

## **GENDER FROM DARWIN TO DAWKINS**

### **TMW VESPERS**

**04-29-2022**

#### **ELDER TESS LAMBERT**

Dear God in heaven. Lord, we thank you for bringing us through this week safely. Lord, thank you for this opportunity, this privilege to gather, to consider the world around us, what we are living through. Lord, 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, Lord, that we would be able to see the world as you see it, that we would hate what you hate, and we would love what you love. Lord, we want to know more of your kingdom. We want to know what it looks like. Lord, 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 part of it too. This is our desire Lord. We pray that the more we learn, the more we will understand you, and the more we will be like you. Thank you and this is our prayer. In Jesus' name. 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, on 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 underlying rungs of leadership underneath these men where lot of 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.

So, 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. Brendon is going to give us a bit of a summary in his own words of some of the things I've covered over the last two weeks. So, I'll turn it over to Brendon to remind us of some points that have stood out to him, and any lessons or points of interest you want to mention. Brendon.

Brendon – Thank you, Elder Tess. I just jotted down some brief notes that stuck out for me. I found it interesting how we even got here, you know, the discussion between the left and the right, left being equality governs freedom and the right, freedom governs equality. And from there, we went to, we realized on the right that there was this whole other spectrum of people that we didn't even, we didn't ever focus on, and that brought us to libertarianism, and from there, we looked at the VOX article which was Max that Elder Tess just mentioned. And, that brought us to those three ideology, the ideological principles of the trinity of libertarianism, atheism, and Men's Rights Activists (MRAs).

And, that sort of 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, about couple weeks, and just how they think and the arguments they use like, they'll use catch cries saying they have, they use the logic or they use evidence to justify their misogyny or racism in some areas. They'll use, you know, they have the rational thinking to back up their misogyny, I guess, is a summary of what they do. An interesting point to me was that came from one of the articles was that the misogyny or the male supremacism came less from your dominionist or religious area and came more from a secular, atheistic point of view, and that was from the atheistic authors themselves. I found that really interesting.

I just find that the similarities with the, you know, the fight, this modern atheistic group of young men coming through, I find it interesting that they're sort of, they see these threats, and it's the same through history that they see, when they see a threat they feel, and the threats were feminism which, that's why they're MRAs. They see the church as a threat and that's why they're atheists. They see the state as a threat, and that's why they're libertarians. That's why they're libertarians, and I find that 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 are the perpetrators but they're the victims in their minds.

And the other interesting point when we looked at the four horsemen is how they sort of had a cultural feminist type of ideology like you know, I guess based from an evolution stand point, they saw men and women having intrinsic weaknesses or strengths which sort of sound similar to cultural feminism where women and men have certain capacities for certain roles, and they sort of use that to excuse awful treatment like, you know, if a woman gets drunk, well of course, it's only natural that a man would then take advantage of that because he can't help it, and so there's this strange sort of, it's not strange to them but this ideology that comes through that sort of enables them to be misogynistic. Really awful. What's some other things I remember?

And, I think they don't like, and it's sort of especially pertinent now with what Elon Musk is about to do with Twitter. There's this fight against political correctness or cancel culture or this left, you know, not allowing this, in their words, this rational thinking and this freedom of thought to discuss, you know, like what they would call sensitive topics or difficult subjects. We know are inaccurate wrong, 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, just found that, yeah, so it underlying, it's still this fight for freedom over equality. That's sort of what I remember. I'm not sure there's lot more I know.

Elder Tess – Thank you, Brendon. I think 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 that one you referenced where the interviewer is speaking to a researcher in, Sarah Henry speaking to Alex DiBranco, and the interviewer tries to kind of say what we as a

movement have been researching for a few years and recognizing, you know, this sexism within this religious dominionist community, and the researcher comes back and says, yes, it's there but there is more of a men's rights ideology being pushed through the secular atheistic, new atheistic community than the dominionist one. And I think 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, 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; she could attack what she thought were the threats and problems within society. And then, she said that she has since found that, her atheistic community is, in her own words, "the worst." So, some of them, those who have their eyes opened to see this issue with the men's rights movements, with misogyny, with these concepts of freedom and equality, they recognize it within their own movement. And, they recognize it even as being worse within their own movement than the religious ideology they thought they were there to fight.

This is the exact point that we're trying to make. Protestantism is not either the cause of the problem in the world today, the problem being the nature of the Sunday Law (SL), gender discrimination, inequality. It's neither the cause, and it's not the whole. I think we've made that point, but we could spend 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. There was an atheist conference called, Mythcon, run by the organization, Mythicist Milwaukee. They invited a You Tube 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 is known for his racist, misogynistic, and anti-social 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." So. A female British MP launches, or helps lead an anti-internet harassment campaign, trying to stop internet harassment, partly of women and he tweets, "I wouldn't even rape you." At that Milwaukee conference, an atheist conference, he doubles down on that remark, and his fans in the audience burst out into whoops and cheers. They are so proud of him.

Coming home to Australia, the Atheist Foundation of Australia in 2017, announced that feminist author, Clementine Ford would headline their up-coming 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. This from the followers of, such as Richard Dawkins who championed free speech. It shows some hypocrisy of even their definition of freedom and free speech, the hypocrisy of

them to go, then go on right-wing podcasts, and talk about the silencing of those who wish to have rational thoughts around the evolutionary intellectual differences of races. So called the left-wing cancel culture.

So, some of that, you also brought into something that we're going to discuss more of which is cultural feminism. I made a couple of bullet points as you spoke in, 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.

So, thank you for that review. It brought us over through the most significant points, and I'm not sure, 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. I want to give, I think I just want to share screen again because I wanted us to see, I don't think I shared him before. Sam Harris, we've seen. 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. I don't think I've shown Hitchens before. (Showing photographs of these men)

This is Christopher Hitchens. (Showing a photo of Christopher Hitchens) You have these four horsemen. And, I wanted to also for us to recognize one other man who comes up quite a lot. Again, there is an extensive number of influential scientist, leaders underneath them who are as misogynistic as they are, and problematic. There is a whole article dealing with Me Too 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 inbuilt into the scientific community and very hard to root out. Maybe that would be shared at another time.

I'll just see if I can share screen Lawrence Krauss. He will come up quite frequently if you are reading articles about that because while the other leaders you might hear quoted are justifying the sexual abuse that is found in their conferences and by some of their leaders, he is the perpetrator of certain amount of that sexual abuse that they then justify. His record with women is that, he is the type of man that if you're a young woman and was at the conference, she was told to be very careful what she drank and very careful where she went and avoid him at all cost because he has a reputation.

He also came out in vigorous defense of a friend of his whose name I can't immediately recall, Jeffrey Epstein, good friend of his. He vigorously defended Jeffrey Epstein, and I'm not just wanting us to see that the sexism in these men; the racism in these men. I'm wanting 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, not just seeing that they're sexist, and his justification for his friend Jeffrey Epstein, his defense of that, was that essentially, as a rational thinker, you couldn't, I'm going to quote instead of reading it, not directly his comments but why he could justify or excuse Jeffrey Epstein. Quoting actually from the Atlantic on Laurence Krauss sexual misconduct allegations, "Sexual misconduct cases do not fit neatly into the framework that governs rigorous scientific inquiry. If there is one thing that we've learned from the Me Too movement, it's that so much of understanding injustice is experiential and rooted in anecdotal evidence." And, this is part of their problem. It is part of the problem the MRAs have with feminism; with issues of equality.

The issue is 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 kind of the same thing because you can't go into some aspects of inequality, some aspects of Me Too movement allegations with that type of scientific inquiring brain and find all the shreds of evidence to build a case. It often does not exist because there often isn't much left at the end of, even at the end of rape.

"It's that so much of understanding injustice is experiential and rooted in anecdotal evidence. For hard core free thinkers that's the 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. He couldn't verify them with 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 Naftali wrote in the outline after the allegations about Krauss made public. So, that was a direct quote from Ashley Naftali.

"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." So, 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 is a photo of Krauss reaching around to touch a woman's breast who'd asked 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, witnesses, even witnesses, how do you test that in an empirical way. Maybe he's just famous and people are to get him which was part of his defense. So, they see these allegations, and they see that the issues that feminists and women are trying to raise, and they see it as kind of almost like a religion in that they with 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 kind of excuse. Marie.

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

Elder Tess – I didn't see you hand, I'm sorry. It's my fault.

Marie – I just find some of it hard to picture, for example, do these men, they find religion a threat, and they don't agree with church and state. So, how would they feel then about the political right, the religious right, 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.

Elder Tess – So, that's kind of where we ended last week, isn't it? Saying that, how do you see there is this massive right-wing group that upholds this essential trinity ideology and yet oppose church and state? That's kind of where we finished last week. Am I understanding you correctly?

Marie – To be completely honest with you, I didn't see that last 10 minutes of it, so I might have missed that.

Elder Tess – I remembered what happened with your computer.

Marie – I was actually watching it today, but I didn't get to the last 10 minutes of it.

Elder Tess – Please do go back to that because we bring it up then in the last 10 minutes, but you won't find an answer there, unfortunately. It was more that we were recognizing that your question exists. There is that problem that we need to address and answer when we see a group opposed to church and state and yet on the wrong side of the SL. So, we're coming around to that.

Marie – Ok. Thanks. I'll watch the last 10 minutes.

Elder Tess – But, you won't find an answer there. So, hopefully, you find one, if not tonight. We are discussing that. I wanted to spend just 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, but he passed away some time ago, except extensive misogyny, but I also wanted to mention his position on trans-people.

So, Dawkins compared the lives of trans-people to Rachel De Lisle. Do we remember in 2015, Rachel De Lisle is a white women who said that she identified as a black woman, and then tried to forge a career in black activism and academia. Do people remember her from 2015? So, she is white, but she said that she identified as a black woman. And Dawkins essentially said that the 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.

So, this is the type of dog whistling. He will tweet that, but in the end, he will say discuss, and then when he gets attacked to that, he will say, he was just trying to engage in scientific reason, in open discussion. So, he wasn't necessarily giving his thoughts. He was just stating something, and then telling people to discuss it in the comment section of twitter which always works well. It's a cover for his own views. He then says “a trans-woman, a woman purely semantic. If you're defined 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.”

So, I want to take two points from 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. Again, if he's a heretic, the questioning something related to gender, what does that make the gender issues? It makes it a type of religion. Heresy is war against or opposition to religion. And they invoke that, again, 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 Bennet. He, 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 beliefs, but he's very close to Richard Dawkins. He's just much more careful what he says. But, I want to screen share to a You Tube clip, and this is, unfortunately, they put together a debate between Daniel Bennet and Dinesh de Souza, and this debate is about the existence of God. It's deeply problematic that they even give Dinesh de Souza a platform let alone Daniel Bennet.

Dinesh de Souza is far-right, far enough right-wing to, if you were to look him up in Wikipedia, find his comments on race, it is about that long. He's a huge supporter of Alex Jones, a conspiracy theorist, and a vocal opponent of the Clintons, Barrack 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 Bennet on the existence of God because Dinesh de Souza does believe in a God.

So, that's not really what we here to listen to. We're here to hear from Daniel Bennet. So, I'm going to screen share, and just show short clip of this video, and then I'd like Lynne, if you don't mind for us as we listen to this video at the end of it, I'd like you to tell us what you think that Daniel Bennet is saying.

Video – A minute and then we're done.

Elder Tess – So, they're going to take, I think about two last questions before the end of the debate.

Video – Questioner. So, my question is, first of all, I don't really believe that there has been equal dignity for women established universally. I think it's more legislative than actually socially or culturally established, but this is for both candidates as has been said, but why are women almost universally excluded from the hierarchies of religion and decision making in religion?

Video - Thank you. Ask the next question please.

Elder Tess – Lynne. Can you repeat in your own words what her question is?

Lynne – Basically, she is asking why women are not included in decision making and rules of positions of power. I guess you could say. I think, did she say within religion, and I'm not sure if she said religion and something. I forgot that bit, but basically, she's talking about the lack of representation of women, particularly in religion.

Elder Tess – I might just replay it so we can pick up that point.

Video replayed.

Elder Tess – I think I cut it off a little too soon. So, 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 a religious context. Is that ok, Lynne? Does that make sense?

Lynne – Yeah.

Elder Tess – Then we'll listen to Daniel Bennet's response.

Video – Daniel Bennet: I'll answer the first one. I think that the reason that women have in general not played those roles does have ultimately biological explanation in terms of the way in ways 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. So, 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. Now, anticipating ...

Elder Tess – That's the end of his response to her question. He then goes into something else.  
Lynne.

Lynne – I was just trying to unmute, but the screen was all moving because you went from screen share, but anyways. So, basically, his primary reason is biological is what he was saying, and he mentioned basically the evolution of human culture and how males have dominated in regards to positions of power and maintained them. It would be interesting to know a bit more about that part of his answer, especially considering he was talking about biological explanation



because he didn't really go into that a lot. He then sort of talked about how men moved into those positions and then maintained them. It's kind of, 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.

Elder Tess – That's how I understood it, and the feminists did not appreciate the answer that he gave. Some suggested that he read the room after his first part of his answer and realized that leaving it there did not sit well with his audience. But, he hints that there being a number of reasons, but the primary one that he mentions first is biological. Towards the end he dips his toes into 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 the subject of race, and say, why have all but one U.S. presidents be white, and he was to say, primarily biological, and it relates to how societies developed, and white 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 justifying the connection between the obvious discrimination and the reference to a biological cause.

He references issues within society towards the end, but issues within society are not the biological. The biological is the differences between men and women, and that ties into what we were saying, really towards the end of last week's vespers. So, 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 is not biological? What are intrinsic weaknesses if not biological? Biological differences. And when he has the very opportunity, in front of the most racist, misogynistic, conspiratorial, right-wing, defender they could have found perhaps, to debate him an opportunity to take religious institutions to task for their misogyny, he pretty much justifies religion, or sexism in religion as having a biological foundation.

So, what I heard, it's a lot of what of women heard in his answer that they found problematic. Again, tying into what you brought up, Brendon, the first tenet of social Darwinism, the belief that people have intrinsic abilities and talents and correspondingly, intrinsic weaknesses. I want to finish reading from 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." So, religion/atheism, it's a mirror image. "With Dawkins and friends, situating themselves at the 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 Bennet, 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 it is not, it's cause is not religion but biology, then they are not able to divorce themselves from sexism, from gender stereotype, 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. She said we know just the tiniest part about how the digestive system works. If they can say that about the digestive system, what about the brain?

So, 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 Me Too 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, it's easy to prove, but why they are. Where that sexism is coming from. They've said it's rooted in biology.

So, I want to take a little bit of time to go backwards and look at Darwin, just look at that earlier history. 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, and then we'll take it from there. Katherine.

Katherine – Ok. So, 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." That's from 1871. So, I can read a few quotes regarding race first, if you like, to give a little bit of that first because he had obviously written some things in here that related to the issue of race which was influential on group of people. So, one quote he had written said, "The differences of this kind between the highest men of the highest races and the lowest savages are connected by the finest gradations."

What he was arguing in this book was, when you look at the different races of human beings are they differ like species, are they kind of or is they are, they are all connected along like, some are more evolved than others. And, he was arguing that basically, some are more evolved than others. They are not, sort of all separate and distinct. So, there are men who are the highest men, and there are then the lowest savages. There is another point where he said, "At some future period not very distant as measured by centuries so soon, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout all the world, the savage races." 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. So, eliminating those steps that take you through the spectrum of more evolved and less evolved.

So, 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. But currently, instead of as at present between the Negro or Australian and the gorilla. So, currently they're pretty close to each other, the Negro, Australian, is like, you know, the lowest man, and gorilla is the highest animal, and they're pretty close to each other. So, he kind of expected those middle categories to be exterminated, and that would be a natural development as humanity progressed. So, that's some of his comments on race that I picked up from that book.

Moving on to gender, he talked about again the role, he was arguing for selection by reproduction, and he was arguing about the differences between males and females, and how this had to do with their roles in progress of mankind. So, 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 selected during manhood." So, because of their role and to possess the females and to reproduce and evolve, they had to have the higher mental faculties.

"Consequently, in accordance with the principles 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." So, the males would pass these higher mental faculties down to the next generation of males. Specifically, their children of those higher, the mental, the brain, and the skills will be handed down to the males. Another quote. He said, "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 woman can attain, whether requiring deep thought, reason, or imagination or merely the use of the senses and hands. If two lists were made of the most eminent man and woman in poetry, painting, sculpture, music, history, science and philosophy, with half a dozen names under each subject, the two lists would not bear comparison. We might also infer 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 woman."

He does also speak about women. If I may read a little more. "In order that women should reach the same standard of man, she or 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. The women who excelled in the above would be married and produced offspring in larger numbers than other women." This is not the quote I thought I was going to read. There was the 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. So, 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 easily into selfishness.

So, these qualities seem to be his natural and unfortunate birthright. So, the men are naturally competitive and selfish. They can't help it, and the women are more generous to other and kind and all of that because of their roles.

Elder 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 who talk his thoughts to their kind of conclusion. He obviously said 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.

Francis Galton, the half cousin of Charles Darwin, very much 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 said it doesn't work so well in human societies because people interfere with the process. 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 human interfering with natural selection.

So, he sets out to consciously improve the race. He coined the term eugenics. This is where the term eugenics came from. It came, 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 tends 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."

So, he said 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. 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 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 editors 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 more suitable race, and it's truly awful, the language he uses. So, eugenics has a direct link through to not just social Darwinism, but Charles Darwin himself, his very family, but where social Darwinism really took its most shape was in the interaction between Charles Darwin and his advocates: August Schleicher, Max Mueller, and Ernst Haeckel. What do you notice about these names? Brodie. August Schleicher, Max Mueller, Ernst Haeckel.

Brodie – Sounds very German.

Elder 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, and what they developed was the kind of the following idea. They thought at the time, Charles Darwin in 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 ape brain and the human brain or 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.

So, they're looking for what differentiates a human being from the great ape. What they believed was that it was language, and this is where it developed. So, if I can draw a brain stem and a brain, 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 because of the evolution of the 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.

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 the animal species, we all have the same bodies, but what we have are different languages, and therefore, they suggested that these different languages showed that different races evolved kind of separately. Despite having similar physiology these races are distinct lines of evolution that they can separate from one another. And then, they divided mankind into nine different species. "Haeckel constructed an evolutionary and intellectual hierarchy of such species."

So, it didn't take them long to dividing human by different languages up into different species to then to start to do this [hierarchy], and 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. This 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. Social Darwinism came to play a major role in the ideology of Nazism which combined it with a similarly pseudo-scientific 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 the 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 WWII.” So, they would argue today that social Darwinism has fallen out of favor. I want to question that though. Brendon. Sorry. In reading the quotes, I didn’t see your hand.

Brendon – Even when, yeah, it just sounded like fascist Germany which is what you’ve gone into anyways. That’s all I was going to say. Even when Katherine was reading the quotes, like you could start seeing the, yeah, it’s awful. That’s all I was going to say.

Elder Tess – If Mount Rushmore was going to claim that religion is the cause of war and suffering in society and nation, then they should have a very close look at the holocaust and its origin. We have shown the link between Catholicism and anti-Semitism, WWI and WWII. The world has been becoming post-Christian for some time now though, and even when we go back there, atheism Darwinism, social Darwinism, is heavily, bears heavy responsibility for the holocaust, and that is why it has fallen out of favor. But, the problem is that the 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 that social Darwinism is a pseudoscience because it isn’t based in biology.

But, gender is based in biology. So, you cannot separate social Darwinism with the study of biology when it becomes connected with 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 developed in the 1860s and 1870s rewritten in a modern context. It’s not new. It didn’t take long for it to develop out of Darwinism. But, when it comes to gender, it is so very intrinsically connected to biology that even there, you can’t say that it’s just that, 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 at work. 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, you know in newspapers when people would write in with their problems, and usually a woman, but not always, would answer their, would give them advice and counsel on their personal issues.

This one is an evolutionary psychologist. So, she is 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. Why do we do that because it's not healthy? And, the evolutionary psychologist is going to explain to her why she prefers, and often, some 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 explains why through the history of evolution these traits are appealing to some women, that these males, again, 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 might 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, the quality of family environment, not being a single mom because she's ... Oh, I didn't actually read that part. 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 are a nice girl, if you want 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. 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. Brendon.

Brendon – Was that article, is this correct in looking at it from this perspective, was that just an article to justify abuse?

Elder Tess – Yes.

Brendon – If you want to cut it all down and so we look, we're starting to look at the mindset of the methodology to justify abuse. And so, they're using that methodology to, this is why it's ok. We don't have a choice because it's not, it's natural. That's how it is; can't change it. So, abuse is normal.

Elder Tess – Natural selection biologically created those men, and they are in many cases unable to change; they're a product of evolution. We just need to live with that. That is the, I think, the core tenet of that article.

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

Elder Tess – It's ok, but also with that element that they can't help it. They are not in control. What so you expect to happen if you're going to date a bad boy, however you tell that he's 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, oh, we aren't doing social Darwinism because since the holocaust, that's not very popular. We are just understanding biology, and Daniel Bennet 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. 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 women 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 is speaking 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 emotions. It's rational based, reason based. That is what they're saying women are incapable of or haven't, I shouldn't say incapable, have an intrinsic weakness with. And, they would say that is not social Darwinism. They would say biology.

He used biology to explain why women don't have leading positions within atheism or are not within atheism in great numbers. Daniel Bennet used the same argument of biology, however much he tries to soften it, to explain why religions have a patriarchal structure. They still believe in biology which brings us to that root of the problem. Why isn't 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, so I don't want to answer your question, Marie, about how all this relates to the Sunday Law (SL). We will get into that next week, I promise. But, I just want to close on speaking of one men's rights activist, Roy Dan Hollander. Does anyone know that name? You can raise your hand if you know that name. Not familiar with him? He is, he was on the extreme spectrum of the MRAs. I might share an article later on our forum. I will explain the article after I explain a little bit about him.

He became a lawyer and very much an activist for the men's rights movement, and he constantly brought lawsuits toward those who he thought were discriminating against men. For example, clubs would have, where you would have to pay to enter a club, 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. So, they would have nights when 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 etc.

So, he brought these clubs to court because offering free admission to women and not men, he saw it as reverse discrimination. This is the type of thing he did constantly. He also brought Columbia University to court for giving a, the fact that they had a women's and gender study's program, but didn't have a men's study's program. So, he said that that was male gender discrimination. He did this a lot. But, he also, I won't read the quote for time, he also being an atheist repeats that concept with you over and over and over again, that feminism is a religion. He says that it's a belief system that advocates an accident of nature. The fact that you were born a girl makes females superior to man in all matters under the sun, and when he brought Columbia University to court, he claimed that they violated, not just the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment but also the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment, the separation of church and state. Essentially, his argument was that men were doubly injured by their absence from the women's study's curriculum, but by the unfettered spread of feminism, the religion.

So, he had 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 he, if he had just hit her earlier in the relationship, things might have worked out differently, better. He says, "Why do men have to relinquish the strength that evolution gave them while females ruthlessly use every weapon in their arsenal against them?" So, in his thinking, women having developed, through evolution, intrinsic strengths and

weaknesses – bodies that men find attractive, manipulative techniques. Men have developed intrinsic strengths and weaknesses – physical strengths. Why can women use manipulation, but men can't use their intrinsic strength? Physical strength? In other words, women can manipulate, so 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 the score with all of them. So, when he was given a terminal cancer diagnoses, he took a gun, he went to the house of a woman judge, and when the door opened, he let it rip, killing her son, shooting her husband, although her husband survived. He fled before he found her. Shortly before that, he also shot another men's rights lawyer who he considered to be arrival of his. He then took his life with the same gun.

So, he couldn't just pass away, cancer or otherwise. He was determined to strike back in the very end. Why do men have to relinquish their strength that evolution intrinsically, through biology, gave them, physical strength, while women, females can ruthlessly use their 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. He shot at this woman's home killing her son in middle of 2020. I remember that in the news. I'm not sure you might as well.

The media had for years known about him, and it was like he was kind of 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. And he, Roy Dan Hollander, in his personal website put a link to his interview by the Colbert report, and next to the link, Dan 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, that 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. He is an extreme example, but I went to him for few reasons. First of all, the failure of the media, for I could say millennia but I'll leave it at decades, to see the danger in this trinity, particularly in new atheism and the men's rights movements, to show again 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 that those gendered concepts support the men's rights movement, support their misogyny.

The link between misogyny and new atheism, I hope 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 SL and probably tie it

up. 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 SL, as we walk through such a dangerous time in this earth's history, thank you that you teach us, that you do not leave us blind. We see that the Christianity, the religion that you have tried to, that you have preserved over 6K years, as you have led your people, it 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 who offers a solution. We pray that we will understand the solution, embrace the solution, and 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 upheld by Darwinism, where we have these own, our own social Darwinist beliefs of intrinsic strength 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 brain. 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 be. Help us to rewire our brains. I pray that you'll be with us through the Sabbath hours as we think on these things more deeply. 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.