently by never having said a word against the Bible than if he had acted otherwise. ... I have read lately Morley's *Life of Voltaire* and he insists strongly that direct attacks on Christianity (even when written with the powerful force and vigour of Voltaire) produce little permanent effect; real good seems to follow only the slow and silent side attacks" (Charles Darwin, Cambridge University manuscripts dated October 22 and 24, 1873; in Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, p. 387).

14 Gertrude Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, pp. 144-146. Amazingly, Himmelfarb, after revealing these inexcusable shortcomings in Darwin's laboratory technique, opines: "There is something attractive in all this - in Darwin's capacity to retain, as a mature and distinguished scientist, the unassuming ways of the youth and amateur. It was part of his charm that age and fame should have so little altered him" (p. 146). In this sentence Darwin is a

"mature" scientist, yet a few sentences before his is characterized him as an "amateur." Both cannot be true. One suspects that were it not for the Establishment's adulation of Darwin, Himmelfarb would not have included this contradictory face-saving commentary.

15 The standard source on Darwin the man and his accomplishments is *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, edited by his son Francis and published in three volumes in England in 1887 by John Murray, the publisher of Lyell's *Life, Letters, and Journal* and of the *Origin*. In the United States there was an edition published by D. Appleton with the first volume appearing in 1893 and the second in 1897. This source lists a total of 129 works published by Darwin, counting separate editions of his books, contributions to books edited by others, and papers appearing in scientific journals (Vol. 2, pp. 533-541). He published 23 full-length books besides the *Origin*, not counting separate editions or serial parts with differing publication dates.

This apparently significant output should be placed in perspective by noting that Darwin had absolutely no other responsibilities because he was independently wealthy and never had to work for a living a day in his life (Himmelfarb, op. cit., p. 134). By comparison, James Clerk-Maxwell, demonstrably the greatest scientist since Isaac Newton, and a contemporary of Darwin, was a full-time professor at Cambridge University until his death, yet Maxwell is credited with 101 scientific papers and several books which changed the face of literally all electromagnetic theory and physics generally (W.D. Niven, *The Scientific Papers of James Clerk Maxwell*, Dover, 1965, first published in 1890, Vol. 1, p. xxxi and Vol. 2, pp. v-vii).

16 To what extent is it accurate to describe Darwin as being upheld and supported by an "establishment"? The answer is that for many years Darwin was steadily advanced and popularized by a small circle of very influential people. Lyell was at the head of this group and paved the way for Darwin not only ideologically (as discussed under **Myth #2**) but literally. Lyell, "a great mover of men," had "a deliberate strategy ... to prepare a bodyguard of experts to shout down the 'howl of execration' which was sure to greet the *Origin*" (Himmelfarb, op. cit., p. 238). Others exercised their influence to prevent Darwin's work from being pre-empted by the revelations of A.R. Wallace (see **Myth #5**).

Lyell and others promoted the *Origin* when it first appeared, friends nominated him for the highest scientific honor in England (the Copley Medal bestowed by the Royal Society of London), and "friends prevailed" when Darwin was threatened with bad publicity because of his evolutionary beliefs (ibid., p. 306). All this despite the fact that Darwin was a virtual recluse because of chronic bad health (see **Myth #14**), rarely attending any scientific meetings, not the one at which his theory of evolution by natural selection was first presented before the Linnaean Society, and not even the one at which he was awarded the Copley Medal! There was certainly an Establishment standing behind Darwin which was quite satisfied with his evolutionary teachings. There is the definite possibility that this establishment had Masonic connections (see **Myth #12**).

17 Julian Huxley, "Introduction," *The Origin of Species*, Mentor, 1959, p. xiii. Julian Huxley was the founder of UNESCO.

18 Blythe considered natural selection to be a "conservative rather than a creative force" (Loren C. Eiseley, *Darwin and the Mysterious Mr. X*, Dutton, 1979, p. 54; in Randall Hedtkke, *The Secret of the Sixth Edition*, Vantage, 1983, p. 44).

19 Loren C. Eiseley, "Charles Darwin, Edward Blythe, and the Theory of Natural Selection," *Philosophical Society*, Vol. 103, p. 94; see also Ian T. Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, TFE Publishing, 1987, pp. 125-126.

Eiseley gave considerable study to this topic, eventually devoting an entire book to it in which he reiterated, "In the British *Magazine of Natural History* in 1835 and again in 1837 - the very year that Darwin opened his first notebook upon the species question - Blythe discussed what today we would call both natural and sexual selection" (Loren C. Eiseley, *Darwin and the Mysterious Mr. X*, op. cit., p. 46). Eiseley concludes that Darwin had read Blythe's articles.

20 D. King-Hele, *Erasmus Darwin*, Scribner's, 1963, p. 69; in Hedtkke, op. cit., p. 43.

21 Francis Darwin, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 45; the phraseology here follows Himmelfarb, op. cit., p. 240.

22 Gertrude Himmelfarb, op. cit., p. 240. **23** *ibid.*, p. 307.

24 *ibid.*, pp. 245-247. Virtually identical accounts are given by Ian T. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 76-78; and by Hedtkke, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

25 Ian T. Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, TFE Publishing, 1987, pp. 75-76.

26 Gertrude Himmelfarb, op. cit., p. 477. **27** *ibid.*, p. 253.

28 Francis Darwin, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 534. Other editions were published in the United States and other countries during Darwin's lifetime.

29 One way to estimate the impact of evolutionism is to total the political murders directly attributable to evolutionary thought. It is well known that Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, and Mao Zedong collectively murdered over 100 million people for political reasons, meanwhile rationalizing these crimes by appeal to evolutionary doctrines such as the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. It is certain that Darwin did not foresee the evil to which his book would lead, but as we have seen Darwin's thought was ultimately driven by rejection of the Bible. The twentieth century holds the record for the most political murders, exceeding even the death toll of 75 million due to the Black Plague in fourteenth century Europe.

30 Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Mentor, 1958, second edition, first published in 1860, p. 48.

31 *ibid.* The first five chapters are more than one-third of the book.

32 *ibid.*, p. 158. **33** *ibid.*, pp. 288-289.

34 *ibid.*, pp. 318-319, for example: "The theory of natural selection is grounded on the belief that each new variety and ultimately each new species, is produced and maintained by having some advantage over those with which it comes into competition; and the consequent extinction of the less-favoured forms almost inevitably follows. It is the same with our domestic productions; when a new and slightly improved variety has been raised, it at first supplants the less improved varieties in the same neighborhood; when much improved it is transported far and near, like our short-horn cattle, and takes the place of other breeds in other countries." In making this association between selective breeding and evolution, Darwin of course overlooks (or chooses to overlook) the fact that human intelligence is required to conduct such breeding projects. The analogous principle for life in general is that an External Intelligence is necessary to maintain it.

35 Gertrude Himmelfarb, op. cit., p. 333.

36 Leonard Huxley (ed.), *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley*, Macmillan, 1900, Vol. 2, p. 193; in Taylor, op. cit., p. 132.

37 D. Hull, *Darwin and His Critics*, Harvard, 1973, p. 270; in Hedtkke, op. cit., p. 24.

38 Charles Darwin, op. cit., pp. 419-420.

39 Randall Hedtkke, op. cit., p. 1: "What is the secret of the sixth edition of *On the Origin of Species*? Incredibly, this - Charles Darwin, in his old age, abandoned natural selection, the mechanism by which evolution was believed possible."

40 Typographical errors and other simple mistakes in the first edition were corrected in the second edition which appeared only two months after the first. The second edition was in fact the very last edition to uphold natural selection as the mechanism for evolution, successive editions promoting natural selection less and less until in the sixth, natural selection was abandoned altogether (Hedtkke, op. cit., pp. 31-32).

41 Charles Darwin, op. cit., p. 426.

42 Julian Huxley, op. cit., p. xv. **43** *ibid.*, p. xiii.

44 Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, sixth edition, Modern Library, 1872, p. 168; in Hedtkke, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

45 *ibid.*, p. 178. Private correspondence reveals that Darwin at least as early as 1863 had begun to express doubts about the place of natural selection in evolution: "When we descend to details, we can prove that no one species has changed [by natural selection]; nor can we prove that the supposed changes are beneficial, which is the groundwork of the theory. Nor can we explain

why some species have changed and others have not" (Francis Darwin, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 210).

46 Charles Darwin, Letter to the Editor, *Nature*, November 11, 1880, Vol. 23, p. 32; in Hedtke, op. cit., p. 35. To this day *Nature* remains the premier scientific journal in England.

47 *ibid.*

48 D. Hull, op. cit., p. 412; in Hedtke, op. cit., p. 30.

49 Just prior to the first appearance of the *Origin* in 1859, Darwin wrote to Lyell: "Remember your verdict will probably have more influence than my book in deciding whether such views as I hold will be admitted or rejected at present ..." (Francis Darwin, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 218).

50 Henshaw Ward, *Charles Darwin: The Man and His Warfare*, Bobbs-Merrill, 1927, p. 325; in Hedtke, op. cit., p. 41.

51 *ibid.* **52** K.M. Lyell, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 363-364.

53 Thomas Huxley, *Darwiniana*, 1896, p. 475; in Hedtke, op. cit., p. 46.

54 Randall Hedtke, op. cit., p. 46.

55 The following representative list of anti-Darwinian books includes no Christian works. It should be noted that these books question only Darwinism, not evolutionism in general. Though some of the authors are theists (i.e. they believe in God), they all accept evolutionism as a fact, and some are very involved in the New Age, demonstrating that the modern shift away from Darwinism is *not* a movement back to the Bible. From the publication dates, the rise of anti-Darwinism in the 1980s and 1990s is apparent.

1960: G.A. Kerkut, *Implications of Evolution*, Pergamon.

1967: Peter Medawar (ed.), *Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution*, Wistar Institute.

1968: G. Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, Norton.

1971: Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried*, Gambit.

1977: Pierre-P. Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms: Evidence for a New Theory of Transformation*, Academic.

1981: Jacques Barzun, *Darwin Marx Wagner: Critique of a Heritage*, University of Chicago.

1982: Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Darwin, Evolution, and the New Biology*, New American Library.

1983: G.R. Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, Harper and Row.

1984: Wm. [sic] R. Fixx, *The Bone Peddlers*, Macmillan.

1984: Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny: A New Word, A New World*, Penguin.

1985: Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Alder & Alder.

1986: John D. Barrow and Frank J. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, Oxford.

1987: Richard Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, Simon and Schuster.

1991: R. Wesson, *Beyond Natural Selection*, MIT.

1993: Michael A. Cremona and Richard L. Thompson, *Forbidden Archeology*, Bhaktivedanta Institute.

1996: Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, Free Press.

1997: R. Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, Park Street.

1997: Lee Spetner, *Not By Chance*, Judaica Press.

1998: Michael A. Cremona, *Forbidden Archeology's Impact*, Bhaktivedanta Institute.

2000: Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, Regnery.

2004: Guillermo Gonzales and Jay Richards, *The Privileged Planet: How Our Place in the Cosmos Is Designed for Discovery*, Regnery.

56 Gertrude Himmelfarb, op. cit., p. 170, repeats the "fixity of species" myth concerning Linnaeus: "It is one of the ironies of history that Linnaeus' classification of species should in large part prevail even today, surviving so long the assumption upon which it was based, that of the immutability of species."

57 Ian Taylor, op. cit., pp. 160-161.

58 Since God is in control of history, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that He timed the announcements of Mendel and Pasteur to provide a direct

challenge to evolutionism just as it was becoming popular. Western culture had an opportunity to recant its belief in evolutionism, but failed the test.

59 Ian Taylor, op. cit., p. 161.

60 Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, 2nd edition, p. 318.

61 *ibid.*, p. 426. **62** Francis Darwin, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 69.

63 The abortion holocaust, another product of evolutionism, has cost many more lives than political deaths by dictators in the twentieth century. More than 50 million babies are currently aborted worldwide each year, many of them because of the implication of evolution that babies are less highly developed and therefore of less value than adults.

64 Albert G. Mackey, "Darwin, Charles, and Freemasonry," *Mackey's Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, The Masonic History Company, 1950, Vol. 3; in John Daniel, *Scarlet and the Beast*, JKI Publishing, 1994, Vol. 2, p. 34.

65 W.L. Wilmshurst, *The Meaning of Masonry*, Gramercy, 1980; first printed in 1927, p. 47.

66 *ibid.*, p. 94.

67 *ibid.*, p. 17. Masonry claims to be the "direct and representative descendant" of the ancient Mysteries, i.e., the pagan religions of antiquity. Modern Masonry has existed since at least the early 1700s. The pagan religions of antiquity without exception were evolutionary, and Masonry as their modern "representative" has always been evolutionary as well.

68 Stephen Knight, *The Brotherhood*, Stein and Day, 1984, p. 6.

69 *ibid.*, pp. 9-12.

70 *ibid.*, p. 44. Knight (p. 240) also notes that "the Church of England has been a stronghold of Freemasonry for more than two hundred years. Traditionally, joining the Brotherhood and advancing within it has always been the key to preferment in the Church." This fact may help to explain why the nineteenth-century church in Britain took no consistent position against the rising tide of evolutionism.

71 Ian Taylor, op. cit., p. 127.

72 Wilbert H. Rusch and John W. Klotz, *Did Charles Darwin Become a Christian?*, Creation Research Society, 1988, p. 20

73 *ibid.* **74** *ibid.*, p. 7. **75** *ibid.*, p. 12.

76 Ian Taylor, op. cit., p. 137.

77 Wilbert H. Rusch and John W. Klotz, op. cit., p. 13.

78 Ian Taylor, op. cit., p. 137. In an otherwise very helpful book, Hedtke (op. cit., p. 38) concludes that because Darwin rejected natural selection as the means of evolution, he must also have turned to biblical creation. Hedtke's rationale for this unwarranted conclusion is the fallacious Lady Hope myth.

79 Francis Darwin, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 59. The term "agnostic" was coined by Darwin's friend Thomas Huxley.

80 *ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 66.

81 Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, second edition, p. 450.

82 Francis Darwin, op. cit.; in Clark and Bales, op. cit., p. 34.

83 Charles Darwin, "Recollections," Cambridge manuscript; in Rusch and Klotz, op. cit., p. 24.

84 Gertrude Himmelfarb, op. cit., p. 127.

85 *ibid.*, 133. **86** *ibid.*, p. 141. **87** Ian Taylor, op. cit., p. 129.

88 Arnold C. Brackman, *A Delicate Arrangement*, Times Books, 1980, p. 7; in Taylor, op. cit., p. 129.

89 Ralph Colp, *To Be An Invalid*, University of Chicago, 1977, p. 142; in Hedtke, op. cit., p. 25.

90 G. Pickering, *Creative Malady*, Oxford, 1974, p. 71; in Hedtke, op. cit., p. 25.

91 Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, second edition, pp. 168-169.

92 Francis Darwin, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 244. **93** See **Note 45**.