

The Great Darwin Hoax

Trapped between the Reality and Mythology of "Survival of the Fittest"

Holistic Darwin and How Darwin Got Hijacked

*By Paul R. Lawrence & Robert Porter Lynch (excerpted from *Trusted to Lead*)*

As a twenty-first century leader, you are best empowered to make intelligent decisions about people when you are supported by an insightful and accurate belief system. In this respect, most leaders have been seriously led astray by erroneous thinking or confused by highly conflictive theories.

For this reason, a historical review is useful to set the record straight and illuminate the path forward as we attempt to put the ship of fate back on course.

In the middle 1800s the quest to comprehend the nature of human behavior became deeply mired in controversy. For over half a century, as science was becoming a profession, various theories of evolution were emerging.

The Search for Evolutionary Cause

Writing in 1852, Herbert Spencer, a virulent writer highly respected in Victorian circles, was thoroughly convinced that the theory of evolution *was true*, but no one had, at that time, put forth a plausible position about *how* it came to be true. Spencer thought the debate would rage until someone came up with a plausible answer.

Then, in 1859 a relatively obscure naturalist (now we'd call him an evolutionary biologist) stepped forward, publishing his findings from an earlier trip he made to study plants and animals. The man was Charles Darwin, and the book was called the *Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*.¹ (Typically referred to as *Origin of the Species*).²

Natural selection referred to the slow process of varying the configurations of a species; either it would adapt to the new environment, or become extinct. It put forth the idea that plants and animals (including humans) evolved over a prolonged period of time as a result of either variations in the genetic structure (a modern term) of the species, which reoriented itself to the very slow changes in geological conditions (such as climate), or because a competing species invaded the territory and choked out less adaptable species (such a trees choking out sunlight for bushes).

¹ In Darwin's 1st Edition of 1859, the term "Survival of the Fittest" did not appear, nor did the word "Evolution." Darwin was quite familiar with the works of Herbert Spencer, a philosopher, psychologist, mathematician, and scientist, who was an ardent advocate of the idea and term "Theory of Evolution." Darwin had read Spencer's 1852 Essay (referred to in Darwin's Historical Sketch in the beginning of *Origin of the Species*) which strongly argued for the Theory of Evolution, but did not have a scientific premise for "how" it occurred. In the *Origin of the Species*, Darwin provided the answer Spencer was seeking. After the publication of *Origin of the Species*, Spencer coined the term "survival of the fittest" in his *Principles of Biology* (1864) to describe Darwin's hypothesis of Natural Selection stating: "This survival of the fittest, . . . is that which Mr. Darwin has called 'natural selection', or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life." Spencer was seeking to bolster his own economic theories and find the causative factor for his evolutionary theory. Darwin quickly latched on to Spencer's conjunction and by the 1869 (5th) Edition of *Origin of the Species*, the text was substantially changed to link the idea of natural selection and survival of the fittest inextricably ("survival of the fittest" appears 13 times in the 1876 edition, and the word "evolution," which was not used in the original edition, was inserted beginning with the 1872 edition and appears 10 times in the 1876 edition)

² While it did raise some controversy at the time, it was not an instant best seller. Robert Chamber's 1844 book *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, a precursor to Darwin's theory, was a far better seller in Victorian England for quite some time.

The Great Darwin Hoax -- *What Darwin Really Said*

What made the book particularly controversial was his claim that humans descended from precursor apes, an idea that revolted the Victorian sensibilities of the time, and clearly contradicted creationist theory in the Old Testament.

For Spencer, Darwin provided the evidence he needed to demonstrate the exact process by which evolution actually occurred, and thus the ammunition to defeat the advocates of the opposing creationist belief system.

Coining the term "Survival of the Fittest"

Spencer termed Darwin's concept of natural selection: "survival of the fittest," a term that has stuck now for almost two centuries. Darwin responded favorably to Spencer's use of the term, writing:

"We may feel sure that any variation in the least degree injurious would be rigidly destroyed. This preservation of favourable individual differences and variations, and the destruction of those which are injurious, I have called Natural Selection, or the Survival of the Fittest. Variations neither useful nor injurious would not be affected by natural selection."³

Today nearly every student has heard of Darwin's controversial theory. *Origin of the Species* is widely considered the most important biological book ever written because it influenced so many other thinkers who followed in the fields of biology, medicine, sociology, politics, and business, to name a few.

Spencer's championing of *survival of the fittest*⁴ then led the development of "Social Darwinism,"⁵ an idea never supported by Darwin himself. Social Darwinists viewed life as a struggle for existence in a world of limited resources in which only the strongest, most powerful will push those weaker into extinction or subservience.

This idea was picked up and became the rallying call for fascists⁶ and robber baron capitalists.⁷ Social evolution, in their opinion, was a matter of letting the lazy, intellectually inferior, and physically

³Darwin, *Origin of the Species*, p 64 1876 Edition

⁴Spencer believed that the state should not interfere with the natural evolution of society, thus he was opposed to any form of help for the poor because they were simply unfit, and should be eliminated; those people with mental defects were best off dead, and government should not intercede in supporting, regulation of sanitation, housing and the medical profession, etc. (Hofstadter, p 390-393)

⁵ See Hofstadter, Richard; *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, Beacon Press, 1955

⁶ Based on *Origin of the Species*, Darwin's cousin, Francis Galton in 1865-1869 developed the idea of Eugenics – changing our social values to promote selective racial breeding based on strength of body and mind. Eugenics was then picked up by Adolph Hitler as his basis for genocide. Darwin himself did not support this idea. Darwin agreed that eugenics was beneficial in the breeding of domestic animals, but humans were born with moral values (sympathy and compassion): "The aid which we feel impelled to give to the helpless is mainly an incidental result of the instinct of sympathy, which was originally acquired as part of the social instincts, but subsequently rendered, in the manner previously indicated, more tender and more widely diffused. Nor could we check our sympathy, even at the urging of hard reason, without deterioration in the noblest part of our nature. The surgeon may harden himself whilst performing an operation, for he knows that he is acting for the good of his patient; but if we were intentionally to neglect the weak and helpless, it could only be for a contingent benefit, with an overwhelming present evil. ... We must therefore bear the undoubtedly bad effects of the weak surviving and propagating their kind; but there appears to be at least one check in steady action, namely that the weaker and inferior members of society do not marry so freely as the sound; and this check might be indefinitely increased by the weak in body or mind refraining from marriage, though this is more to be hoped for than expected." (*Descent of Man*, p 134).

⁷ Richard Hofstadter outlines how Andrew Carnegie and others used Social Darwinist thinking to promote their monopolies.

The Great Darwin Hoax -- *What Darwin Really Said*

weak should be left to wither from society.⁸ Turn of the century literary authors, H.G. Wells and Jack London wrote extensively from this perspective. Nazi's justified their gas chambers as a step in evolutionary progress. Colonial expansion into Africa was rationalized as simply an exercise in survival of the fittest. Competition between individuals became the foundational thinking for free market capitalism.

Steel industrialist, Andrew Carnegie, became an adoring advocate of Spencer and the *Survival of the Fittest* construct, which gave the compelling rationale to industrialists to grab as much as they could, after all it was *in the nature of things*. Carnegie personally considered Spencer to be the person who most influenced his thinking. Carnegie began his relationship with Spencer in 1882, referring to him with adoration as "My Dear Master." Spencer advocated that science validated that it was perfectly natural -- thus right and good -- to rise to the top of cut-throat world of capitalist competitors.

Not only was competition in harmony with nature, Spencer believed, but it was also in the interest of the general welfare and progress of society. Many successful capitalists of the late 19th century embraced Spencer's philosophy. These captains of industry used his words as justification to oppose social reform and government intervention. As Spencer said, these would interfere with the natural -- and beneficial -- law of survival.

"The concentration of capital is a necessity for meeting the demands of our day, and as such should not be looked at askance, but be encouraged," Carnegie wrote, paraphrasing Spencer. "There is nothing detrimental to human society in it, but much that is, or is bound soon to become, beneficial."⁹

Several years later, Carnegie codified this thinking in his 1889 essay "The Gospel of Wealth," stating:

"While the law [of competition] may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it ensures the survival of the fittest in every department. We accept and welcome, therefore ... great inequity of environment, the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few, and the law of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential for the future progress of the race."¹⁰

This kind of thinking fueled the egos of Robber Baron Capitalists, continuing full-force into the twentieth century, as leaders explained their dubious actions in terms of survival of the fittest. For example, Bernie Ebbers (the now disgraced CEO of the now extinct WorldCom), when he acquired a company, would throw the leaders of the respective divisions in a room and let them "duke it out" to reveal which alpha male was dominant; and that determined who would command the division. It worked well in producing short term profits, and then collapsed itself into a black hole, like a dying star. Hitler also used this tactic, letting his senior officers fight amongst themselves, driving the most powerful to prevail devoid of any sense of overriding principle or reason.

When the survival of the fittest league hijacked Darwin's thinking about lower animals (including reptiles and mammals) and applied it to humans, they changed the entire landscape of leadership

⁸ There are many economic critics of Social Darwinism who point to the idea of Comparative Advantage (see David Ricardo) that very convincingly argues that weaker members of society are valuable even if the stronger members are better at doing everything; many job specialties are not intellectually demanding, but must be performed in a well functioning economy. Comparative Advantage regards trade and cooperation as far more important than pure competitiveness.

⁹ From PBS Program: www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/carnegie/peopleevents/pande03.html

¹⁰ Carnegie, Andrew; "Wealth," reprinted in *The Andrew Carnegie Reader*, ed. J.F. Wall, University of Pittsburgh Press. Pittsburgh, (originally published 1889), p132

The Great Darwin Hoax -- *What Darwin Really Said*

thinking. Today, if you ask a group of business leaders about Darwin's key theme, nearly everyone will state: *Survival of the Fittest*, meaning a dog-eat-dog strategy requiring dominance and aggression over others. And this belief system has predominated for the last century and a half, causing many leaders to take action based on this extraordinary belief.

But wait; this is where the story gets interesting and where leadership theory got off track. When the survival of the fittest advocates commandeered Darwin, they split myth from reality. (Remember, a myth is a half lie, half truth, disguised as the truth.) Here's how:

Flaw in Survival of the Fittest

Darwin recognized a serious flaw in his theory of natural selection as it applied to humans. In *Origin of the Species*, Darwin was seeking a unified universal theory that explained both plant and animal evolution over the eons of time. Natural selection – adaptation by variations (what we now know as genetic structure) -- explained it. However Darwin saw that its impact moved slower than a glacier:

“Natural selection [by genetic variation] generally acts with extreme slownessdepend[ing] on physical changes, which generally take place very slowly.....only at long intervals of time, and only on a few of the inhabitants of the same region. I further believe that these slow, intermittent results accord well with what geology tells us of the rate and manner at which ... the world [has] changed. Slow though the process of selection may be ... I can see no limit to the amount of change ... which may have been effected in the long course of time through nature's power of selection, that is by the survival of the fittest.”¹¹

Darwin was troubled with this explanation in *Origin of the Species*. While natural selection may cause the evolution of flowers and plants, or insects and mammals, it certainly did not shed light on the much more rapid evolution of the human species.

Humans Required a Special Theory of Evolution

In *Origin of the Species*, Darwin also introduced the idea of *sexual selection*, but did not develop the idea much beyond males of species developing sexually specific weaponry, like antlers, to dominate other males in the battle over females, thus producing more powerful offspring¹².

(Just as one can only understand Adam Smith a century before Darwin by reading both sets of his books, one cannot understand Darwin without considering his full body of work.)

To provide the answer to the question of speed of evolution in the human species, he relied on further developing the concept of sexual selection and its relationship to the uniqueness of the human species, along with the development of social capabilities.

Working tirelessly with a now far deeper understanding of his subject, twelve years after the publication of *Origin of the Species*, Darwin published his massive treatise: *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (1872). It was twice as long as *Origin of the Species*, and laid out the fundamental differences between humans and other animals. In the *Descent of Man*, Darwin also proposed that not was natural selection a process of human evolution, but conscious choice played a major role – sexual roles and expectations, as well as cultural and family expectations probably had more influence on human evolution than natural selection.

¹¹ Darwin, Charles; *Origin of the Species*, Modern Library One Volume “Giant” Edition, c1955 p 85-86

¹² Ibid, p 70

The Great Darwin Hoax -- *What Darwin Really Said*

The torch bearers of Social Darwinism in the latter half of the twentieth century were Ayn Rand (author of *Atlas Shrugged* and *The Fountainhead*) and her protégé Alan Greenspan. Together in 1966 they wrote the book *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*, in which they advocated the best government is the least government. In the section on *The Nature of Government* (pp 294-303, partially excerpted from her prior writing entitled *The Virtue of Selfishness*) is stated:

...Men can derive enormous benefits from dealing with one another. A social environment is most conducive to their successful survival – *but only under certain conditions*.

The two great values to be gained from social existence are: knowledge and trade.* Man is the only species that can transmit and expand his store of knowledge from generation to generation; ... the second great benefit is the division of labor: it enables a man to devote his effort to a particular field of work and to trade with others who specialize in other fields. This form of cooperation allows all men who take part in it to achieve greater knowledge, skill and productive return on their effort than they could if each had to produce everything he needs, on a desert island or on a self-sustaining farm....

A society that robs an individual of the product of his effort, or enslaves him, or attempts to limit the freedom of his mind, or compels him to act against his own rational judgment ...is not a society, but a mob held together by institutionalized gang-rule....

If men are to live together in a peaceful, productive, rational society and deal with one another to mutual benefit, they must accept the basic social principle without which no moral or civilized society is possible: the principle of individual rights....

... the task of protecting [individual] rights under an *objective* code of rules ...is the task of government -- of a *proper* government – its basic task, its only moral justification and the reason why men do need a government. *A government is the means of placing retaliatory use of physical force under objective control – i.e. under objective control*....

....the proper purpose of a government [is] to make social existence possible to men, by protecting the benefits and combating the evils which men can cause one another. The proper functions of a government fall into three broad categories, all of them involving the issues of physical force and the protection of men's rights: *the police*, to protect men from criminals, *the armed services*, to protect men from foreign invaders, [and] *the law courts* to settle disputes among men according to objective laws....The principle ...purpose of law and of government is the protection of individual rights. Today this principle is forgotten, ignored and evaded.....

Instead of being the protector of man's rights, the government is becoming the most dangerous violator; instead of guarding freedom, the government is establishing slavery; instead of protecting men from the initiators of physical force, the government is initiating physical force and coercion in any many and issue it pleases creating a deadly, subterranean reign of uncertainty and fear ... arrogating to itself the power of unlimited whim – so that we are fast approaching the stage....where the government is *free* to do anything it pleases, while the citizens may only act by *permission*; which is the stage of the darkest periods of human history, the stage of rule by brute force.

Thus the stage was set for Greenspan, in his role as Chairman of the Federal Reserve, to give free-rein to the banks and financial institutions, because the best government was the least government. Laws to protect the rights and freedoms of the middle class were left to the figure itself out. Regulating banks violated the philosophy that the Government that Rules Least Rules Best. A false belief in the "objective" nature of humanity laid an entire economic world bare to the encroachments of those who would tear down many of the regulations placed on financial institutions as a result of the predations that caused the Great Crash of 1929.

* [RPL note: this statement borders on a sociopathic view of personal relationships. Darwin himself that said that human bonding went far beyond survival needs. Sympathy, compassion, and love were inherent in normal humans. The Rand-Greenspan argument that follows speaks only to self-interest and individual rights, but nothing of the individual's responsibilities to the greater good of the whole. Also note that their view of government has nothing to do with education & schooling, health of people, ensuring good housing, building roads and infrastructures, regulating the financial infrastructure, or any other form of public interest. Greenspan was a close friend of Ayn Rand advocate and Nixon advisor, Charles Colson, who was instrumental in having Greenspan appointed to Nixon's Council of Economic Advisors.]

How Darwin Distinguished Human Behavior from Other Animals - His Deepest Insights

In his second book, Darwin demonstrated that for humans, survival was not primarily dependent upon natural selection by random genetic variation, but by learning, language, moral decisions, innovation, working collaboratively, and selection of mates that would further civilization. In other words, for humans (as distinct from other animals and plant species) survival was not of the fittest (strongest and most dominant) but by collaborative adaptation (innovation, learning, and moral choice). Unlike lower animals where sex was a matter of dominance and power, in the higher order of humans, the role of sexual selection was to further the purposes of civilization.

From a leadership perspective, while the idea of survival of the fittest has always been a defective leadership framework, it has spawned a unique breed of survival of the fittest advocacy authors who extol the virtues of brutal self interest in leaders like Attila the Hun and Genghis Kan.

While Darwin expected there to be some errors in his findings, modern scientific research over the last century and a half has proven how remarkably accurate Darwin was in both his observations and conclusions. We are going to quote Darwin extensively to bust the myth about survival of the fittest and put forth the groundwork for a new framework of human behavior that both explains and guides the trust building process (and many other leadership processes for that matter.)

Darwin saw that human evolution had caused the species of homo sapiens to be distinctively different from its mammalian apelike ancestors. Here's what he said about those distinguishing characteristics. (The following are direct quotes from *Descent of Man*)

The Higher Intellectual Qualities of Humans

- **Reason & Attention:** Of all the faculties of the human mind, *Reason* stands at the summit.¹³ Hardly any faculty is more important for the intellectual progress of man than *Attention*.¹⁴
- **Imagination:** Without the higher powers of the imagination and reason, no eminent success can be gained.¹⁵

The Higher Social Qualities of Humans

- **Fellowship:** Man is a social being. We see this in his dislike of solitude, and his wish for society beyond that of his own family. Solitary confinement is one of the severest punishments that can be inflicted.¹⁶ Endowed with social instincts take pleasure in one another's company, [humans] warn one another of danger, defend and aid one another in many ways.... these instincts are highly beneficial to the species.¹⁷
- **Social Instincts** lead [man] to take pleasure in the society of its fellows, to feel a certain amount of sympathy with them, and to perform various services for them. Man appreciation of the approbation and disappointment of his fellows ... form[s] the high[er] activity of his mental faculties, with past impressions extremely vivid.
- **Sympathy and Guardianship:** The all-important emotion of *sympathy* is distinct from that of *love*.... The basis of sympathy lies in our strong retentiveness of former states of pain or pleasure. ... We are thus impelled to relieve the sufferings of another, in order that our own painful feelings may be at the same time relieved. In like manner we are led to participate in the

¹³ Darwin, Charles; *Descent of Man*, Modern Library One Volume "Giant" Edition, c 1955., p 453

¹⁴ Ibid, p 452

¹⁵ Ibid, p 874

¹⁶ Ibid p 480

¹⁷ Ibid, p 913

pleasures of others.... [Sympathy] is of high importance to all those animals which aid and defend one another. ... Instinctive sympathy would cause [man] to value highly the approbation of his fellows; for the love of praise and the strong feeling of glory, and the still stronger horror of scorn and infamy are due to the workings of sympathy.¹⁸ Sympathy [is].... one of the most important elements of the social instincts.¹⁹

- **Remorse** is an overwhelming sense of repentance ...bearing the same relationship as rage does to anger, or agony to pain. The nature and strength of feelings which we call regret, shame, repentance, or remorse, depend not only on the strength of the violated instinct, but on partly on the strength of the temptation, and often still more on the judgment of our fellows.²⁰ A man who possesses no trace of sympathy and social instincts [is] an unnatural monster.²¹
- **Greater Good:** After the power of language had been acquired, the wishes of the community could be expressed, the common opinion how each member ought to act for the public good, would naturally become, in a paramount degree, the guide to action.²² Social instinctsgive impulse to some of [man's] best actions [which] are, in a higher degree, determined by the expressed wishes and judgments of his fellow men, and, unfortunately very often, by his own strong selfish desires.
- **Praise & Blame:** It is impossible to exaggerate the importance during rude [prehistoric] times of the love of praise and the dread of blame. A man who was not impelled by any deep, instinctive feeling, to sacrifice his life for the good of others, yet was roused to such actions by a sense of glory, would by example excite the same wish for glory in other men. He might thus do far more good to his tribe than by begetting offspring with a tendency to inherit his own high character.²³
- **Courage** is the most noble of all the attributes of man, leading him without a moment's hesitation to risk his life for that of a fellow creature; or ... to sacrifice it for some great cause. "²⁴ No man can be useful or faithful to his tribe without courage. This quality has been universally placed in the highest rank. Prudence, on the other hand, which does not concern the welfare of others, has never been highly esteemed.²⁵

Conscience, Morality and the Integration of Intellectual and Social Capabilities

- **Conscience:** Of all the differences between man and the lower animals, the *Moral Sense of Conscience* is by far the most important. It has rightful supremacy over every other principle of human action.... Any animal whatever, endowed with well-marked social instincts,...would inevitably acquire a moral sense or conscience, as soon as its intellectual powers had become as well, or as nearly well developed, as in man. Conscience looks backwards, and serves as a guide for the future.²⁶ The moral faculties are generally and justly esteemed as of higher value than the intellectual powers.²⁷

¹⁸ Ibid, 478 –81

¹⁹ Ibid, p 509

²⁰ Ibid p 485

²¹ Ibid p 483

²² Ibid, p 478

²³ Ibid, p 500

²⁴ Ibid, p 471 & p 913

²⁵ Ibid, p 488

²⁶ Ibid, p 484

²⁷ Ibid, p 913

The Great Darwin Hoax -- *What Darwin Really Said*

- **The Golden Rule:** To do good in return for evil, to love your enemy, is a height of morality. [Social] instincts, together with sympathy, would have been highly cultivated and extended by the aid of reason, instruction, and the love or fear of God, before any Golden Rule would ever be thought of and obeyed.²⁸ The social instincts – [which according to Marcus Aurelius are] the prime principle of man’s moral constitution – with the aid of active intellectual powers and the effects of habit, naturally lead to the Golden Rule, “As ye would that men should do to you, do ye to them likewise;” and this lies at the foundation of morality.²⁹ [The Golden Rule] is the foundation stone of morality.
- **The Standard of Morality** [is] the general good or welfare of the community. When a man risks his life to save that of a fellow creature, it seems more correct to say he acts in the general good, rather than for the general happiness of mankind.³⁰
- **Controlling Thought:** The highest possible stage on moral culture is when we recognize that we ought to control our thoughts.... As Marcus Aurelius long ago said: “such as are my habitual thoughts, so also will be the character of my mind; for the soul is dyed by those thoughts.”³¹
- **Law of Honour** [is] the law of the opinion of our equals. Man can generally and readily distinguish between the higher and lower moral rules. The higher are founded on social instincts, and relate to the welfare of others. They are supported by the approbation of our fellow men and by reason. The lower rules ... relate chiefly to self.³²
- **Code of Conduct:** As love, sympathy, and self-command become strengthened by habit, and as the power of reasoning becomes clearer, [man] will feel himself impelled to certain lines of conduct. He might then declare – I am the supreme judge of my own conduct, ...I will not in my own person violate the dignity of humanity.³³
- **Fidelity:** There cannot be fidelity without truth.³⁴
- **Standards of Excellence:** The most efficient causes of progress seem to consist of a good education during youth whilst the brain is impressible, and of a high standard of excellence, inculcated by the ablest and best of men, embodied in the laws, customs, and traditions of the nation, and enforced by public opinion.

Meaning of Life

- **Finding Purpose:** As soon as the important faculties of the imagination, wonder, and curiosity, together with some power of reasoning, had become partially developed, man would naturally crave to understand what was passing around him, and would have vaguely speculated on his own existence.
- **Devotion:** The feeling of religious devotion is a highly complex one, consisting of love, complete submission to an exalted and mysterious superior, a strong sense of dependence, fear, reverence,

²⁸ Ibid p 484

²⁹ Ibid p 495

³⁰ Ibid, p 490

³¹ Ibid, p 492

³² Ibid, p 491

³³ Ibid, p 481

³⁴ Ibid p 488

gratitude, hope for the future, and perhaps other elements. No being could experience so complex an emotion until advanced in his intellectual and moral faculties.³⁵

- **Belief in God:** The conviction of the existence of an all-seeing Deity has had a potent influence on the advance of morality. His conscience then becomes the supreme judge and monitor. The belief in God has often been advanced as not only the greatest, but the most complete of all distinctions between man and the lower animals.³⁶

Competition & Collaboration

- **One-on-One Competition:** When two men of equal mental quality are put into competition, the one who has higher energy, perseverance, and courage, will generally become more eminent in every pursuit, and will gain ascendancy.³⁷
- **Teamwork in Competition:** When tribes came into competition, the tribe with the greater number of courageous, sympathetic, and faithful members, who were always ready to warn each of danger, to aid and defend each other would succeed better and conquer the other.
- **Discipline & Courage:** How important fidelity and courage must be. The advantage, which disciplined soldiers have over undisciplined hordes follows chiefly from the confidence (trust) which each man feels in his comrades.
- **Self Interest:** Selfish and contentious people will not cohere, and without coherence nothing can be effected.³⁸
- **Advantage of Strong Values:** Although a high standard of morality gives but a slight or no advantage to each individual man and his children over other men of the same tribe, yet that an increase in the number of well-endowed men and an advancement in the standard of morality will certainly give an immense advantage to one tribe over another. A tribe ...possessing a high degree the spirit of patriotism, fidelity, obedience, courage, and sympathy, were always ready to aid one another, and to sacrifice themselves for the common good, would be victorious over other tribes; and this would be natural selection. Morality is one important element in their success.³⁹
- **Progress as a Civilization:** The wonderful progress of the United States, as well as the character of its people, are the results of the more energetic, restless, and courageous men from all parts of Europe having emigrated during the last ten or twelve generations to that great country, and have succeeded best. A nation which produced ... the greatest number of highly intellectual, energetic, brave, patriotic, and benevolent men, would generally prevail over less favoured nations.⁴⁰
- **On Men & Women:** Man is the rival of other men; he delights in competition, and this leads to ambition which passes too easily into selfishness. The latter qualities seem to be his natural and

³⁵ Ibid pp 468-470

³⁶ Author's Note: God's relationship to Man could only be acknowledged once language and learning had progressed in humans to an advanced level where man was capable of embracing the idea of God. Thus, man, who has the advanced intellectual and social power as we now know them, did not embrace God until about the last 4-5 000 years. This is when man shifted a stage and was "created by God, as much as man created an awareness of God's presence".

³⁷ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, Ibid, p 874

³⁸ Ibid, p 498

³⁹ Ibid, p 500

⁴⁰ Ibid, p 508

The Great Darwin Hoax -- *What Darwin Really Said*

unfortunate birthright.⁴¹ Woman differs from man chiefly in her greater tenderness and less selfishness. Owing to her maternal instincts, [she] displays these qualities towards her infants to an eminent degree; therefore it is likely she would often extend them towards her fellow creatures.⁴²

Reptiles and Mammals

- **Lower animals** are excited by the same emotions as ourselves ... *Terror* acts in the same manner on them as on us, causing the muscles to tremble, the heart to palpitate, the sphincters to relax, and the hair to stand on end. Suspicion is the offspring of fear.⁴³

Implications

Why is Darwin perhaps the most revered, defiled, influential, misunderstood scientist this planet has ever produced? Most who have castigated him, have never been exposed to Darwin's commentary on the human species, particularly his most revealing observations of the nature of humans.

The implications of the Darwin Hoax and the hijacking of his theory of natural selection has had a massive impact on the behavior of political and business leaders for a hundred and fifty years. The thinking is clearly flawed, and the results have been tragic - wars, inequities, and financial collapses. It is time not just to set the record straight, but to follow a path that will chart a course that will positively change the course of human events.

"The Buffalo Theory" of Survival of the Fittest

—attributed to Cliff Clavin from the TV series: *Cheers*

"Well you see, Norm, it's like this... A herd of buffalo can only move as fast as the slowest buffalo and when the herd is hunted, it is the slowest and weakest ones at the back that are killed first.

This natural selection is good for the herd as a whole, because the general speed and health of the whole group keeps improving by the regular killing of the weakest members.

In much the same way, the human brain can only operate as fast as the slowest brain cells.

Now, as we know, excessive drinking of alcohol kills brain cells. But naturally, it attacks the slowest and weakest brain cells first.

In this way, regular consumption of beer eliminates the weaker brain cells, making the brain a faster and more efficient machine. And that, Norm, is why you always feel smarter after a few beers."

⁴¹ Ibid, p 873

⁴² Ibid p 873

⁴³ Ibid, p448