

11. Gender from Darwin to Dawkins

Tess Lambert, 29.04.2022

Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OHZ-NysYn1U>

[00:00:06.070] - Brodie

Dear God in heaven. Lord, we thank you for bringing us through this week safely. Thank you for this opportunity, this privilege to gather, to consider the world around us, what we are living through. How important it is. Lord, we ask that you would bless Elder Tess now as she leads us through these important events. We ask for eye salve, that we would be able to see the world as you see it, that we would hate what you hate and love what you love. Lord, we want to know more of your Kingdom. We want to know what it looks like. We want to know what we have to be like to be eligible to be a part of it. And we want people, when they see us, to want to be a part of it too. And this is our desire, Lord. We pray that the more we learn, the more we will understand you and the more who will be like you. Thank you. And this is our prayer. In Jesus name, Amen.

[00:01:05.970] - Tess

Amen. One of the difficult parts of discussing modern atheism is knowing when to stop sharing quotes, because there is so much information out there on the misogyny, the racism, the views of modern atheism. And we've spent quite a bit of time on the top four. But last week we started also showing the views of the leadership underneath these men. Where a lot of the sexual abuse even has taken place, and the justification of that abuse all the way down to Max, where we started in that Vox article. Unless we go off on a new tangent or exploration, we don't have much more to say about atheism. As far as proving that there is a problem of sexism in atheism today, Brenden is going to give us a summary in his own words, of the things I've covered over the last two weeks. I'll turn it over to Brenden to remind us of some points that have stood out to him, and any lessons or points of interest you wanted to mention. Brenden.

[00:02:50.790] - Brenden

Thank you, Elder Tess. I've just jotted down some brief notes that stuck out for me. I found it interesting how we even got here with the discussion between the left and the right. Left being equality over freedom and the right, freedom over equality. And from there we realized on the right that there was this whole other spectrum of people we never focused on before. And that brought us to libertarianism. From there we looked at the Vox article, which was about Max. And that brought us to those three ideological principles of the trinity, of libertarianism, atheism, and men's rights activism. And that took us to look at the origins of the modern atheistic world. Which brought us to the Four Horsemen as well. And that's where we spent the past couple of weeks and just how they think and the arguments they use. They're saying they use logic or they use evidence to justify their misogyny or racism. They have the rational thinking to back up their misogyny. I think this is a summary of what they do. An interesting point to me, that came

from one of the articles, was that the misogyny or the male supremacism came less from Dominionist or religious areas, but came more from a secular atheistic point of view.

[00:05:11.660] - Brenden

And that was from the atheistic authors themselves. I found that really interesting. I just find it interesting that they see these threats, and it's the same through history when they see a threat. And the threats were feminism, which why they're men's rights activists. They see the church as a threat, and that's why they're atheists. And they see the state as a threat, and that's why they're libertarians. And when they're threatened by these things, they are the victims, even though they're perpetrating discrimination on particularly women, because that's their focus. They're perpetrators, but they're the victims in their minds. And the other interesting point is, when we looked at the Four Horsemen and how they had a cultural feminist type of ideology. Based from an evolution standpoint, they saw men and women having intrinsic weaknesses or strengths. Which sound similar to cultural feminism, where women and men have certain capacities for certain roles and they use that to excuse awful treatment.

[00:07:11.680] - Brenden

Like if a woman gets drunk. Of course, it's only natural that a man would then take advantage of that. Because he can't help it. There's this ideology that comes through that enables them to be misogynistic. It's really awful. I had some other things that I remember. And it's especially pertinent now with what Elon Musk is about to do with Twitter, that there's this fight against political correctness or cancel culture. Or the Left not allowing this rational thinking and this freedom of thought. To discuss like what they would call sensitive topics or difficult subjects that we know are inaccurate. But they want to fight for everyone's right to be able to go into some of these extremely racist and misogynistic beliefs. And without going into detail, it's still this fight for freedom over equality. That's what I remember. Not sure. There's a lot more.

[00:09:14.870] - Tess

Thank you, Brenden. You highlighted what for me were the most weighty points of what we've been discussing. And some of the greatest evidences for what we're trying to demonstrate. There is a lot of quotes that have been read, but for me, perhaps the most powerful one was the one you referenced. Where the interviewer is speaking to a researcher. Sarah Henry speaking to Alex DiBranco. And the interviewer tries to say what we as a movement have been researching for a few years. Recognizing the sexism within the religious Dominionist community. And the researcher responds and says: Yes, it's there. But there is more of a men's rights ideology being pushed through the secular New Atheistic community than the Dominionist one. And that recognition from their own members is important to recognize. And that was only one quote. There are other quotes by women within that community. One woman, the one who was propositioned in the elevator, who Richard Dawkins was quite abusive towards, she spoke and we didn't read all that she had to say. But there was a lot that she had to say. That she thought that when she found the New Atheistic community, she'd found her people. That she'd found her safe place from which she could attack religion.

[00:11:15.420] - Tess

She could attack what she thought were the threats and problems within society. And then she says that she has since found that her atheistic community is, in her own words, the worst. Some of them, those who have their eyes opened to see this issue with the men's rights movement, with misogyny, with these concepts of freedom and equality, they recognize it within their own movement. And they recognize that it's even worse within their own movement than the religious ideologies they thought they were there to fight. And that is the exact point that we're trying to make. That Protestantism is not the cause of the problem in the world today. The problem being the nature of the Sunday Law, gender, discrimination, inequality. It's neither the cause and it is not the whole. And we've made that point, but we could spend, I think, week after week laboring it. Even today just fighting the urge to keep reading quotes, keep giving evidence after evidence of this problem that is outside of religion. I thought to share just a couple of more instances of how this is playing out in the atheistic community.

[00:12:47.310] - Tess

There was an atheist conference called MythCon, run by the organization Mythicist Milwaukee. They invited a YouTube personality, Carl Benjamin, to be their guest star. Benjamin writes and speaks online under the name Sargon of Akkad. A reference to an Empire building Sumerian King. And he's known for his racist, misogynistic and antisocial justice views. In May 2016, he tweeted, "*I wouldn't even rape you*" at a female British MP who helped lead an anti internet harassment campaign. A female British MP leads an anti internet harassment campaign. Trying to stop internet harassment partly of women. And he tweets and says, "*I wouldn't even rape you*". At that Milwaukee conference, an atheist conference he defends that remark, and his fans in the audience burst out into whoops and cheers. They are so proud of him. The Atheist Foundation of Australia in 2017 announced that feminist author Clementine Ford would headline their upcoming Global Atheist Convention. Their Facebook page was flooded with rape and death threats from commenters angry that an outspoken feminist would be given a prominent platform. It was a fountain of violence, someone affiliated with AFA recalled. Horrible beyond words, and all of it was from fellow atheists.

[00:14:15.570] - Tess

This from the followers such as Richard Dawkins, who champion free speech. It shows some hypocrisy of even their definition of freedom and free speech. And the hypocrisy of them to then go on right wing podcast and talk about the silencing of those who wish to have rational thought around the evolutionary intellectual differences of races. The so called left wing cancel culture. You also brought something in that we're going to discuss more of, which is Cultural Feminism. I made a couple of bullet points as you spoke Cultural Feminism. And then you also spoke about where we really finished up last week, which was speaking about intrinsic qualities, intrinsic weaknesses, and intrinsic strengths that evolution teaches are developed through the evolutionary process. And how those beliefs in the development of intrinsic strengths and intrinsic weaknesses influences their perspective of gender issues today. Thank you for that review. It brought through the most significant points. And I'm not sure if you said you didn't expect us to get here from where we started, and neither did I. But I am excited. Although it is incredibly unpleasant to be looking at some of these things, it is fascinating.

[00:16:21.410] - Tess

I think I just want to share screen again. I don't think I shared him before. Sam Harris. I just want us to be able to recognize these people, because sometimes you see faces. And I wish I had done this more. Sometimes we don't recognize the names, but we recognize the faces. And I don't think I'd shown Hitchens before. This is Christopher Hitchens. But you have those Four Horsemen. And I want us to recognize one other man who comes up quite a lot. Again, there is an extensive number of influential scientists. Leaders underneath them who are as misogynistic as they are and problematic. There is a whole article dealing with the #Metoo movement within the scientific community, and it's quite troubling reading. Because these men are held in very high esteem and misogyny and sexual abuse is so very much built into the scientific community. And very hard to root out. Maybe that will be shared at another time. I'll share screen Lawrence Krauss. He will come up quite frequently if you are reading articles about that. The other leaders you might hear quoted are justifying the sexual abuse that is found in their conferences and by some of their leaders.

[00:18:07.410] - Tess

He's the perpetrator of a certain amount of that sexual abuse that they then justify. His record with women is problematic. If you're a young woman at the conference, she was told to be very careful what she drank and very careful where she went and avoid him at all costs. Because he has a reputation. He also came out in vigorous defense of a friend of his name. I can't immediately recall. Jeffrey Epstein, a good friend of his. He vigorously defended Jeffrey Epstein. And I not just want us to see the sexism in these men, and the racism. I want us to see how they justify that sexism. Because that is what is going to educate us. Sure, they're sexist. But why are they sexist? How do they justify that when they are supposed to embody the modern enlightenment, when they are champions of rational thought, when they are not just atheistic but believe in a fundamentalist, militant modern atheism. How do they justify their misogyny? That is what will teach us. I'm not just saying that they're sexist. And his justifications for his friend Jeffrey Epstein, his defense of that was that essentially as a rational thinker. I'm going to quote, not directly his comments, but why he could justify or excuse Jeffrey Epstein. Quoting from The Atlantic on Lawrence Krauss sexual misconduct allegations.

[00:20:09.790] - Tess

Sexual misconduct cases do not fit neatly into the framework that governs rigorous scientific inquiry. If there's one thing that we've learned from the #Metoo movement, it's that so much of understanding injustice is experiential and rooted in anecdotal evidence. And this is part of their problem. It's a part of the problem that men's rights activists have with feminism, with issues of equality. That so much is rooted in experience and anecdotal evidence, and they see that as very similar to religious thought, and that is where feminism and religion for them are intertwined are the same thing. Because you can't go into some aspects of inequality, some aspects of #Metoo movement allegations, with that type of scientific inquiring brain and find all the shreds of evidence to build a case. It often doesn't exist because there often isn't much left, even at the end of rape. It's that so much of understanding injustice is experiential and rooted in anecdotal evidence. For hardcore free thinkers, that's a problem because personal testimonies can't be verified or tested in an empirical way. That was part of his justification for Jeffrey Epstein. He couldn't go in and test these women's allegations.

[00:21:45.140] - Tess

He couldn't verify them within the empirical scientific brain. Therefore, he chose to defend his belief in Jeffrey Epstein, his friend's good character, rather than allegations that he could not scientifically test. Ashley Naftule wrote in the outline after the allegations about Krauss were made public. So that is a direct quote from Ashley Naftule. *"If something can't be measured, calculated, observed, watched, it may as well not exist, even though studies of sexual harassment in the scientific community reveal the opposite to be true."* Studies of sexual harassment show there is a massive problem. But you cannot go into each one of those allegations and test them in an empirical way. Measure, calculate and observe that sexual harassment taking place. Some you can. There's a photo of Krauss reaching to touch a woman's breast who'd ask for a photo with him. But the photo was blurry, so he found a justification. There were multiple witnesses who said he grabbed her breast. But even witnesses. How do you test that in an empirical way? Maybe he's just famous and people are out to get him, which was part of his defense. They see these allegations and they see the issues that feminists and women are trying to raise. And they see it as a religion where their brain governed by rigorous scientific inquiry, can't get to the root of. And when they already have a foundational misogyny, it only exacerbates that excuse. Marie. I hope that doesn't disrupt anyone.

[00:23:51.450] - Marie

My question is more about the revision section of last week. I'm sorry, because I'm going to be taking you off track.

[00:24:06.170] - Tess

I didn't see your hand. I'm sorry. It's my fault.

[00:24:11.440] - Marie

I find some of it hard to picture. For example, these men that find religion a threat and who don't agree with church and state? How would they feel then about the political right, the religious right?

[00:24:39.840] - Marie

How would they feel about that? And how do they feel about their type of church and state? That's just what I wonder. You don't have to answer the question.

[00:24:56.990] - Tess

That's where we ended last week, isn't it? How do we see that there's this massive right wing group that upholds this essential trinity ideology and yet opposed church and state. That's where we finished last week. Am I understanding it correctly?

[00:25:28.730] - Marie

To be completely honest with you. I didn't see the last ten minutes of it, so I may have missed that.

[00:25:41.790] - Tess

I remember what happened with your computer.

[00:25:47.190] - Marie

I was actually watching it today, but I didn't get the last ten minutes. Sorry about that.

[00:25:53.550] - Tess

Please do go back to that because we bring it up in the last ten minutes. But you won't find an answer there. Unfortunately, it was more that we were recognizing that your question exists. That there is that problem that we need to address. When we see a group opposed to church and state and yet on the wrong side of the Sunday Law.

[00:26:22.520] - Marie

Okay. Thank you.

[00:26:24.260] - Tess

We're going to deal with that.

[00:26:27.010] - Marie

Okay, thanks. I'll watch the last ten minutes.

[00:26:32.290] - Tess

But you won't find an answer there. I wanted to just spend a couple more moments on these men. Please feel free to raise your hand and speak up at any time. Sam Harris we discussed his misogyny, but also his racism. We need to not just know that these men are that way. We need to understand their type of thinking, their methodology, what underlies their misogyny. Richard Dawkins probably one of the most obvious. Except for Hitchens, he passed away some time ago. Extensive misogyny. But I also wanted to mention his position on trans people. Dawkins compared the lives of trans people to Rachel Dolezal. Do we remember in 2015, Rachel Dolezal is a white woman who said that she identified as a black woman and Dawkins essentially said trans people are doing the same thing. You can't be white and self identify as a black person. I'll just quote him, *'some men choose to identify as women and some women choose to identify as men. You will be vilified if you deny that they literally are what they identify as. Discuss!'* This is the type of dog whistling you see.

[00:28:29.600] - Tess

He tweets is, but at the end he says *'discuss'*, and then when he gets attached to that, he will say he was just trying to engage in scientific reason in open discussion. He wasn't necessarily giving his thoughts. He was just stating something and then telling people to discuss it in the comments section of Twitter. Which always works well. It's a cover for his own views. He then said: *'Is a trans woman a woman? Purely semantic. If you define by chromosomes, no. If by self identification, yes. I call her 'she' out of courtesy. I don't like the idea that people can pillory someone like Jordan Peterson for refusing to be compelled to*

change his language.' He said, *'adding that those who do so are denying reality and it's a heresy to do anything other than that'*. I wanted to take two points for that. First of all, his defense of Jordan Peterson should not surprise us. These men are religious or atheist ideologically aligned when it comes to gender. And with that you find that friendship between atheism and the far right. The second, he suggests that you become a heretic for questioning something like trans identity.

[00:29:57.430] - Tess

Again, if he's a heretic for questioning something related to gender, what does that make the gender issue? It makes it a type of religion. Heresy is war against or opposition to religion, and they invoke that religious type of language when referencing not just feminism but gender related issues. I've said enough about Christopher Hitchens, but I want to discuss, just for a moment, the last one we haven't touched on. Daniel Dennett, you would think, is the least problematic of all of them. He seems to be less on a war path and much more careful in how he phrases his belief. But he's very close with Richard Dawkins. He's just much more careful what he says. But I wanted to screen share a YouTube clip. And this is unfortunate. They put together a debate between Daniel Dennett and Dinesh D'Souza. And this debate is about the existence of God. It's deeply problematic that they even give Dinesh D'Souza a platform, let alone Daniel Dennett. Dinesh D'Souza is far right. If you were to look him up on Wikipedia, look at his comments on race, it's quite long.

[00:31:48.630] - Tess

He's a huge supporter of Alex Jones, a conspiracy theorist and vocal opponent of the Clintons, and Barack Obama. He's released conspiratorial movies. He's very right wing to the point of not just bigoted, but conspiratorial as well. And he's who they chose to debate Daniel Dennett on the existence of God, because Dinesh D'Souza does believe in a God. That's not really what we're going to listen to. We're here to hear from Daniel Dennett. I'm going to screen share and just show a short clip of this video. And as we listen to this video, at the end of it, I'd like you to tell us what you think Daniel Dennett is saying.

[00:33:03.770] - Tess

They're going to take, about two last questions before the end of the debate.

[00:33:14.840] - Questioner Video

I don't really believe that there has been equal dignity for women established universally. I think it's more legislative and actually socially or culturally established. But this question is for both candidates. Why are women almost universally excluded from the hierarchies of religion and decision making in religion?

[00:33:40.270] - Moderator Video

Thank you. Ask the next question, please.

[00:33:44.690] - Tess

Lynne, can you repeat in your own words what her question is?

[00:33:54.810] - Lynne

Yeah. Basically she's asking why women are not included in decision making and positions of power. And I think she did say within religion? I'm not sure if she said religion. I forgot that bit. But basically she's talking about the lack of representation of women, particularly in religion.

[00:34:28.810] - Tess

I replay it so we can pick up that point.

[00:34:37.210] - Questioner Video

This question is for both candidates. Why are women almost universally excluded from the hierarchies of religion and decision making?

[00:34:51.010] - Tess

I think I cut it off a little too soon. She said in religion and it was like religious circles, religious positions of power. Listening to this before, I'm pretty sure she's speaking specifically in the religious context. Is that okay, Lynne? Does that make sense?

[00:35:09.910] - Lynne

Yes.

[00:35:12.670] - Tess

Okay, then we'll listen to Daniel Dennett's response.

[00:35:18.350] - Daniel Dennett

I'll answer the first one. I think the reason that women have in general, not played those roles does have ultimately a biological explanation in terms of the way in which human cultures have evolved and in the way in which males have moved into positions of power and maintained them over the years. That's a long story but it's also I think not very original. I think it's a good question and I think it has an answer if you consider religion as a natural phenomenon, as I do, and there's quite a literature on it.

[00:35:59.030] - Tess

Now, anticipating that's the end of his response to our question, he then goes into something else. Lynne. Lynne?

[00:36:24.430] - Lynne

I just was trying to unmute my mic, but the screen was all moving because you ended screen sharing. But anyway.

[00:36:30.470] - Lynne

So basically his primary reason is biological. That's what he was saying. And he mentioned basically the evolution of human culture and how males have dominated in positions of power and maintained them. Which is interesting. It'd be interesting to know a bit more about that part of his answer, especially considering he was talking about the biological explanation. Because he didn't really go into that a lot. But then he talked about how men moved into those positions and then maintained them. It would be an interesting one to understand a little bit more about what he thinks. But I think that's basically what he said, if I understood correctly.

[00:37:31.490] - Tess

That's how I understood it. And feminists did not appreciate the answer that he gave. Some suggested that he read the room after the first part of his answer and realized that leaving it there did not sit well with his audience. But his hints at there being a number of reasons. But the primary one that he mentioned first is biological. Towards the end, he deals with the idea that men have played a role in holding on to the positions of power in various religions. But to suggest that it's primarily biological... If you were to move that into a subject of race and say why have all but one US presidents be white? And he would say, primarily biological, and that it relates to how society's developed and why people gained positions of power and held on to them. There is a justification towards the end, but that does not go all the way to justifying the connection between the obvious discrimination and the reference to a biological cause. He references issues within society towards the end. But the issues within society are not the biological. The biological is the differences between men and between women.

[00:39:10.560] - Tess

And that ties into what we were saying really towards the end of last week's Vespers. We are continuing on from what we were discussing. This idea of the biological is another way of saying intrinsic strengths and intrinsic weaknesses. What are intrinsic strengths if not biological? What are intrinsic weaknesses if not biological? And when he has the very opportunity in front of about the most racist, misogynistic, conspiratorial, right wing defender they could have found perhaps to debate him, an opportunity to take religious institutions to just task for their misogyny pretty much justifies religion or sexism in religion as having a biological foundation. So, yes, that is what I heard. It's what a lot of women heard in his answer that they found problematic. Again, tying into what you brought up, Brenden. The first tenant of Social Darwinism, the belief that people have intrinsic abilities and talents and correspondingly intrinsic weaknesses. I want to finish reading from that source, that same source, a few paragraphs down, when it talks about the influence of Social Darwinism, intrinsic strengths and intrinsic weaknesses. And they are saying that as we are, to explain the sexism in Darwinism, in the atheistic movement today. To continue reading that same source, '*as a capitalist fueled institution, new atheism has established itself as a mirror image of religion*'.

[00:41:06.250] - Tess

Religion and atheism. It's a mirror image. '*With Dawkins & friends situating themselves as a pinnacle of the movement in the role of God. Feminist philosopher Elizabeth Gross put it this way, God is dead. Long*

live man. Dawkins and the male leaders of the movement have resurrected man as God. For these men, misogyny is not based in religion at all, but in biology. And that is what Daniel Dennett, the one man who had alluded us so far, was saying. Misogyny is not based in religion. For them. Misogyny is based in biology. And that is why you find misogyny within atheism. If it was within religion. If religion was the cause of misogyny, then getting rid of religion would solve misogyny. But because its cause is not religion but biology, then they are not able to divorce themselves from sexism, from gender stereotypes, whether it relates to women or LGBT people. Again, rational thought, being able to pull something apart and completely understand it. How do you do that with the subject of trans people? There is so much that is experiential. There is so much that we don't understand. A woman recently that I know visited a gastroenterologist with some health problems, and the gastroenterologist told her, we may never find the cause of your pain because there is that much we don't know about the digestive system.

[00:42:56.290] - Tess

She said. We noticed the tiniest part about how the digestive system works. If they can say that about the digestive system, what about the brain? For someone who believes that they can pull something apart and understand it through rational thinking and scientific method? And if you can't do that, the issue doesn't exist. They struggle with many of these topics related to gender, not just the #Metoo movement, not just a sexual abuse incident where they don't have video evidence to analyze, but also trans people, where you can't necessarily dissect the brain and understand all aspects of what these people know experientially. What I want us to see is that not only are they sexist. Easy to prove. But why they are? Where that sexism is coming from. They've said it's rooted in biology. I want to take a little bit of time to go backwards and look at Darwin. Just look at that earlier history. And Katherine, you sent me some quotes, a couple of sources during the week which showed me you were looking into Darwin or having a bit of a closer look at him. And I asked you to read them tonight just to have a little bit of a window into Darwin's thinking.

[00:44:24.930] - Tess

And then we'll take it from there. Katherine.

[00:44:32.950] - Katherine

I did read a few really interesting articles about that time period. And some of it spoke about what Darwin had written in his book, which came after *The Origin of Species*. And the book after that was called *The Descent of man and Selection in relation to sex*. And that's from 1871. I can read a few quotes regarding race first if you like. Because he had obviously written something in here that related to the issue of race, which was influential on groups of people. One quote he had written said that *'the differences of this kind between the highest men of the highest rates and the lowest savages are connected by the finest graduation.'* What he was arguing in this book was, when you look at different races of human beings, are they different, like species, or are they all connected along like some are more evolved than others. And he was arguing that basically some are more evolved than others. They are all separate and distinct. There are men who are the highest men, and then there were the lowest savages. There is another point where he said *'at some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout all the world the savage races.'*

[00:46:22.790] - Katherine

And in his mind, this was going to be a good thing. What he was talking about was having a bigger gap between the animal kingdom and the human race. Eliminating those steps that take you through the spectrum of more evolved and less evolved. He did a compare and contrast that in the future, in fact, we would maybe potentially end up with caucasian people. And then the next step down with a big gap would be down to some ape as low as a baboon. That would be more ideal. He called it a more civilized state. The Negro or Australian and the gorilla. Currently they're pretty close to each other. The Negro and Australian is like our lowest man, and gorilla is the highest animal, and they're pretty close to each other. He expected those middle categories to be exterminated, and that would be a natural development as humanity progressed. That's some of his comments on race that I picked out of that book. Moving on to gender. He talked about the role of selection by reproduction. And he was arguing about the differences between males and females and what this had to do with their roles in progressive mankind.

[00:48:11.090] - Katherine

There's a quote that said, *'the half human male progenitors of man have struggled together during many generations for the possession of the females, to avoid enemies or to attack them with success, to capture wild animals, and to invent and fashion weapons requires the aid of the higher mental faculties, namely observation, reason, invention, or imagination. These various faculties will thus have been continually put to the test and collected during manhood.'* So because of their role, and to possess the females and reproduce and evolve, they had to have the higher mental faculties. *'Consequently, in accordance with the principals often alluded to, we might expect that they would at least tend to be transmitted chiefly to the male offspring at the corresponding period of manhood'*. The males would pass these higher mental faculties down to the next generation of males, specifically. Their children, but the brain skills will be handed down to males. Another quote he says is *'the chief distinction in the intellectual powers of the two sexes is shown by man attaining to a higher eminence in whatever he takes up than women can attain, whether requiring deep thought, reason, or imagination, or merely the use of the senses and hands.'*

[00:49:42.900] - Katherine

If two lists were made of the most eminent men and women in poetry, painting, sculpture, music, history, science, and philosophy, with half a dozen names under each subject, the two lists would not be a comparison. We may also insert from the law of the deviation of averages, that if men are capable of decided eminence over women in many subjects, the average standard of mental power in man must be above that of a woman, and thus man has ultimately become superior to women.' He does also speak about women. If I may read a little more, *'in order that women should reach the same standard as men, she ought, when nearly adult, to be trained to energy and perseverance, to have her reason and imagination exercise to the highest point, and then she would probably transmit these qualities chiefly to her adult daughters. But the whole body of women, however, would not be thus raised unless during many generations of women who excelled in above were married and produced offspringing larger numbers than other women.'* That's not the quote I thought I was going to read. There was one about

women passing on those nurturing qualities, extending because she's maternal, she would display these qualities to her infants, and then she would often extend them towards her fellow creatures.

[00:51:09.570] - Katherine

Women would be kind and gentle to other creatures. But man is the rival of other men. He delights in competition, and this leads to ambition, which passes to his leads of selfishness. These qualities seem to be his natural and unfortunate birth right. The men are naturally competitive and selfish. They can't help it. And the women are more generous to others and kind, and all of that because of their roles.

[00:51:48.690] - Tess

Thank you, Katherine. There's a lot in those quotes, a lot in those quotes to unpick. I'd like to come back to the earlier ones that you read on race. It wasn't Charles Darwin himself that took his thoughts to their conclusion. He obviously says quite explicitly as you read about the races, how they would develop into the superior, ultimate superior and the ultimate inferior. But it was his cousin who thought that we should give that a helping hand, the process of that differentiation of races, a helping hand. And that was his half cousin, Francis Galton, a man who did interact with him scientifically. I'll erase some of this. Francis Galton, the half cousin of Charles Darwin, very much of a proponent of what Charles Darwin was saying. They did interact on some of these things. And he offered an attractive solution to those who were seeing immigration and the mixing of races as a threat. Galton decided that natural selection does not work well in human societies the way it does in nature. In nature, you see natural selection at work. He says that it doesn't work so well in human societies because people interfere with a process.

[00:53:30.740] - Tess

For example, I guess that is what the right wing might claim that the left wing does. Through social welfare, humans interfere with the process of natural selection. As a result, the fittest do not always survive. Sometimes the weak survive because of humans interfering with natural selection. *'He sets out to consciously improve the race. He coined the term eugenics. This is where the term of eugenics came from. It was coined by the half cousin of Charles Darwin. It comes from a Greek word meaning good birth or noble in heredity. In 1883, Galton defined eugenics as the science of improving stock, which is by no means confined to questions of judicious mating, but which takes cognizance of all influences that tend to, however remote a degree, give the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable races or strains of blood than they otherwise would have'*. He says that eugenics is about speeding up the process of natural selection so that more suitable races become more dominant more quickly. And he refers to this as what must be introduced to the nation, to the national conscience, like a new religion.

[00:55:09.090] - Tess

So he sees this form of atheism as a form of religion and sees that it needs to be introduced as a form of religion to get for people to embrace it and follow it. *'It has indeed strong claims to become an Orthodox religious tenet of the future. For eugenics cooperates with the workings of nature evolution by ensuring that humanity shall be represented by the fittest races'*. He wrote an article for the editor of the Times titled *'Africa for the Chinese'*. I don't actually recommend that people read it. If you want to have a good

day. It is truly awful. But he was a proponent of colonizing Africa with Chinese people because he believed that the Chinese people were a more suitable race. It's truly awful the language he uses. Eugenics has a direct link through to not just Social Darwinism, but to Charles Darwin himself. He's very family. But where Social Darwinism really took it to most shape was in the interaction between Charles Darwin and his advocates. August Schleicher, Max Müller and Ernst Haeckel. Now, what do you notice about those names? Brodie. August Schleicher, Max Müller, Ernest Haeckel.

[00:56:47.690] - Brodie

Sounds very German.

[00:56:51.890] - Tess

Yes, it was in Germany where he found his greatest advocates for Social Darwinism. And the interaction between Charles Darwin, and just to name three leading German figures, was where Social Darwinism truly developed. What they developed was the following idea. They thought at the time, Charles Darwin and the scientific community, that the human brain and the ape brain were about the same size. So Darwin and his colleagues suspected that because they were the same size, the orangutan brain and the human brain. Darwin and his colleagues suspected that only the invention of language could account for the differentiation between humans and other great apes. If they're looking for what differentiates a human being from a great ape, what they believe was that it was language. And this is where that developed. If I draw a brain stem and a brain. Which looks like a tree that fell over, but you get the idea. What separated it from an ape, was the development of language. But what they recognized was that the evolution of language and the mind go hand in hand. From this perspective, empirical evidence from languages from around the world was interpreted by Haeckel in Germany as supporting the idea that nations, despite having rather similar physiologies, represented distinct lines of evolution.

[00:58:44.290] - Tess

So even though I have a similar body to someone in Germany, to someone in Italy, to someone in Ghana, to someone in Japan, compared to animal species, we all have the same bodies, but what we have is different languages. And therefore, they suggested that these different languages showed that different races evolved separately. Despite having similar physiology. These races are distinct lines of evolution that they can separate from one another. And they then divided mankind into nine different species. Haeckel constructed an evolutionary and intellectual hierarchy of such species. It didn't take them long to dividing human by languages up into different species. To then to rank them in intellectual evolutionary hierarchy. In a similar vein, Schleicher regarded languages as different species and subspecies, adopting Darwin's concept of selection through competition to the study of history and spread of nations. Some of their ideas, including the concept of living space, were all adopted by Nazi ideology after their deaths, because this is all happening in the 1860s and 1870s. But it takes a firm hold within Germany. *'Further interpretations moved to ideologies, propagating a racist and hierarchical society, and provided ground for the later radical versions of Social Darwinism.'*

[01:00:35.930] - Tess

Social Darwinism came to play a major role in the ideology of Nazism, which combined it with a similarly pseudoscientific theory of racial hierarchy to identify the Germans as a part of what the Nazis regarded as an Arian or Nordic master race'. It's all of this thinking dividing up races and then stratifying them that came stemmed from Social Darwinism. 'Nazi's Social Darwinist beliefs led them to retain business competition and private property as economic engines. Nazism likewise opposed social welfare based on a Social Darwinist belief that the weak and feeble should perish for the sake of the nation. This association with Nazism, coupled with increasing recognition that it was scientifically unfounded, contributed to the broader rejection of Social Darwinism after the end of World War II'. They would argue today that Social Darwinism has fallen out of favor. I want to question that. Brenden. Sorry. In reading the quotes, I didn't see your hand.

[01:01:45.790] - Brenden

Yeah, it sounded like fascist Germany. Which is what you've gone into anyway. That's all I was going to say before. Yeah, it just sounded like fascist Germany. Even when Katherine was reading the quotes. Yeah, it's awful. That's what I was going to say.

[01:02:14.390] - Tess

If Mount Rushmore are going to claim that religion is the cause of war and suffering in society and nations, then they should have a very close look at the Holocaust and its origins. We have shown the link between Catholicism and antisemitism. World War I and World War II. The world has been becoming post Christian for some time now, though, and even when we go back there. Atheism. Darwinism. Social Darwinism. Bears heavy responsibility for the Holocaust, and that is why it has fallen out of favor. But the problem is that people today now argue the following. They say that Social Darwinism is not scientific. Because Darwinism atheism is supposed to look only at biology, only at how biology has developed over millions of years. And they say Social Darwinism is a pseudoscience because it isn't based in biology. But gender. Gender is based in biology. So you cannot separate Social Darwinism with the study of biology when it becomes connected to gender. Even though it still does exist. Social Darwinism still comes through with race, which is exactly why you find a book written in 1994. All it is is what's developed in the 1860s and 1870s rewritten in a modern context.

[01:04:11.770] - Tess

It's not new. It did not take long for it to develop out of Darwinism. But when it comes to gender, it is so intrinsically connected to biology that even there you can't say that it's just that. Which is now often vilified by atheists themselves. It's just that Social Darwinism that isn't really part of modern evolutionary thinking. I want to screen share an article actually, and maybe I can share this afterwards. I won't read it all, but it's just evidence of this thinking. There is much like this. I found this looking for a more recent article, but I ran out of time. This is the Guardian 2010, where they had a series where this evolutionary psychologist would answer people's questions, much like an agony aunt in newspapers when people would write in with their problems. And usually a woman not always would give them advice and counsel on their personal issues. This one is an evolutionary psychologist. She's going to answer from the position of evolution. And the question this week is, '*Why do nice girls fall for bad boys?*' And a woman is going to write in and say, me and some of my female friends find bad boys attractive.

[01:05:48.450] - Tess

Why do we do that? Because it's not healthy. And the evolutionary psychologist is going to explain to her why she and often other women prefer men who don't treat them well. And it's an interesting read. She discusses narcissism, psychopathy, Machiavellianism. These bad boy traits that are risk taking, manipulative and deceitful self obsessive. And she explains why through the history of evolution, these traits are appealing to some women. She uses the terms males and boys that *mate* with females. It's very animalistic language. She discusses the competition between males, poaching mates for brief affairs. It's all explained with the type of methodology of Social Darwinism. She discusses how nice girls may be the only females who tolerate the dark triad male personality that's the narcissistic, etc. Because they will forgive these naughty boys and inadvertently giving them yet another chance to misbehave. But nice girls? Are you prepared to be a single mother? A bad boy son who survives all the risk taking behavior to reach reproductive age may make you a grandmother many times over because he will mate with many females. But are you really looking for quantity over quality? So quantity of grandchildren because he will mate with many women, or quality of the family environment, not being a single mom. Oh, I didn't actually read that part.

[01:07:59.800] - Tess

I think that's important to mention. She also says, if I can find it. '*Bad boys exhibit dark triad traits, narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism. And their behavior, according to one theory, is genetic, meaning they're unlikely to change their ways.*' Boys will be boys, won't they? If you get in a car drunk, what's going to happen? It's genetic. In other words, it's biological. They can't help it. If you're a nice girl, if you want a lot of grandchildren, you just have to negotiate what you want out of society, out of relationships. But that's just one example of how Social Darwinism is very alive and well today on the subject of gender. But much of what these men are saying is not even Social Darwinism. It's through what Darwinism fundamentally teaches about biology. Not necessarily just social evolution. But the biology of men and women. Brenden.

[01:09:35.610] - Brenden

Is this correct in looking at it from this perspective? Was that just an article to justify abuse?

[01:09:43.230] - Tess

Yes.

[01:09:45.510] - Brenden

If you want to cut it all down, we're starting to look at the methodology to justify abuse. And so they're using that methodology. This is why it's okay. Well, we don't have a choice because it's natural. That's how it is. We can't change it. Abuse is normal.

[01:10:19.110] - Tess

Natural selection biologically created those men and they are in many cases unable to change. They are a product of evolution. We just need to live with that. That is, I think, the core tenant of that article.

[01:10:39.170] - Brenden

It's really awful when you strip it down to what they're really saying. That it is okay to abuse. That's basically what she's saying in that article.

[01:10:55.950] - Tess

It's okay. But also with that element that they can't help it. They are not in control. What do you expect to happen if you're going to date a bad boy? Then you have to expect that. You can't hold him accountable because social evolution created him that way. And in fact, it's your fault because you find that appealing. Because social evolution also created women who are looking to mate with men, who are good at bringing home game from the hunt. Who through their risk taking endeavors often found the most food to bring back to the cave. That is how social evolution justifies the modern construct of gender today with the differentiation between genders. And then they will say, we aren't doing Social Darwinism, because since the Holocaust, that's not very popular. We are just understanding biology. And Daniel Dennett will say it's biology. And Sam Harris will say it's biology. Why don't you have so many women in atheism because they can't handle the aggressive nature of the discussion. He's not saying that women aren't aggressive. He would look at a bear and see that as aggression. It's not that women are not capable of aggression.

[01:12:40.660] - Tess

It's the first day of my period, I think if I lashed out, he would think, oh, she's aggressive. And then he would look to why I'm aggressive and he would link it to my gender. Well, it's because she's on her period. He would look at a woman being aggressive because of her emotions, because she needs to protect her young. But it will always come back to emotions and hormones. That type of aggression is a different type of aggression than what Harris is speaking about. When he speaks about aggression that is devoid of emotion that you find in these debates over religion and God and atheism and such unpopular topics as whether or not a trans woman is a woman or not. That type of aggression is devoid of emotion. It's rational based, reason based. That is what they are saying women have an intrinsic weakness with. And they would say that is not Social Darwinism. They would say that is biology. He used biology to explain why women don't have leading positions within atheism in great numbers. Daniel Dennett used the same argument, biology. However much he tried to soften it. To explain why religions have a patriarchal structure, they still believe in biology.

[01:14:23.780] - Tess

Which brings us to that root of the problem. Why is there misogyny and sexism within the atheistic community? Why do you find this atheism part of the right wing trinity where they are also often part of the men's rights movement? If you believe that these differences are biological, that it's not a man's fault the way he acts. That it's often a woman's problem, that she's just attracted to men that way, so she bears responsibility when she gets into an abusive relationship and is mistreated. If you believe all that and then you see feminists trying to take down masculinity, it's quite an easy slide into men's rights movements. We're out of time. I don't want to answer your question, Marie, about how all of this relates to the Sunday.

We will get into that next week, I promise. But I just want to close on speaking of one, men's rights activist. Roy den Hollander. Does anyone know that name? You can raise your hand if you know that name. Not familiar with him. He was on the extreme spectrum of the men's rights activists. I might share an article later on our forum. I will explain the article after I explain a little bit about him.

[01:16:30.470] - Tess

He became a lawyer and very much an activist for the men's rights movement. And he constantly brought lawsuits towards those who he thought were discriminating against men. For example, clubs where you would have to pay to enter and would have nights where they would have free admission for women. And the idea was that some of these clubs were most often frequented by men. And if you got more women into these clubs, the men would come as well. They would have nights where women could get in for free. And often they would also then give these women discounted drinks, alcoholic drinks, so the men would flock there thinking they might find a woman, et cetera. He brought these clubs to court because offering free admission to women and not men he saw as reverse discrimination. This is the type of thing he did constantly. He also brought Columbia University to court for giving the fact that they had a women's and gender studies program that didn't have a men's studies program. He said that was male gender discrimination. He did this a lot. But I won't read the quotes for time. He also, being an atheist, repeats that concept over again that feminism is a religion.

[01:18:01.950] - Tess

He says it's a belief system that advocates an accident of nature. The fact you're born a girl makes females superior to men in all matters under the sun. And when he brought Columbia University to court, he claimed that they violated not the 14th Amendment, but also the First Amendment. The separation of church and state. Essentially, his argument was that men were doubly injured by their absence from the women's studies curriculum, but by the unfettered spread of feminism, the religion. He actually challenged Columbia University that they had not separated church and state because through supporting feminism, they were supporting a religion. I just want to read a couple of short quotes of his. He entered into a very short term marriage that ended very badly. And he suggested that if he had just hit her early in the relationship, things might have worked out better, he says. Why do men have to relinquish the strengths that evolution gave them, while females ruthlessly use every weapon in their arsenal against them? In his thinking, women have developed through evolution intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. Bodies that men find attractive. Manipulative techniques. Men have developed intrinsic streaks and weaknesses, physical strengths. Why can women use manipulation, and men can't use their physical strength.

[01:19:41.900] - Tess

In other words, women can manipulate. Why can't men hurt physically? Why can't men punch? Why can't men react with physical aggression? It ended badly, as you might expect. He said, the only problem with a life lived too long under feminazi rule is that a man ends up with so many enemies, he can't even escort with all of them. When he was given a terminal cancer diagnosis, he took a gun. He went to the house of a woman judge, and when the door opened, he let rip, killing her son, shooting her husband. Although her husband survived. He fled before he found her. Shortly before that, he also shot another man's rights lawyer, who he considered to be a rival of his. He then took his life with the same gun. He couldn't just

pass away, cancer or otherwise. He was determined to strike back, even at the very end. Why do men have to relinquish their strengths that evolution, intrinsically through biology, gave them physical strength, while women females can ruthlessly use the intrinsic strength that evolution gave them. The article that I wanted to share was in The Atlantic shortly after he died and really made the point of how flippantly the media had treated, how dangerous he was.

[01:21:23.990] - Tess

He shot at this woman's home, killing her son in the middle of 2020. I remember that in the news. I'm not sure you might as well, but the media had for years known about him, and it was like it was just a joke. And The Atlantic article takes them to task on that. On racial issues, someone that dangerous would not have been treated as much of a joke as this man was. He did not make his hatred very well hidden. Just to read the very end of that article because he was featured on The Daily Show, in The Colbert Report by Colbert. Roy den Hollander on his personal website put a link to his interview by The Colbert Report. And next to the link, Den Hollander included a note, *'if you can make them laugh at you, they won't expect something serious'*. He knew how dangerous he was. He knew that the media, The Colbert Report, that The Daily Show, that MSNBC, that CNN, that Fox, that none of them really took him seriously because they thought it was funny. They didn't like him, but they thought it was funny. There was that failure to see the seriousness of the problem.

[01:22:44.050] - Tess

He is an extreme example. But I went to him for a few reasons. First of all, the failure of the media, for decades to see the danger in this trinity, but particularly in New Atheism and the men's rights movement. Secondly, to show an evidence of someone referring to feminism as a religion. And again hinting at the reasons why they see it as a religion. Linking it to religion. And again, that atheistic Darwinist belief of intrinsic strengths and weaknesses and how those gendered concepts support the men's rights movements support their misogyny. The link between misogyny and New Atheism. I hope that we can see it now. We'll return to this discussion next week, but we're going to get into how this relates to the Sunday Law and probably finish it. If you have thoughts or questions through the week, please, I want to hear them. We'll close in prayer for now. If you'll kneel with me. Dear Lord, as we approach the Sunday Law, as we walk through such a dangerous time in earth history. Thank you that you teach us that you do not leave us blind.

[01:24:29.710] - Tess

We see that the Christianity, the religion that you have preserved over 6000 years, as you have led your people, is not the cause of the problem. Even though it has become an embodiment of some of them. But we also see that it is only you that offers a solution. We pray that we will understand the solution, embrace the solution, become part of the solution. I pray, Lord, that we will see in our own thinking where not just the impact of what has come through Adventism and Protestantism, but is just as much pushed and upheld by Darwinism, where we have our own Social Darwinist beliefs of intrinsic strengths and weaknesses that justify oppression and inequality. Can we see these justifications? Can we see these ideas of strengths and weaknesses for what they are? Justifications and excuses for abuse. And may we be willing to rewire our brains? It is hard, Lord, to rewire our brains. It is millennia of wiring. But we are all

capable of doing that work, and you are helping us. May we embrace everything, however painful, that will help us to rewire our brains. I pray that you will be with us through the Sabbath hours as we think on these things more deep. Continue to lead and guide us. We know that you will do that. Perhaps instead, Lord, may we all follow you as you lead and guide. May none of us fall off the path and away from the light of the midnight cry. I pray this in Jesus' name, Amen.