

The Gospel Unashamed

"From the cowardice that shrinks from new truth, from the laziness that is content with half-truths, from the arrogance that thinks it knows all truth, O, God of Truth, deliver us."

A Controversial Newsletter "The Printed Voice of Summit Theological Seminary"

~ All articles are written by Terry Carter unless otherwise stated ~

Vol. 36 No. 4

October 2023

Terry Carter, Editor

A Feminist on Evolution

I recently read "The Man-made Myth" by feminist Elaine Morgan. This essay is from chapter one of her 1972 book *The Descent of Woman*. In this work, she criticizes the accepted ideas concerning the supposed evolution of man.

Her main issue is not with evolution itself - she does believe in that - it has much more to do with feminism. She has trouble with mostly male scientists thinking primarily about male evolution rather than the evolution of females. Still, she raises some important and thought-provoking questions. While I will not be discussing all the questions she raises in this essay, I do want to discuss some of her ideas regarding women and evolution.

She begins by quickly dismissing the Genesis account of the origin of man and woman.

"According to the book of Genesis, God first created man. Woman was not only an afterthought, but an amenity. For close to two thousand years this holy Scripture was believed to justify her subordination and explain her inferiority; for even as a copy she was not a very good copy. There were differences. She was not one of his best efforts."

There are multiple problems with this opening paragraph.

First, anyone who is familiar with Scripture knows that nothing God does is an afterthought.

"Known to God from eternity are all His works." **Acts 15:18 (NKJV)**

Second, she points out that this Scripture "*was believed to justify her subordination and explain her inferiority*". It is true that some have abused this passage in the past. However, the solution to that problem is neither to ignore the passage nor to continue to abuse and misuse it, the solution is to use it properly.

Third, where does she get the idea that woman was not a very good copy of man? We are repeatedly told throughout the creation narrative that "God saw that it was good". But after creating man, God said, "It is not good for man to be alone". It was only after woman was made that we are told "It was very good". How does this indicate that woman is not a very good copy of man? It certainly does not indicate, in any way, that "*She was not one of his best efforts*".

She does note that "*there were differences*" between male and female. I'm glad that feminists in the 1970's recognized that basic biological fact. I wish the same could be said today. These differences are not bad things, they are wonderful things. Those differences are kind of the point when **Genesis** says, "male and female He created them".

Fourth, she says that woman was "*an amenity*". I am not sure exactly what she has in mind here, but she clearly sees this as a bad or negative thing. An amenity is defined as "a desirable or useful feature". Certainly, the **Genesis** account indicates that woman is both desirable and useful. I suspect that she uses this word to say that she understands Genesis to be portraying a woman as "nice but not necessary". Nothing could be further from the actual message of the text itself.

Finally, she completely ignores the statement that both male and female are created "in the image of God". This is a very important statement. It puts both men and women above everything else that God created. It puts them both on equal footing before God. It recognizes the highest possible inherent worth of both male and female.

"So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them." **Genesis 1:27 (NKJV)**

She rejects the **Genesis** account in one brief and misguided paragraph. She misrepresents what the passage actually says and lays it aside as an intolerable hindrance to the state of women in the world. Her problem is not really what the Bible says, it is what she mistakenly understands it to say.

She is clearly biased against the creation narrative, and thus she turns to the alternative of evolution. She fully recognizes some of the many problems with that alternative. However, since creation is “unthinkable”, she must face the problems that remain. She does a fine job pointing out some of these problems, and I want to share some of them with you.

Early on, she makes this insightful comment: *“We cannot dispute the facts. We should not attempt to ignore the facts. What I think we can do is suggest that the currently accepted interpretation of the facts is not the only possible one.”*

To that I say “Amen!”. This is what creationists have been saying for as long as I can remember. The dispute between evolutionists and creationists is not over the facts, but over the proper interpretation of those facts. It is nice to hear an evolutionist admit this and say it in print!

She then discusses the fact that where there was a first man, there must also have been a first woman.

*“Of course, she was no more the first ancestor than he was – but she was no **less** [emphasis hers] the first ancestor, either. She was there all along, contributing half the genes to each succeeding generation. Most of the books forget about her for most of the time.”*

This is certainly quite true, but it also raises a rather thorny problem for evolutionists. How did male and female come to be in the first place? How did sexual reproduction originate? If a new species first appeared in a male form without a corresponding female, how did it leave any descendants behind? The same can be said of a new species appearing in a female form first without a corresponding male. For evolution to work, you need a male and female of a new species to appear together, not just chronologically but also geographically. This is something

that is simply not talked about enough.

She does not seem to notice the huge issue this raises for evolution. After all, her real issues are not whether evolution is correct, but that it is too centered on the male rather than the female. It seems to me that we would do well to address the existence and origins of the sexes before we engage in a war between the sexes on evolutionary grounds.

This discussion is followed by an amazing admission. In speaking of evolutionist textbooks, she says the following:

“Most of their textbooks include some phrase as: ‘...the early stages of man’s evolutionary progress remain a total mystery.’ ‘Man is an accident, the culmination of a series of highly improbable coincidences...’ ‘Man is a product of circumstances special to the point of disbelief.’ They feel there is still something missing, and they don’t know what.

It seems that it takes a lot of faith to believe in evolution. It raises as many questions as it pretends to answer. For those who are always carping about the “certainty of science”, the reality is far from certain. There is something missing alright, but we creationists know what it is... God.

A few paragraphs later, she adds the following in reference to the “generally accepted picture of human evolution”:

“I find the whole yarn pretty incredible. It is riddled with mysteries, and inconsistencies, and unanswered questions. Even more damning than the unanswered questions are the questions that are never asked...”

This is just one of the big problems of evolution that simply is not talked about enough. *“The devil is in the details”* as they say. I am reminded of a cartoon one of my professors had on his office door. Two men are standing in front of a board filled with

mathematical equations. The caption reads, *“Step six needs some more explanation”*. Step six simply says, *“Then a small miracle occurs”*.

From there, she raises a number of specific questions that she would like to have answered. There is not enough space here to go into all of these, but I do want to briefly discuss a couple of them.

She wants to know why our ancestors began to stand upright rather than on all fours. She quotes from a couple of scientists here as follows:

“With strong pressure on them to increase their prey-killing prowess, they became more upright – fast, better runners.” Desmond Morris

“We learned to stand erect in the first place as a necessity of the hunting life.” Robert Ardrey

She then points out the absurdity of this in the following statement:

“But wait a minute. We were quadrupeds. These statements imply that a quadruped suddenly discovered that he could move faster on two legs than on four. Try to imagine any other quadruped discovering that – a cat? a dog? a horse? – and you’ll see that it’s totally nonsensical. Other things being equal, four legs are bound to run faster than two. The bipedal development was violently unnatural.”

She continues for a few more paragraphs about how the proposed advantages of walking upright are actually ridiculous. She concludes that we need to find the real reason that this occurred.

She then points out the insufficiency of the standard explanations for how and why we began to use weapons. She quotes scientists who simply state that this happened while noting that they never actually explain how or why. She rightly asks, *“Why did one, and only one species of those Miocene apes start using weapons?”*

After some discussion about the difficulties here, she notes that a lot of these scientists:

“...privately realize that their explanations of bipedalism and weapon-holding won’t hold water. They have invented the doctrine of ‘feedback,’ which states that though these two theories are separately and individually nonsense, together they will just get by.”

She then turns to the insufficient explanations as to why we supposedly lost most of our hair as we evolved from our ape ancestors. She quotes one scientist who says that it helped to keep us from overheating as we chased after our prey.

After discussing some of the problems that are raised by this idea, she concludes by noting:

“This problem could have been solved by dimorphism – the loss of hair could have gone farther in one sex than the other. So, it did of course. But unfortunately [for the current explanation] it was the stay-at-home female who became the nakedest, and the overheated hunter who kept the hair on his chest.”

She ends this essay by suggesting that we need to start again at the beginning in our attempts to explain the how and why of evolution while keeping the woman of the species in the forefront, or at least on equal footing with man.

Of course, this really does not solve the issues she has raised with evolution. It might satisfy some feminist evolutionists, but it will not remove the real obstacles to evolution or feminism themselves. To adapt one of her own statements above, it seems that she believes that although the two theories of evolution and feminism are “separately and individually nonsense, together, they will just get by”. But a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. (Unfortunately for her, both links in her chain are not just weak, they are broken.)

This whole essay of hers illustrates quite well the problems that come from rejecting Scripture. The evolutionist rejects the Biblical account of creation and raises far more questions than he can ever hope to answer. The feminist rejects the Biblical account of the origins of male and female and assumes that evolution can be rescued by simply mixing in the right amount of feminism. Such an attempt is nothing but a fool’s errand.

“The fool has said in his heart, “There is no God...” **Psalms 14:1 (NKJV)**

To reject God’s Word will always lead to confusion. It matters not whether it is rejected from an evolutionary bias or a feminist one. Only God’s own account of our origin endows both men and women with the dignity of being created in the image of God.

“So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.” **Genesis 1:27 (NKJV)**

Take away creation, and you have stripped all mankind of their inherent worth. We become nothing but “fortunate accidents” with no purpose or future beyond this life. We are left to live life without hope and without meaning.