

No Morality Without God

Samuel G. Dawson

(Copyright © 2018 Samuel G. Dawson)

(This article is an excerpt from the author's *Foundations of Faith: Practical Essays on Christian Evidences*, available at Amazon.com)

Atheism & Evolution versus Morality

We now want to discuss an aspect of atheism and the theory of evolution which few realize the significance of and that is the moral bankruptcy of both. This discussion arises from the fact that if no God exists, then no such thing as right and wrong exists. There will be no judgment where men will have to account for their behavior in this life. The only laws which regulate man's behavior are those of the animal kingdom, the law of the jungle.

Many evolutionists realize that if man is just another animal, then no moral realm applies to man, any more than a moral realm exists for the beasts of the field. When anyone comes to this realization, he then agrees with the apostle Paul, who said in I Cor. 15:32:

If the dead are not raised, let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die.

In other words, if no God exists, no moral law exists and we can do what appeals to us. If it appeals to me to kill you or steal your wife, there would be no moral principle that says I shouldn't—any more so than it would be immoral for one rhinoceros to kill another, or to steal his female rhino. This leads us to the realization that, *as far as* ethics goes, evolution cannot offer a thing.

To notice carefully that orthodox evolutionists realize that, if no God exists, then it's just the law of the jungle. Hear the words of Jean Paul Sartre:

Everything is indeed permitted if God does not exist, and man is in consequence forlorn, for he cannot find anything to depend upon either within or outside himself...Nor, on the other hand, if God does not exist, are we provided with any values or commands that could legitimize our behavior. (Jean Paul Sartre, "Existentialism and Humanism," *French Philosophers from Descartes to Sartre*, Edited by Leonard M. Marsak, Meridian Books, 1961, p. 485.)

The full title of Darwin's famous treatise is, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or THE PRESERVATION OF FAVOURED RACES IN THE STRUGGLE FOR LIFE*. Many times, evolutionists and atheists complain that "Christianity upholds racism," an unproved charge. Little do they seem to realize that modern racism has always found its strongest and most vicious expressions among doctrinaire evolutionists, men like Karl Marx, Adolf Hitler, and other such advocates of group struggles and survival of the fittest.

Obviously, some evolutionists live moral lives. By these lives, they commend evolution to others and do not bring reproach on it by their lives. But the theory of evolution cannot justify this morality. They simply borrow from the creed of others.

Professor S. J. Holmes, of the University of California, defined the Darwinian code of ethics in these words:

Darwinism, consistently applied, would measure goodness in terms of survival value. (S. J. Holmes, *Science*, August 11, 1939, p. 121.)

In other words, *might does make right*—among men it's just the survival of the fittest, just like the animal kingdom.

Bernhardi, the German general and military writer, who influenced Adolf Hitler to a great extent, said:

Might is at once the supreme right...war gives a biologically just decision. (Friederich von Bernhardi, *Germany and the Next War*, translated by Allen H. Powles, Edward Arnold, 1914, p. 23, cited by Ash-

ley Montagu, *Man in Process*, World Publishing Co., 1961, pp. 76, 77.)

Hitler, greatly influenced by Darwin, said:

The whole of nature is a continuous struggle between strength and weakness, an eternal victory of the strong over the weak. (*Hitler's Words*, edited by Gordon W. Prange, American Council on Public Affairs, 1944, p. 3.)

Karl Marx wrote on January 16, 1861:

Darwin's book is very important and serves men as a basis in natural science for the class struggle in history. (*Marx and Engels, Selected Correspondence, 1846-1895*, New York: Internal Publications, 1936, p. 125.)

Marx also said:

Law, morality, and religion, are to us so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just so many bourgeois interests. (Herr Eugen Duhring, *Revolution in Science*, New York: Internal Publishers, n.d., p. 353, printed in U.S.S.R., cited by James D. Bales, *Communism, Its Faith and Fallacies*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1962, p. 195.)

From the same source, we find this statement by Fredereich Engels, that morality has always been a

...class morality: it has either justified the domination and the interests of the ruling class, or as soon as the oppressed class has become powerful enough, it has represented the revolt against this domination and the future interests of the oppressed. (*Ibid.*, p. 109.)

According to the view of this man, morality was just devised by the rich to keep their money away from the poor. Inherently, nothing good or evil exists.

Nicolai (a pseudonym for Vladimir) Lenin said:

That is why we say that for us there is no such thing as morality apart from human society; it is a fraud. Morality for us is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat.

We say: morality is what serves to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all toilers around the proletariat, which is building up a new, communist society. (Nikolai Lenin, *The Tasks of the Youth Leagues*, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953, pp. 19-24, cited *Ibid.*, p. 196.)

The prominent American atheist of the last century, Robert Ingersoll, said:

Morality is born, of the instinct of self-preservation...Self preservation makes larceny a crime. Murder will be regarded as a bad thing as long as the majority object to being murdered. Morality does not come from the clouds; it is born of human want and human experience. (Robert Ingersoll, *The Works of Robert Ingersoll, VII*, New York: Dresden Publishing Co., 1908, p. 211.)

Once, after I had broadcast many of these quotations on a radio program, an atheist listener objected and said, I should not just read from "bad" evolutionists. I think we can begin to see that, if the evolutionists are right, no "bad" ones exist or good ones either, for that matter. Why read from the works of men who don't carry their doctrine to its logical conclusion? The men we quoted from here were consistent enough to believe the doctrine all the way.

Even in the realm of business, we can see the effects of evolutionary ethics. James J. Hill, a railroad magnate who manipulated men, businesses, and industries to get the railroads under his control, said:

The fortunes of railroad companies are determined by the law of the survival of the fittest. (James J. Hill, cited by Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism and American Thought*, Rev. Ed., Beacon Press, 1955, p. 31, cited by Bolton Davidheiser, *Evolution and Christian Faith*, Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1969, p. 350.)

Andrew Carnegie, the steel magnate, on his conversion to Darwinism said:

I remember that light came as in a flood and all was clear. Not only had I got rid of theology and the supernatural, but I had found the truth of evolution. "All is well since all grows better," became my motto, my true source of comfort. (Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism and American Thought*, Rev. Ed., Beacon Press, 1955, p. 45, cited by Bolton Davidheiser, *Ibid.*, pp. 350-351.)

John D. Rockefeller shared these same sentiments and, for the same reason, the influence of the evolutionary code of ethics:

The growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest...This is not an evil tendency in business. It is merely the working out of a law of nature. (*Ibid.*, p. 351.)

Dr. Russell V. Lee, in the *Telegram Tribune* of San Luis Obispo, California, January 27, 1964, said:

Perhaps it's time to see if some other arrangement than monogamous marriage can't be worked out for some people. In a state of nature the normal buck, bull, or stallion, or primate collects, dominates, and impregnates as many females as possible.

This statement represents the culmination of Aldous Huxley's statement of motives behind the theory of evolution:

I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning; consequently assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption...For myself, as, no doubt, for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom. (*Ends*

and Means: An Inquiry into the Nature of Ideas and into the Methods Employed for Their Realization, Harper, 1937, pp. 312, 316, cited in *Thrust, III*, #3, Austin, TX: Southwest Church of Christ, Jerry Mofitt, Ed., p. 140-141.)

Leo Tolstoy also spoke to this subject:

The attempts to found a morality apart from religion are like the attempts of children, who, wishing to transplant a flower that pleases them, pluck it from the roots that seem to them unpleasing and superfluous, and stick it rootless into the ground. Without religion there can be no real, sincere morality, just as without roots there can be no real flower. (Leo Tolstoy, "Religion and Morality," *Leo Tolstoy: Selected Essays*, 1964, pp. 31-32, cited in "The Foundations of Morality," David L. Lipe, Ph.D., *Reason and Revelation, VII*, 7, Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press, July, 1987, p. 25.)

Of course, all these statements are right, if evolution is right. One great reason the theory of evolution should be rejected, even if a person is not a Christian, is the moral bankruptcy which it engenders.

Consequences on Societies Which Embrace No Morality

If you think this lack of moral foundations has no effect on societies which lack them, please consider: the lack of morality turned the 20th century into a bloodbath. Under Naziism, 25 million died in prisons or labor camps, or were shot. Under communism, 85-100 million were shot or otherwise killed.

In our own country, as well as others, disintegrating moral standards have produced duly dire consequences. Please consider the following comments on our deteriorating society and its effects on marriage, crime, and welfare dependence by John Hawkins, conservative commentator:

1) The Collapse Of Marriage: There used to be quite a bit of social stigma attached to getting a divorce or having a child out of wedlock. That's no

longer true and consequences for society have been horrific.

Although there is some dispute about the numbers, roughly 40% of marriages now end in divorce and “half of all children born to women under 30 in America now are illegitimate. Three in 10 white children are born out of wedlock, as are 53 percent of Hispanic babies and 73 percent of black babies.

That’s important because children raised without a mother AND a father are statistically worse off in just about every area imaginable.

Controlling for socioeconomic status, race, and place of residence, the strongest predictor of whether a person will end up in prison is that he was raised by a single parent. By 1996, 70 percent of inmates in state juvenile detention centers serving long-term sentences were raised by single mothers. Seventy-two percent of juvenile murderers and 60 percent of rapists come from single-mother homes. Seventy percent of teenage births, dropouts, suicides, runaways, juvenile delinquents, and child murderers involve children raised by single mothers. Girls raised without fathers are more sexually promiscuous and more likely to end up divorced. A 1990 study by the Progressive Policy Institute showed that after controlling for single motherhood, the difference between black and white crime rates disappeared.

Various studies have come up with slightly different numbers, but all the figures are grim. According to the Index of Leading Cultural Indicators, children from single-parent families account for 63 percent of all youth suicides, 70 percent of all teenage pregnancies, 71 percent of all adolescent chemical/substance abuse, 80 percent of all prison inmates, and 90 percent of all homeless and runaway children.

A study cited in the Village Voice produced similar numbers. It found that children brought up in single-mother homes ‘are five times more likely to commit

suicide, nine times more likely to drop out of high school, 10 times more likely to abuse chemical substances, 14 times more likely to commit rape (for the boys), 20 times more likely to end up in prison, and 32 times more likely to run away from home.’ Single motherhood is like a farm team for future criminals and social outcasts.

Instead of trying to reverse the crippling damage being done to our country by the collapse of marriage, we’ve chosen to degrade it even further by allowing same sex unions, soon to be followed by polygamous unions that will degrade the institution ever further. If it’s true that marriage is the bedrock of society, then our nation’s house is built on sand.

2) Crime: Despite the fact that China and India have populations four times our size, it’s stunning that America has the largest prison population on Earth. Not coincidentally, America’s once sky-high crime rate dropped as massive numbers of criminals were locked away.

Bizarrely, many people talk about crime as if it’s divorced from morality. We hear about a supposed “rape culture,” school shootings, the “Knockout Game,” child abuse, etc., etc., etc. without making the obvious connection to morals. Good kids aren’t raping anybody, assaulting strangers to prove they’re tough or shooting up movie theaters unless they’re mentally ill.

Kids who are taught about good and evil, right and wrong, patriotism, chivalry and honor are going to make mistakes. A few of them will even turn out to be bad apples. However, full though our prisons may be, they are not full of God-fearing men. They’re full of people who are morally adrift.

...

4) Dependence: Americans have traditionally been some of the most self-reliant people on the face of

the earth. People used to be ashamed to be on the dole even if they felt like they had no other choice. Judging by the numbers we see today, that's no longer true.

More than 1/3 of the population, 109 million Americans, are on welfare. That's more people than there are in the four most populous states in America (California, Texas, New York and Florida) COMBINED. More than 45 million Americans are receiving food stamps. Nearly 11 million Americans, a number larger than the population of Greece, are on disability.

Does anyone care how many of these people are legitimately having hard times and need a little temporary assistance to get back on their feet versus how many are parasites who are looting the system? It certainly doesn't seem like it. There doesn't seem to be a lot of people who even feel bad about being on the dole either. In fact, it's probably more of a social faux pas to suggest that people should feel bad about living off other people's labor than it is to sponge off the taxpayers without regret. That's why it's not just an economic problem, it's a moral problem and it's one that is likely to get larger as a smaller and smaller share of workers are asked to shoulder the load for people who don't work for a living. (John Hawkins, "Five Consequences of America's Moral Collapse," Townhall.com, July 25, 2015)

Conclusion

We could discuss many other points about theistic evolution. Obviously, one cannot hold to the inspiration of the Bible and the most basic principles of all science or any moral principles and the theory of evolution. Surely we can see the absolute impropriety of this system of belief.