

If Darwin Was Right...

Dub McClish

Charles Darwin was born 2 centuries ago (1809). Even those who reject his premises cannot deny the impact of them on mankind. Along with the “sea change” Darwinian evolution has wrought in science, its effect upon religion and morals has perhaps been even more incalculable.

The acceptance of Darwin’s theories required abandonment of faith in God and in the Creation account of Genesis (the claims of “theistic evolutionists” notwithstanding). It was natural to assume that, if the Bible’s opening words are suspect, the rest of it (including its moral laws) might also be faulty (which assumption atheists and humanists have warmly welcomed). In the Darwinian domain, men are soulless critters—freak “accidents of history,” common in origin with everything from maggots to monkeys to mules. Men therefore have no uniqueness that makes us superior in worth or authority to their environment or to other life forms. Moreover, there is no Heaven to seek nor Hell to avoid upon the basis of one’s behavior.

The broad acceptance of Darwinism has gradually—but undeniably—eroded Biblical moral values, the cohesive social force of Western Europe and North America until the early-to-mid 20th century. Several generations of children have been propagandized with Darwin’s dogma by a humanistic public education system, and with predictable effect. A large percentage of these generations have been convinced that we are mere animals. Why should anyone be surprised at the corresponding increases in sexual promiscuity, illegitimate births, destroyed families, and acceptance of sexual perversions as “normal”? The “right” of a woman to murder the baby in her womb could never have been imagined or sought, much less “found,” had not Darwinism done its fiendish work of devaluing life.

After all, we’re first cousins to alley cats and stray dogs (some of which would not stoop to the behavior of some of our kind). If we are mere animals, “morals” are merely what we decide they are. This being so, “morals” are wholly subjective and situational; my idea of “morality” is as good as anyone else’s. Each person should have the right to be a law unto himself. Why should there be any laws against assault, murder, theft, rape, or incest? Four-legged dogs and cats are amoral, so why shouldn’t the two-legged varieties be, also?

Darwinists had their counterparts in the ancient world: “For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are

made, even his everlasting power and divinity; that they may be without excuse:... Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:20-22).

[**Note:** I wrote this article for and it appeared in the *Denton Record-Chronicle*, Denton, TX, March 6, 2009.]

Attribution: From *thescripturecache.com*; Dub McClish, owner and administrator.