

Why Charles Darwin was not a great man

Introduction

There have been a number of polls to determine the greatest Briton, or the greatest man in history, or the most important scientist, and these often declare that Charles Darwin heads the list. In fact, it is often seen as axiomatic or plainly obvious that this is the case. Recognisable media celebrities like David Attenborough,¹ Richard Dawkins² or Brian Cox³ will affirm this while gainsayers are given no screen time.

This is very odd since Darwin never actually produced anything beneficial to society; in fact his theoretical principles have done much harm to culture and society, such as the notion of Eugenics which springs directly from Darwin's ideas. In the lists many people that actually gave mankind great boons are ignored in favour of Darwin. Godly scientists like Isaac Newton who codified the law of gravity and other real achievements, or Michael Faraday who discovered electricity are passed by for someone who promoted a lie. Secular engineers and craftsmen who did actually help mankind, such as Brunel,⁴ make the list but below Darwin.

Darwin's premiership has been so indelibly inscribed on the public consciousness that it would take a major media upheaval to deny him top status; but this is my small attempt to chip away at that myth, for myth it is.

Darwin's supposed achievement

Charles Robert Darwin [1809–82] was an amateur natural historian and geologist chosen by privilege to be the naturalist on HMS Beagle for her voyage around the southern hemisphere [1831–6] during which he collected the material which became the basis for his ideas on natural selection. He was only 28-years old in 1837 that he wrote in a notebook, '*one species does change into another*'. His observations during the voyage suggested to him that plant and animal species were not fixed and permanent.

His works *On the Origin of Species* [1859] and *The Descent of Man* [1871] had a fundamental effect on our concept of nature and the place of man within it.

Darwin is lauded for being the chief engineer of the development of the theory of evolution which is now so embedded in education and science textbooks that it is understood as a law of nature, despite many modern scientists denying its veracity.

¹ Though a naturalist he is not a scientist but a media presenter and former executive of the BBC.

² He is a publicist for a university to promote science but he is widely disliked in the real scientific community because he has never done any actual science; he just talks about it.

³ A former pop musician turned scientific spokesman and media presenter. He has studied science and has a PhD. and does research in high-energy physics; however his awards are not for scientific discoveries but for communicating science to the masses.

⁴ Isambard Kingdom Brunel [1806–59]; an English engineer. He was chief engineer of the Great Western Railway. His achievements include designing the Clifton suspension bridge and the first transatlantic steamship, the Great Western.

If someone talks about evolution they always ascribe it as a discovery of Darwin and celebrate his life-long achievement of discovering this basic fact of nature that now underlies a number of scientific claims and philosophical principles built upon it.

Essentially Darwin proposed that life must be understood as a long, continual process of change (natural selection) where organisms make adaptations over time that gradually evolve into more successful creatures. The proposition is that the simple evolves into the complex and that life began in a primordial soup of chemicals. Over time the weak are eliminated and the strong adapt, change and survive – ‘*survival of the fittest*’; nature selects characteristics beneficial to survival and deletes features that hinder it.

The essential element in this is the change of one species into another, which was a step change from the prevailing doctrine that species are fixed. The fixity of species had been a view held by academics in natural history, biology, botany, divinity and philosophy for generations.

Absurdities about Darwin’s theories

- The world came from nothing.
- Life emerged from a chemical swamp by utter chance.
- Nothing in the natural world is designed according to a purpose.
- Organisms can decide to change elements in their genome to increase their ability to succeed.
- One species can develop into a completely different species, with different physiology, different breathing systems, different vascular systems, different types of eye structure and so on. Even lizards can turn into birds, despite the fact that their bone structure, skin make up and lungs are completely different and any transitional change would kill the animal.
- Given sufficient time, measured in millions of years, simpler, weaker animals turn into stronger more complex animals.

In later life Darwin knew that his theory was a shambles but it was a juggernaut he couldn’t stop. He admitted in a letter, ‘*Not one change of species into another is on record ... we cannot prove that a single species has changed*’.⁵

Early reception of Darwin’s ideas

Darwin’s theories did not start with a bang but with a whimper; his lecture at the Linnean Society had a subdued or even critical response from academics. Yet the publication of his first book on the issue sold out. Nevertheless there were many severe criticisms of Darwin’s proposals from true academics.

One significant criticism was by Adam Sedgwick, Prof. of Geology at Cambridge University, who wrote a letter to Darwin, after reading his book in November 1859, which he read, ‘*with more pain than pleasure*’ because aspects were, ‘*utterly false and grievously mischievous*’.

The real cause of Sedgwick’s concern was that Darwin had not used empirically-based scientific induction and instead trusted in his subjective baseless assumptions: ‘*Many of your wide conclusions are based upon assumptions which can neither be proved nor disproved. Why then express them in the language and arrangements of philosophical induction?*’.

⁵ Francis Darwin Ed. *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol 1, p210.

In summary, Sedgwick's points are as follows:

- Natural selection is but a secondary consequence of supposed primary facts and is absurd.
- Darwin wrote about natural selection as if it were done consciously by the selecting agent.
- Darwin conflated change over time with the explanation of how it came about. Everyone agrees on adaptations but the causes and mechanisms are unknown. [The fact that a virus can mutate and change has nothing to do with the origin of life or new species.]
- Darwin ignored the moral / metaphysical aspect of nature. Sedgwick foresaw the moral impact of evolution's ability to, '*sink the human race into a lower grade of degradation*'; that humanity could be brutalised since men would be just brute animals created by chance with no moral purpose and no accountability to a holy creator.

Sedgwick warned Darwin about his '*triumphalist confidence*' and condemned his imaginary claims that were beyond the limits of science. Despite this, he offered the hand of friendship to Darwin to help him. It seems that Darwin wasn't interested.

Problems with Darwin as an original contributor to science

Darwin's chief claim to fame is his theory of evolution by natural selection, but forms of evolutionary theory had been around for thousands of years. There was nothing original in what Darwin had to say. In fact two of his contemporaries had come up with a discourse on evolution before he did.

Erasmus Darwin

The first of these was his grandfather Erasmus Darwin [1731–1802], an English physician, scientist, inventor, and poet. His scientific and technical writing was often in the form of long poems. These include *Zoonomia* [1794–96], which proposed a Lamarckian view of evolution.

Alfred Russel Wallace

The other was a man named Alfred Russel Wallace who had produced a paper saying much the same as Darwin later wrote. Note this, Darwin had read Wallace's work before he finished his own book. Wallace was in Malaysia and Borneo at this time and had sent his paper on natural selection to Darwin for evaluation. Darwin received this article on 18 June 1858 which described natural selection.

Fearing Wallace would take the credit, Charles Lyell⁶ urged Darwin to publish immediately, so that Wallace was beaten to the publishing date. Lyell and Joseph Hooker⁷ arranged a joint presentation at the Linnean Society in July on 'The Tendency of Species to form Varieties' and on 'The perpetuation of Varieties and Species by Natural Means of Selection'.

This received scant attention so that the president of the Linnean Society commented in May 1859 that the previous year had not been marked by any revolutionary discoveries.

⁶ Sir Charles Lyell [1797–1875]; Scottish geologist. His textbook 'Principles of Geology' (1830–3) influenced a generation of geologists and held that the earth's features were shaped over a long period of time by natural processes, thus clearing the way for Darwin's theory of evolution.

⁷ Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker [1817-1911]; a great Victorian botanist and explorer. He was a distinguished director of the Royal Botanical Gardens at Kew.

Darwin only recalled one review from Prof. Samuel Haughton of Dublin who stated that, *'all that was new in them was false and what was true was old'*.

Ancient philosophers

The fact is that the devil hates the doctrine of special creation and has repeatedly attacked it with forms of evolutionary theory for millennia. Many pagan myths have origin stories where order gradually proceeds out of chaos. Occult religions of all sorts have also long held to some form of evolutionary theory. The spontaneous generation of life, usually from slime, was an ancient doctrine. From this it was a small leap to suggest that one species could gradually develop into a new life form. Some ancient Greeks held it: Anaximander taught that men evolved from fish while Empedocles believed that men arose from plants.

Furthermore, the idea of transmutation, or the conversion or transformation of one species into another, had been around for many years and Darwin studied it assiduously.

Jean Baptiste de Lamarck

Shortly before Darwin, Lamarckism had appeared. This was proposed by Jean Baptiste de Lamarck [1744-1829] whose idea was that organs which are used will develop, while organs that are not used will atrophy. Succeeding generations would then inherit these characteristics and slowly change. For example Lamarck proposed that the long neck of the giraffe was developed by constantly stretching to reach high leaves. Modern understanding of DNA teaches us that this is wrong and it was discarded in the 1930s. Only changes to genes, and their DNA, transmit alterations to offspring.

Charles Lyell

The essential missing component in Darwin's theory was supplied by someone else; his friend Charles Lyell, who developed the idea of uniformitarianism. This proposes that geological changes occur over very long periods of time, which meant that earth must be millions of years old. This went against the prevailing historic view, following the Bible, that earth's history is measured in a few thousand years only and also contradicts known geological features, such as polystrate trees.⁸ It is only with the concept of life being on earth for many millions of years that Darwin's theory could gain any ground since it was believed that such long periods of time could allow for the changes of one species into another.

So Darwin produced nothing original; his creative input to science is quite trivial as well as false. He neither originated nor proved his claim that natural selection could generate new species.

Darwin was not a scientist

Despite constantly appearing in polls as the best scientist in history, Darwin was not a qualified scientist at all; neither did he formally study to be one at any university. Furthermore, his methods are not scientific.

Darwin initially went to the University of Edinburgh Medical School with his brother Erasmus in 1825. There he found lectures very dull and balked at surgery, so he neglected his studies.

⁸ Polystrate trees are fossilised tree trunks which stretch right through the geologic column. Thus a single tree stretches through millions of years of supposed sedimentary deposition. These are quite common on earth and result from dead trees deposited in lakes standing up, then mud sediment forming around them layer by layer as the lake recedes. This process has been observed following catastrophic circumstances (like volcanic action).

His father was annoyed with him and so he sent him to Christ's College Cambridge to study in Divinity to become a parish parson in the Anglican Church. Since he was unqualified for the higher level he studied the ordinary degree course, beginning in 1828. However, he preferred riding and shooting rather than studying; though he did begin natural history studies for pleasure. He was successful in getting some beetle finds published and became a friend of botany professor John Stevens Henslow.

Darwin was also influenced by William Paley's, 'Evidences of Christianity' (1794). Somehow, he managed to complete his course in 1831 and gained an ordinary degree.

So Darwin was a poorly qualified Divinity graduate with no academic background in science whatsoever. Without the financial backing and pushing of his father he would have had little education at all. Also, without his father's connections and wealthy backing, he could not have been accepted as the naturalist on the Beagle, for which he had no qualifications at all.

Darwin only promoted a theory not a proven law

Today virtually everyone believes that evolutionary theory is a tried and tested law; indeed some manipulative 'scientists' have openly claimed that it is a law. The media, especially the BBC, pushes evolution down viewers' throats to such a great extent (often accompanied by lovely images of animals and the natural world in documentaries) that it is quite natural for people to assume that evolutionary theory is axiomatic.

No intermediary fossils

But there is no proof for the theory whatsoever and it will never be proved because it is a lie. Darwin's own concerns that if proof did not emerge within a few decades of publishing, such as by intermediary forms in the fossil record, then his theory would be disproved. Well, no such fossils have been found, despite hundreds of thousands of fossil finds, and thus, by Darwin's own advice his theory should be discarded.

No simple structures

Furthermore multiple examples of life were thought by Darwin to work against his theory, such as the complexity of the human eye or the knee joint.⁹ He needed answers to such complexity to secure his theory. In fact, not only was there no answer to this problem but modern discoveries have shown that nature is a thousand times more complex than thought in the 19th century.

The original idea was that single-celled animals were very simple and these formed the foundation of life; emerging quite by chance out of chemicals on the earth. Gradually single-celled organisms evolved into more complex structures until fish were formed. From fish came amphibians and then reptiles and then mammals.

The problem is that we now know that even single-celled organisms are incredibly complicated; there is nothing simple about life. The idea that, by chance, chemicals could form the complex structures, such as cilia¹⁰ and flagella¹¹ in microbes is quite ridiculous.

⁹ *'To suppose that the eye, with all its inimitable contrivances ... could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest possible degree.'* Quoted in E. Shute, *Flaws in the Theory of Evolution*, Craig Press, Nutley, New Jersey, (1961), p448.

¹⁰ A short microscopic hair-like vibrating structure. Cilia occur in large numbers on the surface of certain cells, either causing currents in the surrounding fluid, or, in some protozoans and other small organisms, providing propulsion. A single cilium contains over 200 different kinds of proteins and is complex in design,

These have numerous faculties resembling complex motors and springs in modern technology. Living cells are called '*nanotechnology factories*' because they are filled with molecular machinery with vast numbers of processes going on harmoniously.

Apart from the molecular machinery, there is the genetic code which acts like a language to guide the internal processes. In the heart of every cell are DNA molecules with chemical nucleotides that provide a coded message which drives activities of proteins. Modern biologists have compared the genetic activity within single cells as being like a computer. So much for being simple!

Since this is not a paper on combating evolutionary theory in detail, I will avoid further discussion but refer you to my book, '*Confronting Evolutionary Theory*'.

Darwin is largely dismissed by modern science

The fact is that Darwin's theories have been going out of fashion for many years due to their failure in the light of modern discoveries. Many modern scientists now deny that they are Darwinian, even if they believe in evolution. Scientists are searching for a new mechanism to explain evolution and are struggling.

Just one example is that of Harvard professor Philip Jay Gould [1941-2002] who proposed the idea of punctuated equilibrium, whereby evolution advances by sudden stages rather than a prolonged slow process.

In fact there are many scientists today who believe in some form of intelligent design because the facts scream that this is the case. They may not be in the majority but they are present in large numbers and some are very respected people.

The modern push promoting Darwinism by people such as Richard Dawkins, is called Neo-Darwinism and this has resulted in a backlash from scientists. Recent books by atheist philosophers of science that have criticised Darwinism include Jerry Fodor and Massimo Piatelli-Palmarini, '*What Darwin Got Wrong*'. Another is Bradley Monton, '*Seeking God in Science: An atheist defends intelligent design*'.

Some extremely famous scientists, such as the Nobel Prize winning Francis Crick and JD Watson,¹² choose not to believe in God, but realise that Darwinism is a broken theory that denies observed facts.

having tubes within tubes, with strands and rods aligned down the length. The motor powering the cilium is within it, thus they can be made to move when separated from the cell wall.

¹¹ A slender thread-like structure, especially a microscopic whip-like appendage which enables many protozoa, bacteria, spermatozoa, etc. to swim. . The motors that drive these appendages are incredibly complicated consisting of the filament (propeller), a universal joint, different types of bushing, rods (drive shaft), rotors, several layers of membranes and so on. These motors are not situated in the filament but in the cell at the base of the filament. Energy is supplied by a flow of acid through the bacterial membrane. It requires about 240 proteins to function, most are not understood but some are known to switch the motor on and off and others to micro-design the tail-filament. The structure is very similar to an electric motor, but more complicated. This whole arrangement is irreducibly complex and must have been designed; it had to come complete with all parts and working. Evolution cannot explain how this could have been generated slowly with each new part being developed but having no purpose alone.

¹² Francis Crick and J. D. Watson are English biophysicists who proposed the double helix structure of the DNA molecule, thus explaining how genetic information is carried in living organisms and how genes replicate. They won the Nobel Prize for Physiology or Medicine in 1962, shared with M. H. F. Wilkins.

One quote from scientists regarding the state of modern Darwinism, '*The classical theory of evolution in its strict sense belongs to the past ... almost all French specialists hold today strong mental reservations as to the validity of natural selection*'.¹³

Darwin's negative impact on society

The negative impact of evolutionary theory on society is hard to quantify but it is safe to say that it underlies almost everything today.

Eugenics

I have already mentioned the despicable notion of Eugenics, which is the science of improving a population by controlled breeding to increase the occurrence of desirable heritable characteristics. This was largely developed by Darwin's cousin Francis Galton as a method of improving the human race. It fell out of favour after the adoption of its doctrines by the Nazis. Galton's ideas could not have taken hold without Darwin.

Only a few decades after Darwin's publications nihilist Nietzsche opined that it was the sick, the disabled, the oppressed, the failures, the hopeless, the broken and the weak, rather than evil men, who were the greatest threat to humanity. Pure evolutionism.

Abortion

It is unthinkable that easily available abortions could have occurred during the historic period when life was sacrosanct under prevailing Christian ethics. After Modernism, Liberalism and especially evolutionary theory, ate away at the foundation of Christian ethics in society, abortion laws were introduced in the 1960s enabling easily available, safe abortions at ever-increasing late stage of gestation, without even parental consolation. Evolutionary theory educated people to consider foetuses as non-human and for pregnant women to consider their desires and life-style choices a higher priority than the value of a life.

The end result has been catastrophic; millions of unformed human lives destroyed in the biggest holocaust in history. While the politicians may have been considering the perils of poor young girls finding themselves pregnant and choosing back-street abortionists, instead of adopting policies to help and succour these girls they chose instead to kill very nearly fully-formed babies that ultrasound scans show respond in panic and silent screams to being attacked by abortionists.

Without evolutionary principles affecting society this could never have happened.

Low morality

Everywhere in society where you see the impact of the idea that the fittest survive and the weakest die you see the fingerprints of Darwin. This leads to the idea that the weak are to be despised and the strong favoured, the very opposite of Christian principles – which is why the devil favours it.

Violence

All aggressors in violent military campaigns see their victims as less than human; thus they feel no pangs of conscience when they subject them to brutality or wipe them out in genocide. This demeaning of human beings may have been present throughout history by immoral people, but the prevailing evolutionary theory has made this ever more easy to be accepted by supposedly civilised people.

¹³ Zygmunt Litynski, 'Should we burn Darwin?' *Science Digest*, Vol 51, Jan 1962, p61.

When people are brought up accepting that '*nature is red in tooth and claw*' and that the strong survive and the weak die off, or that one ethnic group is evolutionarily fitter than another, then it becomes far easier to justify killing 'lesser' people.

It is not without sadness that we must note that great followers of Darwin include: Adolph Hitler, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin (Communism was responsible for the deaths of over 200 million people treated like animals for the evolutionary development of nations). Darwin would have agreed with this for the greater good since he wrote, '*The civilised races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world*'.¹⁴ He also wrote that '*Negroes*' (his word) and Australian aborigines were lesser types of people than civilised nations.

Without any doubt, Darwinism has enabled the Manifest Destiny policy of federal America to defend genocide of Native American Indians plus the repression and persecution of Australian aborigines, New Zealand Maoris and African tribesmen.

Biological arguments for racism may have been common before 1859, but they increased by orders of magnitude following the acceptance of evolutionary theory.¹⁵

Darwin's success; a Christian perspective

There is nothing surprising to the Christian commentator about Darwin's huge success and the rise of Darwinism throughout the 20th century (waning now), despite his appalling lack of science.

As with any industry, it is not so much about talent or original thinking that drives success but about what is happening at the time and the support of powerful people. In the larger view the developments in society reflect the ongoing war between the devil and God and especially the devil's final grasp at achieving world domination through political means.

There is no doubt that evolutionary theory is a very useful tool for Satan to work with and history is proof that Darwin's ideas have led to innumerable harms but also a deleterious effect on the mind of the world's population.

Chief among these are the following:

- Getting rid of God from the origins of life and the universe.
- Implicit undermining of Biblical authority.
- Instigating nihilism; no divine or moral purpose in life.
- Separating ethics from divinity or any absolute moral standard.
- Getting rid of personal accountability for one's actions.
- Enabling the powerful to eradicate the weak.
- Enabling totalitarian societies to gain authoritarian control of the people.
- Controlling education to extinguish independent thinking of the young.
- Enabling destruction of Christian ethics in society.

I'm sure that with time I could add to this list, but this will do. Without doubt Darwin was a principle tool of Satan in facilitating the final satanic push at dominating all aspects of

¹⁴ Darwin; 'The Descent of Man', John Murray (1901), chapter VI, p241-242.

¹⁵ Stephen Jay Gould; 'Ontogeny and Phylogeny', Harvard University Press (1977), p127.

society and seeking to dethrone God. This is why the devil enabled his massive success, despite the fact that Darwin had nothing original to say, no efficient science in his arguments, no empirical proof and no rational argumentation for his imaginary theory.

Conclusion

Darwin was neither an original thinker, nor any sort of originator. He did not discover anything nor proved anything. He made no advance in understanding the laws of nature but hindered people from realising how creation works according to supernatural design. He made no technological advancement to aid society while many of his contemporaries and critics did.

Furthermore, his work rested on the back of others before him whom he did not acknowledge. His lack of credit for the work of Wallace that had preceded him is disgraceful, as is his choice to ignore his grandfather's contribution or Lamarck's, let alone Greek philosophers or pagan writings.

The facts are clear; not only was Darwin NOT a great man, but he was a man that published very bad ideas that did immense damage to human society. Those who keep promoting him as a great scientist should hang their heads in shame. Supposed scientific celebrities that continue to push Darwin and his retched ideas merely prove that they are not good scientists and do not follow scientific method.

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version
© Thomas Nelson 1982

Paul Fahy Copyright © 2016
Understanding Ministries
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>