

Deconstructing Nietzsche's Antichrist

Richard B. Sorensen, PhD Psychology

March 3, 2024

rich@westernesse.com

www.richardsorensen.com

www.unholygrail.net



*He who has a why to live for can bear almost any how.
~ Friederich Nietzsche*

Introduction

The Antichrist was one of the last books that Nietzsche wrote before his descent into madness, and it is also somewhat better organized than his other writings, so it could perhaps be viewed as one of the definitive statements of his life and work. He was a nihilist, so for him, God is dead, or more accurately God in the sense of a divine being is irrelevant and nonsensical because government and the individual are themselves gods – the only gods that actually exist. So

Nietzsche hated Christianity and stated it relentlessly throughout this short book. From his concluding statement:

With this I come to a conclusion and pronounce my judgement. I condemn Christianity; I bring against the Christian church the most terrible of all accusations that an accuser has ever had in his mouth. It is, to me, the greatest of all imaginable corruptions; it seeks to work the ultimate corruption. The Christian church has left nothing untouched by its depravity; it has turned every value into worthlessness, and every truth into a lie, and every integrity into baseness of soul... This eternal accusation against Christianity I shall write upon all walls, wherever walls are to be found – I have letters that even the blind will be able to see. I call Christianity the one great curse, the one great intrinsic depravity, the one great instinct of revenge, for which no means are venomous enough, or secret, subterranean and *small* enough – I call it the one immortal blemish on the human race. ([Nietzsche, 2019, pp. 118-119](#))

What is it about Christianity that caused Nietzsche to hate it so much? It was the fact that Christianity declares that God as a divine being actually exists, that He imposes a morality, and that the Bible tells people to pity others, to help the weak, to support the disabled, and thus to interfere with the survival of the fittest. Even though the event that supposedly triggered Nietzsche's madness was pity for a horse that was being beaten, according to his writing and philosophy, survival of fittest was the only real human value.

What is good? – Whatever augments the feeling of power, the will to power, power itself, in man.

What is evil? – Whatever springs from weakness.

What is happiness? – The feeling that power *increases* – that resistance is overcome. Not contentment, but more power; *not* peace at any price, but war; *not* virtue, but efficiency. The weak and the botched shall perish; first principle of our charity. And we should help them to it. What is more harmful than any vice? – Practical sympathy for the botched and the weak – Christianity.

Pity thwarts the whole law of evolution, which is the law of natural selection. It preserves whatever is ripe for destruction; it fights on the side of those disinherited and condemned by life; by maintaining life in so many of the botched of all kinds, it gives life itself a gloomy and dubious aspect. [Italics in the original] ([Nietzsche, 2019, pp. 30-33](#))

If we examine his anti-Christian position, it was not based on empirical evidence, but rather on his a-priori and internal biases and feelings – in particular on his belief in Darwinism which he refers to in the above paragraph (“Pity thwarts the whole law of evolution, which is the law of natural selection.”) If God is truly irrelevant and people are truly the accidental product of pond scum, then Nietzsche is correct – there is no basis for morality, might makes right, pity and love are contemptible, history may simply be oppressors vs the oppressed as stated by Marx, and there are no limits to what those in power can do to others, nor is there any basis for limits.

Nietzsche made no attempt to soften the implications of his philosophy – he despised “cheerful atheists” and anyone else who adopted only the positive aspects of his thinking. This is the basis for Nietzsche’s statement about himself: “I am no man, I am dynamite.”

In his statement of good and evil above, Nietzsche sounds very much like George Orwell’s characterization of the totalitarian society of Oceania in the latter’s novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* where O’Brien, the party apparatchik and psychologist, explains to Winston, the imprisoned bourgeois who was being tortured in the Ministry of Love in preparation for his total brainwashing,

The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested only in power. Not wealth or luxury or long life or happiness; only power, pure power... The Nazis and the Communists came close to us in their methods, but they never had the courage to recognize their own motives. They pretended, perhaps even believed, that they had seized power unwittingly and for a limited time, and that just around the corner there lay a paradise where human beings would be free and equal. We are not like that. We know that no one ever seizes power with the intension of relinquishing it. Power is not a means; it is an end. We assert our power by making people suffer. If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face – forever... We have cut the links between child and parent, between man and man, and between man and woman... We shall crush you down to the point from which there is no coming back... You will be hollow. We shall squeeze you empty and then we shall fill you with ourselves. ([Orwell, 1949, pp. 211, 217, 220](#))

Communist governments that absorbed the principles of Friederich Nietzsche and Karl Marx have killed around 200 million people, which is 1,000 times more than any other movement in history. Furthermore, they did so with the same motives as the Papacy in the Albigensian Crusade – to stamp out what they considered to be heresy to their religion – the religion of communism. Orwell may have taken the above statements in *The Antichrist* as part of the inspiration for his novel. The fact that human societies have not (or at least, not yet) descended to the depths of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* or to alternative dystopias such as Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* (perhaps a more likely scenario), is primarily due to the influence of Christianity.

Given that Darwinism is a key element in the philosophy of both Nietzsche and Marx, it is therefore of prime importance to consider its truth or fallacy. If Darwinism turns out to be a lie, and if there actually is a divine being who created the world, then Marx’s concepts should be scrapped and Nietzsche’s pronouncements were those of a raving lunatic – in the words of Macbeth, “Full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.”

Deconstructing Darwinism – the Theological Basis of *the Antichrist*

When Charles Darwin sailed to the Galapagos Islands aboard the HMS Beagle in 1831, he noted that the finches on the islands were different from those on the mainland – they had larger beaks in order to crack the tougher nuts which were their main source of food. From this observation Darwin developed his theory of evolution by natural selection; finches with larger and stronger beaks had a better chance of survival and therefore would pass their genetic characteristics to their progeny. This theory known as “micro-evolution” or “limited common descent” is universally accepted in science – finches in different regions had different beak sizes and similar micro evolutionary processes have been observed in all of nature. However, Darwin expanded on his theory of evolution and posited that all organisms evolved from simpler forms and that life evolved from non-life. This theory is known as “macro-evolution,” “universal common descent,” or “Darwinism,” and was the theme of his 1859 book *On the Origin of Species*.

The word “evolution” means “changes in a population”; it makes eminent sense that changes in an environment will produce changes in organisms that live in that environment, such as finches evolving different beak sizes. However, Darwinism is nonsensical – it’s not rational to presume something would come from nothing, that design would come from disorder, that bacteria have evolved into finches, and that the human brain, which is the most complex thing in the universe and is still far from being understood, is the product of only time and chance. Detailed arguments refuting Darwinism have been made in numerous places such as ([Behe, 2006](#)), ([Behe, 2007](#)), and my own extensive summary which is available as an internet article ([Sorensen, 2020](#)), so here we will briefly summarize some of the evidence against it.

1. *Darwinism fails to explain how proteins and DNA could have been spontaneously generated.* Scientists have never been able to explain how these essential building blocks of cells could have been generated without a functioning cell environment. Proteins are constructed of amino acid chains in a specific sequence. It has been demonstrated that amino acid molecules themselves can be spontaneously generated under certain conditions, but the presence of water inhibits the process of joining them together. A non-aqueous cell-like environment is necessary in order to construct the proteins necessary for the cell’s existence.
2. *Darwinism fails the probability test.* Using the analogy of a monkey pressing keys on a typewriter at random, how long would it take for the monkey to produce a sentence that actually made sense, such as the statement, “Every Good Boy Does Fine”? The odds of a monkey generating just this short and simple phrase are $(1/53)^{24}$ or 1 in 189,000,000,000,000,000,000. To improve the odds, the Darwinist Richard Dawkins suggested that once a correct letter was generated, natural selection would fix it in place, and the monkey’s task would therefore become much easier. But the stupidity of Dawkins’ proposal becomes apparent once you consider that natural selection is completely blind and has no way of knowing whether a typed letter is correct or not, and proteins used by cells require very specific sequences of the correct isomer of amino acids. Thirty billion years, the age of the universe proposed by some Darwinists, is not enough time to randomly generate even one protein chain such as is used in the simplest life forms (assuming that this protein could actually be spontaneously generated), let

alone the thousands that are necessary for life.

3. *Darwinism fails the irreducible complexity test.* Cells are incredibly complex and made up of numerous sub-assemblies for movement, nutrition, defense, reproduction, repair, coordination with other cells, and other specialized actions. How can the functioning machinery of the cell originate and generate itself from chemical parts, when the parts can't even be spontaneously generated? Proteins are assembled by cell organelles known as ribosomes, but how can proteins be assembled if ribosomes, which are themselves composed of protein, don't yet exist? Even if one protein chain is somehow produced, how could the machinery to replicate that protein be spontaneously created, and how could reproduction occur? Everything moves toward minimum energy and maximum randomness, in other words, everything tends to decay and fall apart unless energy and order are injected into the system. If no cellular environment is already available, then any spontaneously generated protein chain would degrade and fall apart. Furthermore, injecting energy alone is not enough – adding energy without order and design simply results in faster degradation and breakdown.

Consider plant photosynthesis via chlorophyll alleged by Darwinists to be an accident. Ironically it is the most efficient photoelectric process known and is around 80% more efficient than any photocells fabricated by humans. Also consider various aspects of cell functioning which happen thousands of times per day. For example, the nucleus of the cell which contains the DNA wrapped into a large ball is searched for the regions specifying the blueprint for the construction of specific proteins, and a replica of the regions is made and passed to the cellular machinery responsible for protein construction. Cells, like all complicated machines, are highly designed and irreducibly complex – this represents a catch-22 for Darwinism. Design requires a designer.

4. *Darwinism fails to explain the gaps in the fossil record.* If Darwinism were true, there should be fossil remains of the transitional forms – “reptilian mammals,” “fishian reptiles,” “partially developed birds,” and so on. But little or no such evidence exists, and the fossil record demonstrates that: 1) Organisms typically appear in the record without ancestral lineages; 2) Most fossils are similar to their living descendants (if living descendants still exist); and 3) Most current life forms have had little or no change throughout their history. For example, trilobites appear in the fossil record fully formed, and then disappear, with no transitional forms ever having been found. They are thought to be one of the most primitive of all marine species as their fossils are found in the lowest rock layers. But they were very advanced creatures with three lobes and multiple legs on each lobe, a complex muscle system, gills associated with each leg, a complex circulatory and nervous system, and most surprisingly, very sophisticated eyes on some species that are one of the most advanced optical systems of any animal, and which totally contradicts the Darwinian notion that vision capabilities have evolved from the simple to the complex. Explaining how flight could have developed from nothing is another Darwinism mystery – all fossils of flying insects are fully-developed, and no transitional forms have ever been found.

To explain this fossil conundrum, the Harvard professor Stephen J. Gould hypothesized

that that the rate of macro-evolution is not static. While normally said to take millions of years, it supposedly can, for reasons unknown, dramatically speed up at times. So the periods during which the transitional forms developed (bacteria to fish, fish to reptiles, reptiles to mammals, etc.) were said to be times when the rate of evolution was so rapid that little or no fossil remains would have been preserved. This theory was called “punctuated equilibrium,” and it is on this basis that macro-evolutionists claim that the fossil record “demonstrates the reality of Darwinism.” So strictly due to time, chance, and environmental factors, and with a complete lack of evidence indicating how or why this would have happened, the rate of macro-evolution somehow dramatically sped up at all of the necessary periods so that all of the transitional forms, a key to the entire Darwinian theory, are conveniently missing from the fossil record. How can a serious scientist, or anyone else for that matter, actually believe such rubbish?

5. *Darwinism fails to explain the tenuous balance of life.* The laws of science as we know them contain many fundamental numbers, such as the size of the electric charge of the electron and the ratio of the masses of the proton and electron. The values of these numbers are very finely tuned to make life possible. The chemical bonding properties of carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and other elements are the building blocks of DNA, proteins, sugars, fats, and other organic substances; it is inconceivable that other elements could take their place. Carbon is the most unique of all of the elements in the periodic table. It is a non-metal with virtually unlimited capability to combine with other elements to create the millions of molecules which are the biochemical basis for life. Ironically, carbon is rarely detected anywhere else in the universe.

Symbiosis is another Darwinian mystery. Virtually all organisms exist in ecological niches provided by other organisms, and there are thousands of interdependencies among living things at all levels which are virtually impossible to explain from a Darwinist perspective.

6. *Darwinism fails to explain how the human desires for friendship, love, purpose, justice, and destiny could have developed.* When we reach humans, Darwinism has yet another serious paradox; the Darwinian world is cruel and cold with no inherent ethics or morality. As indicated by Nietzsche, the only real Darwinian ethic is survival of the fittest, so we are supposedly just intelligent animals, duking it out. Yet humans, who are said to be the product of Darwinism, are desperate for love, purpose, justice, and destiny. Studies with both human and primate babies have shown that those who are ignored and do not receive love will die or have serious psychological problems. Without an intelligent designer, human life in general and one’s own life in particular has no intrinsic value or purpose.

The presumption of morality is also basic – kids may argue about the rules of a game, but there is an a-priory assumption that rules exist, and therefore the notion of good and evil is a basic concept. Having a conscience is seemingly an instinctual part of human nature – how could that have evolved? The specifics of moral environments differ from culture to culture, but all of us live in an unseen – but nevertheless real – moral environment that deeply influences the way we live and behave.

Especially troubling for Darwinists is the phenomenon of near-death experiences (NDEs). Thousands of people worldwide have had one or more NDEs, and in several documented cases the individuals were brain-dead. Nevertheless, these individuals later recalled seeing the people trying to save their lives and even reported conversations that took place while they were presumably dead. According to naturalistic scientists, our existence is over when the brain dies, but through the study of NDEs we now know that human consciousness somehow survives death, at least in some cases.

We also have dreams of immortality, and much of our art and music is inspired by thoughts and visions of God and heaven. If we are simply the products of time and chance – of stray molecules somehow coalescing on a cold, impersonal rock – then how could such powerful desires and moral compunctions have ever developed in us?

The test of any scientific theory is whether it is able to successfully explain the phenomena with which it is concerned. Darwinism is thus a *miserable* failure, and if it were a theory in another branch of science such as physics, it would have been rejected and discarded long ago. The only reason that Darwinism is still taught is that it is a theological necessity for the religions of humanism and atheism.

Since Darwinism and Intelligent Design are the only significant theories for the origin of the cosmos, the former would seem to be the more “scientific” because by its very nature it excludes all references to God. Scientists may therefore feel more comfortable with it. But given the fact that Darwinism is in essence a religiously held faith, accepting it as true is a religious rather than a scientific position.

Although humanism and atheism do not have any religious trappings and therefore may not seem like religions, they are nevertheless, as they are a belief system about the nature of God (i.e., there is no God or that he is irrelevant), and therefore about the nature of humanity. In other words, everyone has a theology and a belief system, and therefore everyone has a religion. Humanism and atheism are essentially religious sects and Darwinism is a religious belief requiring faith – a stupendous and unreasonable leap of faith.

Dawkins has proposed the idea of “panspermia” as the origin of life on earth; ancient aliens or a meteor containing cells from another populated planet landed here, and all current life forms evolved from that source. But that idea simply pushes the origin question back a level; the silliness of that theory for the origin of life is revealed when the question is posed, where did the ancient aliens or the cells on the meteor come from? Here are a few quotes from Dawkins and my responses:

1. Quote: Isn't it sad to go to your grave without ever wondering why you were born? Who, with such a thought, would not spring from bed, eager to resume discovering the world and rejoicing to be part of it?

Response: I totally agree. Why not take off your Darwinian blinders, discover why you

were born, and really see the world?

2. Quote: I am against religion because it teaches us to be satisfied with not understanding the world.

Response: I am also against that type of religion. Darwinism is a religion which teaches exactly that – to be satisfied with not understanding the world.

3. Quote: Religion is about turning untested belief into unshakable truth through the power of institutions and the passage of time.

Response: That is exactly what Darwinism has done – over time it has established powerful and intolerant religious institutions which have tried to turn false evolutionist belief into unshakable truth.

4. Quote: Faith is the great cop-out, the great excuse to evade the need to think and evaluate evidence. Faith is the belief in spite of, even perhaps because of, the lack of evidence.

Response: This is exactly what faith in Darwinism has accomplished – forced people to accept, believe, and waste their time supporting a theory that is patently false, and where the evidence is almost completely against it.

H.L. Mencken was an admirer of Nietzsche and wrote an introduction to *The Antichrist*, in which he made the following statements:

If Nietzsche's criticism of democracy were as ignorant and empty, say, as the average evangelical clergyman's criticism of Darwin's hypothesis of natural selection, then the advocates of democracy could afford to dismiss it as loftily as the Darwinists dismiss the blather of the holy clerics.

No man of sound information, at the time Nietzsche planned *The Antichrist* actually believed that the world was created in seven days, or that its fauna was overwhelmed by a flood as a penalty for the sins of man, or that Noah saved the animals by taking a pair of each into his ark. Such notions, still almost universally prevalent in Christendom almost a century before, were now confined to the great body of ignorant and credulous men. Belief in them had become a mark of inferiority, like the allied belief in magic and apparitions.

Christian ethics were quite as dubious, at bottom, as Christian theology – that they were founded, just as surely as such childish fables of the story of Jonah and the whale, upon the peculiar prejudices and credulities, the special desires and appetites, of inferior men. ([Nietzsche, 2019, pp. 13-16](#))

Unfortunately for Mencken and despite his arrogance, there are many individuals much smarter and more intelligent than he was who believe that God created the cosmos, that the stories of the Bible are historical, and that Darwinism is bunk. A similar statement to Mencken's was made by

Steven J. Gould who claimed that those who believe in creation are “religious fundamentalists, not scientists,” and that “professionally trained scientists, virtually to a person, understand the factual basis of evolution and don’t dispute it.” No one disputes micro-evolution but there are many scientists and others holding doctoral degrees who reject Darwinism; see, for example, the books *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, edited by John Ashton, and *The Physics of Immortality* by Frank Tipler. If one accepts that “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” as stated in the first verse of Genesis, then all of the other miracles of the Bible are nothing compared to that.

As discussed in Thomas Kuhn’s famous book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, people typically don’t study the evidence and then develop their worldview (i.e., their a-priori beliefs). Rather, it is typically the opposite – children and adolescents develop a worldview and later as adults seek to fit evidence into it, even if their worldview is erroneous. Individuals with anti-Biblical worldviews would tend to adopt Darwinism because they need an explanation for the origin of the cosmos consistent with their worldview. It then becomes very hard to admit that they are wrong, especially if they have advanced degrees and have become invested in their ideas. With the deconstruction of Darwinism, nihilism is also deconstructed. Mencken, Nietzsche, and Dawkins are thus “educated idiots.”

We should be careful whom we curse. Jesus, who Nietzsche claimed was “the only Christian” said, “Do not fear those who kill the body but are unable to kill the soul; but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” It seems that Nietzsche became the victim of his own quote, “He who has a why to live for can bear almost any how.” At the end of his life he seemingly didn’t have a “why.”

References

- Behe, M. J. (2006). *Darwin's Black Box – The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*. Simon & Schuster.
- Behe, M. J. (2007). *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*. Free Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (2019). *The Antichrist*. General Press (originally published in 1895).
- Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New American Library.
- Sorensen, R. B. (2020). *The Darwinian Emperor is Naked*.
https://www.academia.edu/42232462/The_Darwinian_Emperor_is_Naked