

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM¹

1. The first fact to be recognized, in this connection, is that *evolution* must not be confused with *evolutionism*. The word "evolution" designates only the alleged process itself, the process defined as *continuous progressive change*; the word "evolutionism," however, designates the theory which purports to explain how the process "proceeds," that is, the phenomena that are said to actualize it.

2. A second fact that must be recognized, by way of introduction, is the distinction between *science* and *scientism*. While I have all the respect possible for pure science, I have none whatever for what has come to be called "scientism." By "scientism" we mean the deification of science, and, naturally, of man himself as the author of science. (Devotees of science are prone to forget that their science is purely descriptive of what lies "out there"; of that truth which is written into the structure of the universe; and that all they can do is to *discover* it, and state it in terms of what they designate "hypotheses," "theories," and "laws." "H-2-O," for example, is simply a description (formula) of how hydrogen and oxygen unite to form a molecule of water. As far as human knowledge goes, there has never been an exception to this "law," but no one is qualified to say that there *never will be an exception*; for any man to make such an assertion would be for him to claim *omniscience*, and omniscience is a power that man does not have. Hence, what science calls a "law" is simply a statement of *very, very great probability*. Science has changed its interpretations of the cosmos, both physical and moral, too frequently to justify the ascription of infallibility to the human intellect. Whether they will admit it or not, men live for the most part by *faith*, not by a knowledge which has the quality of absoluteness. In a word, just as true *religion* is not to be identified with *religiosity*, nor true *piety* with *piosity*, so true *science* is not *scientism*.

D. Elton Trueblood's statements are certainly in order here, as follows:

Scientism is so naive as to be almost unbelievable. . . . God is a fiction because He cannot be discovered by laboratory technique. Prayer is futile because it cannot be proved by scientific method. Religion is unworthy of serious attention because it arose in the prescientific age. What we have here, of course, is not merely *science*, but a particularly unsophisticated philosophy of science, which deserves the epithet *scientism*.²

Scientism is, of course, the product of a closed mind, or, in the

1. Trueblood, *Philosophy of Religion*, 168

final analysis, a form of willful ignorance. It feeds on assumptions (as premises) which cannot be proved to be valid.

3. Evolutionism has been blown up into a dogma in recent years. (A dogma is a proposition to be accepted on the ground that it has been proclaimed by the proper authority; in this case, of course, that "proper authority" is human science.) Evolution is presented in many high school and college textbooks as an *established fact*; and in others, the inference that it is factual is expressed by innuendo, with the accompanying inference that persons who refuse to accept it as such are childish or just plain ignoramuses. It seems to be assumed by the devotees of this cult that they have a monopoly on the knowledge of this particular subject. The fact is that the material appearing in these textbooks is simply parroted by instructors who are so ignorant of Biblical teaching that they are not even remotely qualified to pass judgment on the issue involved. Unfortunately, too, persons of eminence in highly specified fields are prone to break into print on various aspects of Biblical doctrine, not realizing that by their own statements they prove themselves to be ignorant of the subjects on which they choose to expatiate. Pernicious fallacies, based on the authority of a great name, thus have a way of persisting from generation to generation even though they have been shown to be fallacious—or at least questionable—many times. It is the prestige of the "great" name or names with which they are associated that gives them a kind of deathlessness. It is the conviction of this writer that the evidence brought forward to justify evolutionism is based all too frequently, not on established fact—that is, by the testimony of eye-witnesses—but on *inference* alone. The important question, therefore, is this: Is the inference drawn from alleged phenomena in this field *necessary* inference, that is, inference the opposite of which is inconceivable? or does much of it savor of little more than *conjecture*? Dr. James Jauncey states the case clearly in these words:

Of course you will often hear from some enthusiastic evolutionists that evolution is now indisputable, that it has been proved beyond all doubt, and that anyone who disputes this is an ignoramus of a fanatic. This is jumping the gun, to say the least. The vehemence of such statements makes one suspect that the speakers are trying to convince themselves. When a scientific theory crystallizes into law, such as that of relativity, it speaks for itself. All we can say at the moment is that evolution is generally accepted, possibly because of the lack of any scientific alternative, but with serious misgivings on the adequacy of some aspects of it. As for the kind of rigorous proof that science gen-

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

erally demands, it still isn't there. Indeed, some say that because of the philosophical aspects of the theory, proof will never be possible."¹

It has been rightly said that a *hypothesis* in science is to be accepted simply as "a fairly good guess."

A clear example of blind spots that occur in the presentation of the theory of evolution—either in published accounts or in the original manuscripts—is the title of an article which appeared in *Reader's Digest* not so long ago, "Can Science Produce Life?" Any honest person can see that this title is misleading, to say the least: life was *never* produced by human agency. (*No man ever created a seed.*) This fact, the author of the article in question, seems to realize. Toward the end he writes, with reference to *microspheres* (proteinoids formed by the fusion of amino acids):

"Although these spheres are not true cells— they have no DNA genes and they are simpler than any contemporary life— they do possess many cellular properties. They have stability; they keep their shapes indefinitely. They stain in the same way as the present-day protein in cells, an important chemical test. But the real significance of these microspheres is that scientists do not *synthesize* them piece by piece; they simply set up the right *conditions*—and microspheres produce themselves.

Thus it will be noted that the eminent scientist-author of this article flatly contradicts the import of the title, by stating that man can only set up the conditions necessary to the production of microspheres but cannot himself do the producing. (The title is an excellent example of the manner in which confusion can be spread by the careless use of language.) Man indeed sets the stage, but only the God of nature (there is no such thing as nature *per se*, an entity), as the cosmic Efficient Causality, can actualize the life process.

4. While one "school" of scientists will resort to the acceptance of evolutionism because *there is no other scientifically acceptable accounting for the existence of the totality of being*; that is to say, no other explanation that would not involve the *supernatural*, or at least the *superhuman*, and in their thinking this indeed would compel them to range beyond the canons of the scientific method; still and all, there are many so-called scientists who at heart reject *in toto* the basic concepts of religion in general, and especially those which are presented in the Scriptures, simply because *it is their will to do this and therefore they set out deliberately to oppose, and if possible to destroy, every religious belief known to man.* These are the

1. Jauncey, *Science Returns to God*, 57.

materialists, the self-styled naturalists, the humanists, the Marxists, the Leninists, and all their ilk. They seek to destroy religious conviction because they *hate* it. "Religion" is to them "the opium of the people." Hence they look upon it as a bounden duty to eliminate it from this world if there can be found any way of doing it. Unfortunately for them, however, it still seems to be true, as was affirmed early in human thinking, that "man is incurably religious," in the sense that he recognizes the existence of the higher Powers and seeks in whatever way possible to be reconciled to them or at least to receive their approbation. Among all nihilists it is a case in which the wish is father to the thought.

5. On the other hand, there are many eminent scientists who either accept reluctantly (and provisionally, let us say) or reject altogether the claims of the evolutionists. For a concrete example, we can cite the Preface to the latest issue of Everyman's Library Edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, from the mind and hand of W. R. Thompson, F.R.S., Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Ottawa, Canada. Thompson states expressly in his Preface that the content thereof will not follow the tenor of previous Introductions to Darwin's work, those written by other scientists, in particular that by Sir Arthur Keith. Thompson writes:

I could not content myself with mere variations on the hymn to Darwin and Darwinism that introduce so many textbooks on biology and evolution. . . . I am of course well aware that my views will be regarded by biologists as heretical and reactionary. However, I happen to believe that in science heresy is a virtue and reaction often a necessity, and that in no field of science are heresy and reaction more desirable than in evolutionary theory.¹

After stating in no uncertain terms what he considers to be weaknesses of the Darwinian theory (which he describes as a theory of the "origin of living forms by descent with modification"), Thompson goes on to point out the fallacies involved in the argumentation used by the evolutionists. This, he declares, "makes the discussion of their ideas extremely difficult." In what way? Because "personal convictions, simple possibilities, are presented as if they were proofs, or at least valid arguments in favor of the theory" (repeating an evaluation made by De Quatrefages). Thompson adds:

As an example De Quatrefages cited Darwin's explanation of the manner in which the titmouse might become transformed into the nut-

1. *Op. cit.*, viii.

cracker, by the accumulation of small changes in structure and instinct owing to the effect of natural selection; and then proceeded to show that it is just as easy to transform the nutcracker into the titmouse. The demonstration can be modified without difficulty to fit any conceivable case. It is without scientific value since it cannot be verified, but since the imagination has free rein, it is easy to convey the impression that a concrete example of real transmutation has been given. This is the more appealing because of the extreme fundamental simplicity of the Darwinian explanation. . . . This was certainly a major reason for the success of the *Origin*. Another is the elusive character of the Darwinian argument. Every characteristic of organisms is maintained in existence because it has survival value. But this value relates to the struggle for existence. Therefore we are not obliged to commit ourselves in regard to the meaning of differences between individuals or species since the possessor of a particular modification may be, in the race for life, moving up or falling behind. On the other hand, we can commit ourselves if we like, since it is impossible to disprove our statement. The plausibility of the argument eliminates the need for proof and its very nature gives it a kind of immunity to disproof. Darwin did not show in the *Origin* that species had originated by natural selection; he merely showed, on the basis of certain facts and assumptions, how this might have happened, and as he convinced himself he was able to convince others.¹

One is reminded, in this connection, of a similar begging of the question, namely, as paleontologists use the alleged ascending levels of the geological map of earth to validate their theory of the alleged ascending levels of fossil remains, so the geologists profess to establish their alleged ascending levels, as given in the geological map, by the time clock provided by the paleontologists. Surely this is a case of backscratching *par excellence*! One is reminded of Mark Twain's whimsical remark that "there is something so fascinating about science: one gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such trifling investments of fact."

6. On the subject of mutations, Thompson writes as follows: "As Emile Guyenot has said, mutations are powerless to explain the general adaptation which is the basis of organization. 'It is impossible to produce the world of life where the dominant note is functional organization, correlated variation and progression, from a series of random events.'"²

I should like to interpolate here a few personal statements as follows: An outstanding example of the downright fanatical zeal with which early exponents seized upon Darwin's theory and blowed it up to such fanatastic extremes (notably, by means of the intellectual vacillations of the erratic T. H. Huxley, the semantic pomposity of the agnostic Herbert Spencer, etc.) is the "tree of life" as hypothesized by the arrogant German,

1. *Op. Cit.*, xi.

2. *Ibid.*, xiii.

Haeckel). Haeckel presumed to arrange existing forms in an ascending scale from the simple to the complex, by arbitrarily inserting imaginary names to identify all the necessarily numerous "missing links." Today, Haeckel's famous "tree" is largely famous, even in the scientific world, for its absurdities.

7. Dr. Thompson concludes his Preface with what is obviously the most telling of all criticisms of the theory of evolution, as follows:

A long-enduring and regrettable effect of the *Origin* was the addiction of biologists to unverifiable speculation [the net result of which was that] the success of Darwinism was accompanied by a *decline in scientific integrity*. This is already evident in the reckless statements of Haeckel, and in the shifting, devious, and histrionic argumentation of T. H. Huxley. A striking example, which has only recently come to light, is the alteration of the Piltdown skull so that it could be used as evidence of the descent of man from the apes; but even before this a similar instance of tinkering with the evidence was finally revealed by the discoverer of Pithecanthropus, who admitted many years after his sensational report, that he had found in the same deposits bones that are definitely human. Though these facts are now well known, a work published in 1943 still accepts the diagnosis of Pithecanthropus given by Dubois, as a creature with a femur of human form permitting an erect posture. Not long ago (1947), an exhibit in London, designed for public instruction, presented human development in such a way as to insinuate the truth of the "biogenetic law"; and in the same exhibit were problematic reconstructions indicating the descent of man and including the Piltdown type.¹

Finally, Dr. Thompson's conclusions, as follows:

It may be said, and the most orthodox theologians indeed hold, that God controls and guides even the events due to chance; but this proposition the Darwinians emphatically reject, and it is clear that in the *Origin* evolution is presented as an essentially undirected process. For the majority of readers, therefore, the *Origin* effectively dissipated the evidence of providential control. It might be said that this was their own fault. Nevertheless, the failure of Darwin and his successors to attempt an equitable assessment of the religious issues at stake indicates a regrettable obtuseness and lack of responsibility. Furthermore, on the purely philosophical plane, the Darwinian doctrine of evolution involves some difficulties which Darwin and Huxley were unable to appreciate. [I might well add that their devoted disciples in our day seem to have closed minds on the same matters.] *Between the organism that simply lives, the organism that lives and feels, and the organism that lives, feels, and reasons, there are, in the opinion of respectable philosophers, abrupt transitions corresponding to an ascent in the scale of being, and they hold that the agencies of the material world cannot produce transitions of this kind. . . .* Biologists still agree on the separation of plants and animals, but the idea that man and animals differ only in degree is now so general among them, that even psychologists no longer attempt to use words like "reason" or "intelligence" in an exact sense. This tendency to eliminate, by means of unverifiable speculations, the

1. *Op. cit.*, xii.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

limits of the categories Nature presents to us, is an inheritance of biology from the *Origin of Species*.¹

One is reminded here of the argument put forward (by Huxley, I think it was) in earlier days, when evolutionism was filling the mental and spiritual atmosphere of our world with paeans to Darwin and Darwinism, that if six monkeys were set to strum at random on typewriters for millions of millions of years they would be bound in time to write all the books in the British Museum.² Surely it requires a greater exercise of faith to give credence to this supposition, than is required for belief in God. Of similar grandiose character is Herbert Spencer's definition of evolution as "an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent, homogeneity to a definite, coherent, heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." (One is reminded of Oliver Goldsmith's statement to the eminent Dr. Johnson, "You make your fishes talk like whales.")

8. There are scientists, as we have noted above, who, even though adhering to the concept of what they call "pure science," according to which "supernatural creation is the denial of scientific intelligibility," still reject, or at least hold questionable, the claims of evolutionism. However, *there are many scientists who reject evolutionism outright for the Biblical doctrine of creation, commonly known as creationism.* Many of these men are active in the work of the Creation Research Society (Ann Arbor, Michigan), others in the Bible-Science Association (Caldwell, Idaho). (One of the outstanding publications of the latter is the book (320 pages) by Dr. A. E. Wilder Smith, *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*.) Those who would try to underscore the impression that all the brains of mankind are on the side of the evolutionists are simply begging the question: that is to say, the burden of proof is on them, not on those who oppose them.

9. The words "evolution" and "evolutionism" are two of the most ambiguous words in our language. "Evolution" means literally "unrolling," "unfolding," etc. As used originally, the term had reference only to the *origin of species*: its use was confined to biological science. Since Darwin's time, however, it has become a yardstick for analyzing and tracing chronologically every cosmical, biological, sociological, and even theological,

1. *Op. cit.*, xxiii, xxiv.

2. Sir James Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe*, 4.

development in the history of humankind. As G. T. W. Patrick puts it—

The fact is that evolution is a very much overworked word. At the close of the last century and in the beginning of this one, the idea of evolution held almost undisputed sway. It was extended far beyond its original application and applied quite universally. We began to hear of inorganic, cosmic, astral, geologic and atomic evolution. Even the "delirious electrons" evolved into atoms, and matter itself was a process of development. Social evolution had already made its appearance, and we learned that the new law applied also to the development of language, ideas, beliefs, the family, the church and the state, and to social and political institutions. In fact, in those days of first enthusiasms it occurred to no one that there is any realm of reality at all excluded from the field of evolution. Nothing is fixed or final; nothing is created; everything just grew and is growing.¹

Hence, in recent years we have books with such titles as *Stellar Evolution, From Atoms to Stars, Biography of the Earth*, and numerous published articles of the same general trend of thought. Nowhere, perhaps, is this attempted universalization of the term made more obvious than in the title of the book recently published (and made a required textbook in biology in various public school systems), *From Molecules to Man*. In all such evolution is presented as a fact, and dogmatically presented as a fact.

In this connection, we recall Herbert Spencer's "cultural evolution" theory, namely, that all cultures have moved "forward" or "upward" from savagery through barbarism to civilization. This idea has long been abandoned by anthropologists and sociologists alike. Hegel came forward with his theory of the course of history, namely, that it is not just the process by which man comes to a consciousness of God and of the world around him, but that it is the process as well by which Spirit (Universal Reason, God) the Absolute comes to a consciousness of Himself; all this by means of reported sequences of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, each synthesis becoming in turn a sort of progressive thesis. This means, in short, that the space-time continuum is God in the process of fully realizing Himself; and as this process of Self-realization becomes incorporated into rational human experience, it becomes known in the physical world as Nature and in the moral world as History. Again, the evolution yardstick has been, for a long time, applied to the history of religion. It was contended that animism (the belief that everything is "ensouled," that is, characterized by an inherent vitalizing power, generally known as "spirit") was the first form of "religion";

1. Patrick, *Introduction to Philosophy*, Revised Edition, 144.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

that, in time, animism gave way generally to *polytheism* (characterized by pantheons of anthropomorphic gods and goddesses, essentially personifications of natural forces); that polytheism was succeeded by *henotheism* (a pantheon with a single sovereign deity), which in turn gave way to *monotheism* (belief in one God who alone is deity). In other words, rather than God having created man in His own image, man has really created his gods or God in his own imagination. It is held further that *monotheism* will ultimately give way to *pantheism*, in which God is identified with Nature, the World, the Universe, the Cosmos, the Totality of Being. Thus any distinction between Creator and what is designated the Creation is eliminated. Pantheism is conceived to be, and presented as, a sophisticated "religion," hence the only system acceptable to the "intelligentsia" (whoever they may be). However, it is doubtful that this general theory is widely entertained in our day: there is too much evidence that *monotheism* has existed along with these other views, somewhere and in some form, from earliest times. Moreover, a dry-as-dust intellectualized cult, such as pure pantheism, or any other cult which ignores the personal "living" God, will never appeal generally to the aspirations, or satisfy the deeper needs, of the human spirit. (Some wag has remarked that if he were a pantheist, his first act of worship, on awaking from sleep each morning, would be that of turning to his pillow and kissing it fervently. We see here the folly of talking about worshipping "nature," when as a matter of fact nature as an entity does not even exist. We do not worship nature; rather, we worship the God of nature, for the fact remains that "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork" (Ps. 19:1, cf. Rom. 1:20).

10. Implicit in the meaning of the word "evolution" as generally used is the idea of progression or "progressive development." The basis of this idea is the *a priori* concept that the historical order must coincide with a certain logical order in each case; that is to say, as applied by evolutionists, all change necessarily takes place from the simple to the more complex. In logic textbooks, this idea is now designated "the genetic fallacy." As stated in one such textbook:

Our previous discussions ought to make it clear now that the facts of history cannot be deduced from logic alone, that factual data are needed to confirm or verify any speculation as to the past. This truth condemns all attempts current in the eighteenth century, and still widely popular, to reconstruct the history of mankind prior to any reliable records, on the basis of nothing but speculations as to what must have

been. The theories as to the origin of language or religion, or the original social contract by which government was instituted, which were based on empirically unsupported assumptions as to what "the first" or "primitive" man must have done, are all historically untenable. It is clearly a logical error or fallacy to assume that actual history can be so constructed or discovered. Not much different, however, are those speculative *a priori* histories which under the name of social evolution attempt to deduce the stages which all human institutions must go through and therefore actually have gone through. In all of these attempts to trace the history of the family, industry, the state, and the like, the earlier stages are assumed to have been simpler, and the later stages more complex.¹

What better examples of this genetic fallacy could be offered than those which have prevailed for a century or more in the field of Biblical criticism? What better example *par excellence* could be suggested than the well-known—and archaeologically disproved—Documentary (Graf-Wellhausen) Theory of the Pentateuch? The *a priori* assumed correlation, chronologically, between the cultural background of the Abrahamic era and that of the Exilic and Post-Exilic periods has certainly been exploded by evidence from the diggings at Mari, Nuzi, Ugarit, etc. These diggings establish fully the fact that the cultural background that is portrayed in the book of Genesis is historically accurate.

Quoting again from the source immediately cited above, we read as follows:

It is an inexcusable error to identify the temporal order in which events have actually occurred with the logical order in which elements may be put together to constitute existing institutions. Actual recorded history shows growth in simplicity as well as in complexity. Modern English, for instance, is simpler as regards inflection than Old English, and our legal procedure became less complicated when the old forms of action were abolished. *A priori* evolutionists had no doubt that the matriarchal family must precede the patriarchal form, and that the nomad state of society must precede the agricultural form. This, however, cannot prevent an actual Indian tribe from changing from the patriarchal to the matriarchal form. Nor can it prevent the Peruvians from skipping the nomad stage because the western slopes of the Andes could not provide them with sufficient cattle to serve as a basis of social organization. Indeed, the supposed law of development from the simple to the complex is too vague to induce us to deduce any specific historical events from it. That which seems simple in one state of knowledge or ignorance is seen to be more complex after increased knowledge or on closer examination. And many things bewilderingly complex at first become simpler to us after systematic study. Genetic accounts or theories which attract us by their *a priori* plausibility thus cease to do so when we discriminate between the intelligible and the temporal order, when we subject theories of what actually happened to the test of verifiability. The converse error is the supposition that an actual history of any science, art, or social institution can take the place of a logical analysis of its structure. When anything grows by additions

1. Cohen and Nagel, *An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method*, 389.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

or accretions, a knowledge of the order of such successive additions is a clue to the constitution of the final result. But not all growth is of that form. Science, for instance, as well as art and certain social organizations, is sometimes deliberately changed according to some idea or pattern to which previous existence is not relevant.¹

11. Again, evolutionists—and scientists generally—are prone to commit the fallacy of *over-simplification*. This is a fallacy which usually attends the inductive (scientific) method. It is also known as the “nothing but” fallacy. For example, “Thought is nothing but the activity of brain cells.” “Thinking is nothing but sub-vocal conditioning” (according to John B. Watson). “Man is nothing but a biological entity.” Evolutionists commit this fallacy in making no effort to account for the *modus operandi* of the many leaps occurring in the alleged evolutionary process (as Thompson states it, leaps from “the organism that simply lives” to “the organism that lives and feels” to “the organism that lives and feels and reasons”). They simply take for granted that these are matters of degree, although they have no evidence beyond the realm of inference to prove it. These gaps which serve to put in bold outlines the ascending levels in the total hierarchy of being, at which, according to some philosophers, new increments of power are infused into the ongoing (upward-moving) total process. D. Elton Trueblood speaks of this hierarchical character, which Aristotle envisioned in his *De Anima*, as that of “radical discontinuity.” This characteristic is surely emphasized in the Genesis narrative of the Creation. (We have taken note of this hierarchical character of the totality of being already, in Part Three above.)

12. Evolutionists, we repeat for the sake of emphasis, simply take it for granted that these “radical discontinuities” in the ascending scale of being are matters of *degree*, and not matters of *kind*. (The notion of the totality of being as a continuum was put forward in early modern times in the famous doctrine of the Great Chain of Being. According to this view our world being the handiwork of a perfect Creator must be “the best of all possible worlds”; hence, again reasoning *a priori*, all possible entities must be actualized, all possible places filled, therein: there must be an unbroken continuity—a progressive gradation—of organisms, from the very lowest living being up to the very highest, God Himself. As stated by Alexander Pope (“Essay on Man”):

Of systems possible if 'tis confest
That wisdom infinite must form the best,

1. *Op Cit.*, 389, 390.

then

... all must full or not coherent be,
And all that rises, rise in due degree.

The complete picture is as follows:

Vast chain of being! which from God began,
Natures aethereal, human, angel, man,
Beast, bird, fish, insect, what no eye can see,
No glass can reach; from Infinite to thee,
From thee to nothing.—On superior pow'rs
Were we to press, inferior might on ours;
Or in the full creation leave a void,
Where, one step broken, the great scale's destroyed;
For Nature's chain whatever link you strike,
Tenth, or ten thousandth, breaks the chain alike.

Thus it will be seen that this imaginative, poetic portrayal of the Weltanschauung parallels the evolutionary picture, but in so doing points up the utter futility of any human effort to search out and specify the almost innumerable links in the so-called "Great Chain." Far more sensible it is to accept the hierarchical picture which, obviously, is in accord with Scripture, experience the fact.)

In simple truth, evolutionists have no explanation of the leap from an existing species to a new species, except—to a certain extent, possibly—by mutations, and these, of course, themselves need to be explained. As Chesterton writes:

Far away in some strange constellation, in skies infinitely remote, there is a small star, which astronomers may some day discover. . . . It is a star which brings forth out of itself very strange plants and very strange animals and none stranger than the men of science. . . . Most modern histories of mankind begin with the word evolution, and with a rather wordy exposition of evolution. . . . There is something slow and soothing and gradual about the word and even about the idea. As a matter of fact, it is not, touching primary things, a very practical word or a very profitable idea. Nobody can imagine how nothing could turn into something else. It is really far more logical to start by saying, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth" even if you only mean "In the beginning some unthinkable power began some unthinkable process." For God is by his nature a name of mystery, and nobody ever supposed that a man could imagine how a world was created any more than he could create one. But evolution really is mistaken for explanation. It has the fatal quality of leaving on many minds the impression that they do understand it and everything else; just as many of them live under a sort of illusion that they have read the *Origin of Species*. But this notion of something smooth and slow, like the ascent of a slope, is a great part of the illusion. It is illogicality as well as an illusion; for slowness has nothing to do with the question. An event is not any more intrinsically intelligible or unintelligible because of the pace at which it moves. For a man who does not believe in a miracle, a slow miracle would be just as incredible as a swift one. The Greek witch may have turned sailors to swine with a stroke of the wand. But to see

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

a naval gentleman of our acquaintance looking a little more like a pig every day, till he ended with four trotters and a curly tail, would not be any more soothing. It might be rather more creepy and uncanny. The medieval wizard may have flown through the air from the top of a tower, but to see an old gentleman walking through the air, in a leisurely and lounging manner, would still seem to call for some explanation. Yet there runs through all the rationalistic treatment of history this curious and confused idea that difficulty is avoided, or even mystery eliminated, by dwelling on mere delay or on something dilatory in the processes of things. . . . the question here is the false atmosphere of facility and ease given by the mere suggestion of going slow; the sort of comfort that might be given to a nervous old woman traveling for the first time in a motor car. . . . What we know, in a sense which we know nothing else, is that the trees and grass [of our world] did grow and that a number of extraordinary things do in fact happen; that queer creatures support themselves in the empty air by beating it with fans of various fantastic shapes; that other queer creatures steer themselves about alive under a load of mighty waters; that other queer creatures walk about on four legs, and that the queerest creature of all walks about on two. These are things and not theories; and compared with them evolution and the atom and even the solar system are merely theories. The matter here is one of history and not of philosophy; so that it need only be noted that no philosopher denies that a mystery still attaches to the two great transitions: the origin of the universe itself and the origin of the principle of life itself. Most philosophers have the enlightenment to add that a third mystery attaches to the origin of man himself. In other words a third bridge was built across a third abyss of the unthinkable when there came into the world what we call reason and what we call will. *Man is not merely an evolution but rather a revolution.* That he has a backbone or other parts upon a similar pattern to birds and fishes is an obvious fact, whatever be the meaning of the fact. But if we attempt to regard him, as it were, as a quadruped standing on his hind legs, we shall find what follows far more fantastic and subversive than if he were standing on his head. . . . Above all, this illustrates what I mean by saying that the more we really look at man as an animal, the less he will look like one.¹

13. The foregoing excerpt brings out in bold relief another common fallacy of "the scientific method," namely, the *sub rosa* assumption that *to name something is to explain it*. Take *mutations*, for example: what are they? Etymologically, the word, from the Latin, *muto*, *mutare*, means simply *to change*, i.e., in form, characteristics, powers, etc. In evolutionism, mutations are sudden variations, "long jumps" in the alleged life process, from species to species. Still and all, the name does not give us any thorough explanation of the process itself. Dr. Tsanoff writes: "The theory of mutations, as developed and interpreted by careful geneticists, has reached specific conclusions regarding the evolutionary results of changes in the germ plasm. But the larger pattern of evolutionary cosmology can scarcely be regarded as ascertained."² Take the term *protoplasm*; what is

1. Chesterton, *The Everlasting Man*, 21-25.

2. Tsanoff, *The Great Philosophers*, 567.

protoplasm? *First living substance*, of course. But what is this *first living substance*, literally, first matter to be moulded? Who knows? Has protoplasm ever been "broken down" in the laboratory? And what is *protoplasmic irritability*? In all these cases one is reminded of John Locke's definition of matter as "something-I-know-not-what." All these words are names which serve for identification, but as for explanation they certainly fall short. *A great need of scientists in our day and age are the disciplines of logic and metaphysics.*

14. Evolutionism requires *an almost unlimited stretch of time to account for all the developments envisioned by the theory.* Apparently, its advocates expect us to accept without question the necessity of such an extent of time to any adequate explanation of the process, and at the same time they arbitrarily use this hypothetical extent of time to support their theory of the process. Is not this a form of begging the question, another case of theoretical backscratching? Is it not true that the stretch of time required by the theory puts it beyond any likelihood of clear proof—and even disproof—*empirically*, that is, by the testimony of eye-witnesses? One is reminded here of Hilaire Belloc's "Ode to a Microbe"—

The Microbe is so very small
 You cannot make him out at all,
 But many sanguine people hope
 To see him through a microscope,
 His jointed tongue that lies beneath
 A hundred curious rows of teeth;
 His seven tufted tails with lots
 Of lovely pink and purple spots,
 On each of which a pattern stands,
 Composed of forty separate bands;
 His eyebrows of a tender green;
 All these have never yet been seen—
 But Scientists, who ought to know,
 Assure us that they must be so . . .
 Oh! let us never, never doubt
 What nobody is sure about!¹

It must be realized, in this connection, that Time is not a Creator. In evolutionism, time becomes a factotum to be used in whatever way possible to give substance to the general hypothesis.

15. As stated heretofore, the term "evolution" in common parlance means simply development, progression, etc., in terms of a sequence. Progression, however, is not always easy to define. I might line up a wheelbarrow, a gig, a buggy, a wagon, an

1. Belloc, *More Beasts for Worse Children*, in *Cautionary Verses*. (Knopf, 1951).

automobile, and even an airplane, in a single row side by side. There would be some structural resemblance, of course. But we know, in this case, that one of these vehicles is not the outgrowth ("emergent") of that type which preceded it; we know, rather, that all of them were products alike of human technology, inventions of the human intelligence. We know also that as a sequence they spell progression; this progression, obviously, is distinct from that kind of progression which is brought about by the operation of *resident* forces characteristic of the different levels of being. However, "evolution" is often used to signify a going forward, a development, a progression, that is not "emergent" in any sense of the term. Hence, we speak of the evolution of political systems, of social organization, of the science of medicine, of technology, of ethics and law, etc. But the evolution that has been in vogue from the beginning in biological science is that which is defined by LeConte as "*continuous progressive change, according to fixed laws, by means of resident forces.*" This is the evolution which we are considering here. (Note the full import here of the word, "resident.") As a matter of fact the "time" element works against "progressiveism," that is to say, "increased time spans in biological systems will merely increase the probability of equilibrium being set up and not the probability of improbable reaction products being formed." "As infinite time is approached, infinite randomness will be achieved, namely, complete lack of order." In a word, time does not provide the possibility for the occurrence of the highly improbable. (*Vide* Harold F. Blum, *Time's Arrows and Evolution*, 178A).

16. Obviously, theories of this type, that is, as related to the traditional LeContian definition, are based on the assumption that all so-called progressive change (by means of *resident forces*) is fortuitous, that is occurring by "accident" or by "chance" (purposelessness); hence, they are commonly designated "materialistic" or "mechanistic" theories. This writer finds it difficult to accept the notion that a movement can be repeatedly "progressive" and at the same time "fortuitous." Surely, we have here a semantic paradox, to say the least! (The same is true of the phrase "natural selection." Selectivity surely connotes, presupposes, deliberation and choice; how, then, can impersonal "nature" rightly be said to "select" anything?) However, it is a characteristic of the devotees of evolutionism to indulge "double talk," perhaps unwittingly at times, in their use of terminology. (Again, we call attention to the great need for

the disciplines of logic and metaphysics in the formulation of scientific theory.)

17. Theories of what is called "emergent evolution" tend to the *organismic*, rather than the *mechanistic*, explanation of the various facets of the life process. (We have presented the claims of *emergentism*, *holism*, etc., in preceding sections of this work; however, we shall briefly restate a few of the facts about this view.) Emergentism is the theory that, in general, evolution is a naturalistic process proceeding from the operation of resident, yet essentially vitalistic, force or forces; that each "emergent" has a different structure with additional properties, and its own behavior patterns; that each "emergent" not only has subsistence *per se* (that is, after "emerging"), but also acts as a causal agency, a transmitter of effects. Moreover, it is said to be beyond the ability of human intelligence to know how many levels of "emergence" there may be or may yet come to be. If one should ask what it is that causes these "emergents" to "emerge," the answer is that a *nisus* or pull does it. The theory of some members of this school is that the pull is exerted by "whatever lies ahead." But it is difficult to understand just how "whatever lies ahead" actually exists in order to exert a pull, when according to the theory it is in the process of being actualized (or should we say, of actualizing itself?). If "God" is envisioned as the Ultimate "Emergent"—the Goal of the Process—as seems to be implicit in the Hegelian theory of the Absolute—then God is, in terms of the theory, in the indeterminate and indeed interminable process of becoming God. Hence, other advocates of the theory identify the *nisus* with a push—an impulsion—from within. Be that as it may, in either case, God is presented to us as engaged in the age-long cosmic business of Becoming, not Himself, but Itself. Emergentism is pantheistic: its "God" is either "nature" as a whole, or an impersonal process operating in "nature." (Cf. the philosophical system known as "Holism." According to this system, the Creative Process—that is, Evolution—stabilizes being in successively more complex *wholes* (the atom, the cell, etc.), of which the most advanced and most complex is the person or personality.¹ Holism is a form of Emergentism.)

On the basis of the inclusion of human intelligence in evolution, as playing, perhaps, the most important role in the process, advocates of the theory in our day take the position generally

1. J. C. Smuts, *Holism and Evolution*, 261-262.

that *societal* (or psychological) evolution has superseded in large measure what has heretofore been known as organic (biological) evolution. (For a clear presentation of this view, see the book, *Human Destiny*, by Lecomte du Nouy; also the concluding chapters of the Mentor books, *The Meaning of Evolution*, by George G. Simpson, and *Evolution in Action*, by Julian Huxley; and especially the books by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* and *The Future of Man*. See Bibliography *infra*.) Teilhard envisions evolution through a gradation of forms from atomic particles to human beings, in ever increasing complexity of structure, and along with it, development of consciousness (a kind of *panpsychism*). Man is the focal point in whom all facets of the evolutionary process converge, and in man reflective thought finally emerges. The unique idea in Teilhard's system is his view that the ultimate reality of this cosmic development (that is, of evolution) is the incarnate Christ (not the "superman" of Nietzsche, nor that of Samuel Butler, nor that of G. B. Shaw's *Man and Superman* or his *Back to Methuselah*, but the God-Man.) Two quotations from this writer are pertinent: "The only universe capable of containing the human person is an irrevocably 'personalizing' universe." Again, "In one manner or the other, it still remains true that, even in the view of the mere biologist, the human epic resembles nothing so much as a way of the Cross."¹ This, to be sure, is another—and more profound—theory of emergentism. Like that of Bergson's *creative evolution* (described below), this is an honest effort to describe the *modus operandi* of the alleged evolutionary process, which in the last analysis becomes an effort to describe the indescribable—the ineffable. *The mystery of the life movement itself is too profound to yield its secrets to the mere human intellect.*

18. *The Mystery of the Life Movement.* Evolution is described as *continuous progressive change, according to fixed laws, by means of resident forces.* The word "evolution" designates the *process*; "evolutionism," however, designates *how the process proceeds*, that is, the phenomena that are said to *actualize* it, in Aristotelian terms, the *efficient causality* of it. These are usually listed as follows: (1) Lamarck (1744-1829): *the transmission of characteristics (modifications) acquired through the interaction of the organism and its environment.* This theory is now generally rejected, except by the Russian biologist, Lysenko, who has been all but canonized by the Kremlin oligarchy for his

1. Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man*, 290-311.

revival of it. (2) Charles Darwin (1809-1882), getting his cue from Malthus's *Essay on Population* (the thesis of which was that because population increases in geometrical proportion, whereas the earth's resources multiply only in arithmetical proportion, the time will come when the earth will not be able to provide food for its population, unless some selective process removes the surplus), proposed the theory of evolution by *natural selection*. The process of struggle for existence, Darwin held, selects out and preserves only those organisms which prove to be the most capable of adapting to environment (the doctrine of *the survival of the fittest*, that is, the fittest to demonstrate survival quality by adaptation). Incidentally, Darwin's contemporary, Alfred Russel Wallace (1823-1913) had arrived at the natural selection theory even before Darwin, but Darwin happened to beat him into print. (They were always good friends, however.) Wallace pointed out the fact to Darwin that while natural selection might account for the survival of an existing species, *it did not account for the arrival of new species*. (3) August Weismann (1844-1914) contended that the explanation of evolution lies in *the continuity of the germ-plasm*. It seems obvious, however, that only process and form (the form being, e.g., in man's case, that which specifies man as man) can be transmitted from generation to generation through the germ-plasm; Germ-cells are affected, it seems, only by variations of mutations in themselves, and not by what goes on in the life of the parent. (Still and all, it seems incontrovertible that any modification in the parent organism is transmissible only through the chromosomes and genes. Moreover, genes are but hypothetical "determiners" of heredity operating beyond the world of sense-perception. (4) Mutations, discovered by the Dutch botanist De Vries (1848-1935) are sudden big leaps to new species which are said to breed true *per se*. It is commonly held that evolution might have proceeded by these abrupt and relatively permanent germinal changes rather than by slight variations. (There are some, however, who contend that mutations might have come about through slowly accumulating changes in the genes. To this writer's thinking mutations are indispensable to any possible validation of the evolution theory. Moreover, mutations have all the appearance of special creations. (This brings us back to the discussion of the "radical discontinuities" which make themselves manifest in the *hierarchical* interpretation of the totality of being, and the view that at different stages in the Creative Process, God infused into it new increments of force,

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

that is, new and distinct powers, by direct action, thus bringing into existence the successively higher levels characterized by energy-matter, life, consciousness, and self-consciousness, in the order named. According to this view, Creation involved *new increments of power plus continuity of plan*. (See again material presented in Part Three of the present work. Cf. also the title of the well-known book by Hoernle, *Matter, Life, Mind and God*.) (5) The "laws" of heredity as first formulated by the Austrian monk and botanist, Gregor Mendel (1824-1884) are believed to play a significant role also in the alleged evolutionary process. (6) Protagonists of the theory in our day are inclined to agree that evolution may have proceeded in all these ways, with the sole exception of the Lamarckian notion of the inheritance of acquired characteristics. However, *the phenomena characterizing this life movement leave the very essence of the movement, the power that produces it and causes it to surge forward, as the theory demands, still unaccounted for*.

19. Under the evolution hypothesis there are two rather significant views of the movement of the process, as follows: (1) What is called *orthogenesis*, that is, "straight line" evolution (of which the poetic version is that of the "Great Chain of Being"). This is the view that variation in successive generations of a succession of parents and offspring follows a specific line of development, finally undeviatingly evolving a new type. The classic example is that of the very ancient and small "eohippus" which by gradual, step-by-step change is said to have evolved in the horse that we know today. This is also known as the theory of "determinate variation." (2) There is also the view of what might properly be called *fountainlike evolution*. This is the doctrine of the late French philosopher, Henri Bergson (1859-1941). Bergson's thesis is that the phenomena envisioned by evolutionism do not explain evolution, that is, the life movement itself; that this surge upward of the what might be called the core of the Creative Process is explainable only as the *Elan Vital* (Life Force). In Bergson's thought the *Elan Vital* is the primordial cosmic principle, the ground of all being, that is at the very root of evolution, a vital push or impulsion "pervading matter, insinuating itself into it, overcoming its inertia and resistance, determining the direction of evolution as well as evolution itself." This never-ceasing free activity is Life itself. Indeed Bergson speaks of it as "Spirit," as a directing Consciousness as

1. Bergson, *Creative Evolution*.

well as an actualizing Power. The unique aspect of this view is Bergson's picture of Life Force operating like a fountain, so to speak, with a center "from which worlds shoot out like rockets in a fireworks display," "as a series of jets gushing out from the immense reservoir of life." We must be careful, however, not to think of this center as a "thing"—we must think of it only as a process. Moreover, as the core-movement pushes upward, according to Bergson's theory, the push encounters resistance by the matter on which it works; hence, there is a falling back toward gross matter by the residue that is left behind by the progressive push of Life toward fulness of being. According to this theory, the *Elan Vital* manifests itself in the lower animals in the form of *instinct*; it manifests itself in man in the form of *intelligence* (intellection), the power that enables him to surge upward through learning by trial-and-error; it will ultimately push on to what Bergson calls *intuition* in man, which will be immediacy in man's apprehension of truth, corresponding in a way, but on a much higher level, to the immediacy of the brute's response to sensory stimuli. Bergson envisions nothing beyond this power of intuition. (It would seem indeed that what we have learned in recent years about the phenomena of the subconscious in man constitutes a genuine prognosis of Bergson's theory of human intuition. See *supra*, Part Two, Section 6.) Of course this fountainlike description of the movement of evolution, allowing for both progression and retrogression, is another theory of emergentism. (One of my science professors remarked to me once that to him evolution simply meant variation, and variation either upward or downward. This is approximately Bergson's view.)

20. *Alleged Evidence for Evolutionism.* The evidence generally cited by evolutionists to support their theory may be summarized as follows: (1) *Comparative anatomy*, or structural resemblance among species. (But to what extent does structural resemblance necessarily prove emergence? Could it not be interpreted as supporting the view that a Creative Intelligence simply used the same general pattern in creating living species?) (1) *Embryology*: the embryos of different animal species tend to similar development in early stages. Those of lower animals are said to cease developing at certain points; those of higher animals move upward through additional stages of development. Ontogeny is said to recapitulate phylogeny; that is, each individual organism of a certain phylum tends to recapitulate stages through which its ancestors have passed in their racial history.

(The idea is seriously questioned today by many biologists.) (3) *Serology*: the blood composition of higher animals is the same. Samples of blood from closely related higher animals can be mixed, whereas an antagonistic reaction sets in if there is wide separation between the species. (4) *Vestigial remains*: the presence of unused organs. Usually cited in this category are the appendix in man, degenerate eyes in cave animals, wings of the female gypsy moth, etc. (5) *Geographical distribution of animals*: arrested development of flora and fauna in areas cut off in prehistoric times from continental land masses. The classic example of this are the marsupials of Australia. (Yet the opossum, whose only natural habitat is America, is a marsupial.) (6) *Paleontology*: correlation of the ascending scale of the simple to the more complex of fossil forms with successively earlier to later geological strata. (Thus geologists rely on the evidence of paleontology to support historical geology, and the paleontologists cite the evidence of geology to support their chronology of fossil remains. This, some wag has remarked, borrowing from the comic strips of the nineteen-twenties, is a kind of Alphonse-and-Gaston stunt.) (7) *Artificial selection*. That is, changes brought about by selective breeding, by the application of human intelligence; for example, by Mendel, Burbank, and others. This, it is claimed, adds momentum to the whole process. (8) *Classification of animals* in phyla, classes, genera, species, orders, families, etc., in ascending order of complexity, from unicellular organisms up to man.

21. *Materialistic Evolutionism*. This is the world-view that all things have "evolved" by accident or chance (that is, *purposelessness*). Devotees of this cult simply refuse to recognize Efficient Causality of any kind in the origin and preservation of the cosmos (with the sole exception of some form or forms of primal physical energy); they rest their case on the eternity of matter-in-motion. (Obviously, then, this primal physical energy is their "god.") With disarming simplicity they proceed to describe all phenomena of the cosmos, including those of the life processes and of the thought processes, in terms of a "fortuitous concourse of atoms" (or sub-atomic forces). The *credo* of the materialistic evolutionists is bluntly stated in what rightly may be designated their "Bible," namely, the book by George Gaylord Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution*. Simpson writes:

In preceding pages evidence was given, thoroughly conclusive, as I believe, that organic evolution is a process entirely materialistic in its origin and operation. . . . It has also been shown that purpose and

plan are not characteristic of organic evolution and are not a key to any of its operations. . . . Man was certainly not the goal of evolution, which had no goal. [He goes on to say, however, that with the entrance of the human mind into the process, purpose and plan did come into operation: this he designates "the new evolution"]

[He continues]: But purpose and plan are characteristic in the new evolution, because man has purposes, and he makes plans. Here purpose and plan do definitely enter into evolution, as a result and not as a cause of the processes seen in the long history of life. The purposes and plans are ours, not those of the universe, which displays convincing evidence of their absence.¹

It is difficult to see how an intelligent man could make such a fatuous statement, especially in view of the fact of the *mathematical preciseness* that characterizes the processes of that which we call "nature," and *without which no science could ever be formulated*. Any man who denies efficient causality destroys science, and even the possibility of science. We are reminded here of a statement by the late British philosopher, C. D. Broad, to the effect that the theory of determinism (denial of any freedom of choice) is so absurd that only a very learned man could ever have cojured it up. (Small wonder that materialists prefer to be known by a more felicitous name, such as "naturalist" or "humanist"!)

As stated heretofore, materialistic evolution is usually described as "mechanistic." The word "mechanism," however, has a question-begging aspect. Machines are contrivances, but as far as human experience goes, they are contrivances of some intelligent agent to serve some function, to gain some end. Moreover, anyone who insists that the cosmos is just a great machine, is simply reading into his understanding of it the properties and powers *that he himself sees in a machine*. (Is not this another case of anthropomorphism?) Now it seems obvious that in an organization of any kind an organizing agency is required: some power by which elements are organized into wholes of being; some power to marshal them into a cosmos or world order. This, moreover, would have to be some kind of power that is entirely different from mechanical forces, and the opposite of gravitational force; gravitational force tends to drag the physical world down to a "heat-death," which is technically defined as a state of "maximum entropy." (The physicists tell us that the cosmic clock, so to speak, is running down as matter continues to dissolve into radiation and energy continues to be dissipated into empty space.) However, the basic thesis of evolutionism is progression or progressive development; and

1. Simpson, *op cit.*, 143.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

progression is precisely the aspect that is of importance to it. But progression implies a goal to which the movement is directed, toward which someone or something is striving, and thus the idea of progression belies the concept of mechanism. Obviously, "mechanism" and "evolution" are irreconcilable terms. As Bishop Butler has written, in his famous *Analogy*:

The only distinct meaning of the word "natural" is *stated, fixed, or settled*: since what is natural as such requires and presupposes an intelligent agent to render it so, *i.e.*, to effect it continually or at stated times, as what is supernatural or miraculous does to effect it for once.¹

In a word, with respect to what are called "the laws of nature," we should not say, "the more law, the less God," but we should say, "the more law, the more God." LaPlace once declared that he had swept the heavens with his telescope and could not find a God anywhere. One of his contemporaries remarked that "he might just as well have swept his kitchen with a broom." Because God is not corporeal in any sense (Exo. 3:14, John 4:24); He is not to be apprehended by any physical or corporeal means (John 1:18). Hence the stupidity of the Russian astronaut who is reported to have said that in all his travels throughout the celestial realm he had searched the stratosphere in every direction to find God but had failed to do so. Of course he failed—the humblest, most secularly-uneducated student of the Bible knows why.

Of course, the Christian cannot possibly accept materialistic evolutionism, because it directly contradicts the Biblical doctrines of the eternal purpose and sovereignty of God. (Cf. Isa. 46:-11; Acts 15:8, 17:30-31; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Eph. 3:8-12). Nor is there any good reason why any Christian, or any other intelligent person, should accept it, for several reasons. In the first place, any unbiased person can readily see that the phenomena of personality (perception, consciousness, and especially *meaning*) are not entirely reducible, if reducible at all, to "matter-in-motion" (brain cell activity). As the noted physicist, Sir Arthur Eddington, has written:

Force, energy, dimensions belong to the world of symbols: it is out of such conceptions that we have built up the external world of physics. . . . We have to build the spiritual world out of symbols taken from our own personality, as we build the scientific world out of the symbols of the mathematician.²

1. Butler, (Bishop) Joseph, *The Analogy of Religion Natural and Revealed*, Everyman's edition, 20-21.

2. Eddington, *Science and the Unseen World*, 82.

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT — HIS PERSON AND POWERS

We recall here also the words of Professor Claude Tresmontant, who teaches the Philosophy of Science at the Sorbonne:

The discoveries of modern science have made it easier to prove the existence of God than it used to be. Those who find no place for God in their philosophy must be prepared to affirm that mindless, inanimate matter has been able to organize itself, to become animated, and to endow itself with consciousness and thought. . . . If the material universe is to be regarded as the only reality, matter must be credited with all the attributes that theologians specify as belonging to God, including supreme intelligence, creative power, and eternal, autonomous existence.

When asked if the emergence of life could not be attributed purely to the laws of chance over a very long period of time, he replied:

It may be theoretically possible, but mathematically it is so extremely improbable that only a few scientists now seriously think that pure chance can be put forward as an explanation of the emergence of even the simplest living organism.¹

As Fred Emerson Brooks has written in his poem "The Grave Digger"—

"If chance could fashion but one little flower
With perfume for each tiny leaf,
And furnish it with sunshine and with shower—
Then chance would be Creator with the power
To build a world for unbelief."

Materialistic evolution simply cannot be harmonized with the empirical fact of cosmic order. This order is clearly evident (1) from the mathematical relations characteristic of the processes of the physical world and the mathematical formulae by which they are amenable to precise description; (2) from the manifold interrelationships of ends and means, as empirically discerned, prevailing throughout the totality of being; (3) from the predetermined (planned) life cycles of all living species, and (4) from the over-all adaptation of nature to human life and its needs. Old Pythagoras was right when he declared that "things are numbers," that is to say, mathematical preciseness is the prime reality of the cosmos. When an astronomer, for instance, predicts the time of an eclipse and it fails to come off as predicted, he does not charge the failure to the movements of the heavenly bodies; no, indeed, he immediately turns to his figures to see where he has made a mistake in his calculations. Again, the atoms of one element are differentiated from those of the other elements by the *number* of protons in the nucleus

1. From "So You Are an Agnostic," Sar Shalom Publications, 236 W. 72nd St., New York, N. Y. 10023

and the corresponding number of electrons in the orbit (from one and one in the hydrogen atom up to 92 and 92 in the uranium atom). Similarly, the differentiation of living species is determined by the number of chromosomes in the reproductive male and female cells. Even the physical phenomenon of color is now found to be reducible to numerical terms, and that of sound as well, and the result is television video and audio. As stated often herein, the word *cosmos* means *order*; lacking this order, human science would be impossible, for the simple reason that science is man's discovery and description of the order prevailing in the various segments of the physical world. Surely this architectonic order presupposes a Supreme Orderer, a directing Mind and Will. *It is inconceivable that sheer chance could have produced the order we find all around us.* (The student is urged to read the little book (107 pages) by the eminent scientist, A. Cressy Morrison, *Man Does Not Stand Alone.*) The Morrison book, according to its author, is written to "challenge the conclusion of Julian Huxley in his book, *Man Stands Alone.*" Contrary to the usual and much over-worked theme of man's adaptation to nature, Morrison's thesis is that of *the amazing adaptation of nature to man.* His conclusions are as follows:

My purpose in this discussion of chance is to bring forcibly to the attention of the reader the fact that the purpose of this book is to point out clearly and scientifically the narrow limits within which any life can exist on earth, and prove by real evidence that all the nearly exact requirements of life could not be brought about on one planet at one time by chance. The size of the earth, the distance from the sun, the temperature and the life-giving rays of the sun, the thickness of the earth's crust, the quantity of water, the amount of carbon dioxide, the volume of nitrogen, the emergence of man and his survival—all point to order out of chaos, to design and purpose, and to the fact that, according to the inexorable laws of mathematics, all these could not occur by chance simultaneously on one planet once in a billion times. It *could* so occur but it *did not so occur*. When the facts are so overwhelming, and when we recognize, as we must, the attributes of our minds which are not material, is it possible to flaunt the evidence and take the one chance in a billion that we and all else are the result of chance? We have found that there are 999,999,999 chances to one against a belief that all things happen by chance. Science will not deny the facts as stated; the mathematicians will agree that the figures are correct. Now we encounter the stubborn resistance of the human mind, which is reluctant to give up fixed ideas. The early Greeks knew the earth was a sphere, but it took two thousand years to convince men that this fact is true. New ideas encounter opposition, ridicule, and abuse, but truth survives and is verified.¹

To be sure, in our day, evolutionists admit the introduction of purpose now that—as they contend—psychological evolution

1. *Op. cit.*, 99, 100.

has taken over from the biological. (We have noted this in the excerpt quoted above from Simpson's book.) Purpose entered the cosmic picture, we are told, along with the human intellect and its power of purposeful selection and striving. It strikes us, however, that by correlating purpose with *human mental activity*, by analogy we are bound to conclude that the design which prevails throughout the subhuman world points irrefutably to *another and superior kind of mental activity, that of the Creative intelligence and Will*. Man, obviously, does not create; he simply uses the material which he finds at hand to be used for his own purposes.

This is precisely the argument presented by the distinguished Professor of Philosophy at Earlham College, D. Elton Trueblood, who writes as follows, after first pointing up the fact of the kinship between mind and nature, and showing that this fact lies at the root of the very success of scientific achievement. He writes as follows:

Whatever our explanation of this correspondence, and it may be said in passing that the hypothesis of the existence of God, who is at once the Creator of the natural order and the Creator of man's mind, is a fully adequate explanation, there is no avoiding the fact that the kinship between mind and nature exists. This kinship is the chief basis of whatever success science achieves. *It is what we mean when we affirm the existence of an intelligible world.* The world, of course, is not now fully intelligible, and it may, for all we know, involve fundamentally irrational elements, but the history of science has been the elimination of many supposed irrationalities, which have finally been understood. The meaning of these observations becomes more apparent when we consider the significance of *explanation*.

Trueblood goes on to discuss the role of *purpose* in explanation:

A situation is never understood until we have some intimation of why it has occurred, and we never have an intimation of "why" until we come into contact with purpose. Purpose, in turn, is meaningless apart from a mind which entertains the purpose. Not only is purpose a self-explanatory principle; there is, so far as we are aware, no other. All other types of explanation leave fundamental questions unanswered. We go on asking, "Why?" *in exactly the same way as before...* If a nail is being driven, we discover a set of secondary causes reaching all the way from the purpose of the carpenter to the completed process. The nail goes in *because* the hammer hits it. The hammer head moves *because* it is moved by the muscles of a man's arm. The arm muscles move *because* they are directed by nerve impulses. But the whole enterprise takes place *because* a man has a reason for driving a nail in a board. Perhaps he wants to build a house for his friend. Our language obscures the true situation in that we use the same word "because" in each case, but reflection shows that the word in its fourth use means something very different from what it means in the first three uses. The first three do not really explain, but the fourth *does* explain. This remains true even when we ask why the man wants to build the house.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

We, then, have solved our first problem and have turned to another. When we try to explain a purpose we find that our only recourse is to refer to other and more inclusive purposes. Thus, Purpose is really an ultimate principle of explanation, and the only adequate explanation of the world would be the Purpose which includes the whole process. If the world is understandable, such a Purpose must exist. But the belief in the existence of such a Purpose is *theism*. Because science shows the world to be intelligible, at least to a considerable degree, science becomes a witness to intelligent Purpose in nature and consequently it bears testimony to the credibility of theism.¹

At this point Dr. Trueblood quotes from Baron von Hugel as follows:

Already Mathematics and Mechanics absolutely depend, for the success of their applications to actual Nature, upon a spontaneous correspondence between the human reason and the Rationality of Nature. The immensity of this success is an unanswerable proof that this rationality is not imposed but found there by man. But Thought without a Thinker is an absurd proposition. Thus faith in Science is faith in God.²

Incidentally, this final statement supports the firm conviction of the present writer, that Biblical students need not fear science. In a word, God has written two books: one is the Book of Nature (Psa. 19:1, Rom. 1:20-21, Heb. 11:3), in which He reveals His everlasting power and divinity; the other is the Book of Scripture (2 Tim. 3:16), in which He reveals His Plan of Redemption for mankind. Science is, of course, man's attempt to interpret the former of these Books, and what is called Systematic Theology is man's attempt to interpret the latter. Obviously there may be apparent discrepancies between these interpretations, for the simple reason that man is liable to error. But, in the very nature of the case, there can be no discrepancies between the content of the two books, because both are from God from whom all Truth comes to man, and Truth does not contradict itself. (Cf. John 8:31-32, 14:6, 17:17, 18:37.) In this connection, we quote again from Trueblood:

When we are told that gas pressure is explained by movement of molecules, we ask why the molecules move, and we are asking precisely the same kind of question again. When we trace an occurrence to the purpose of an intelligent being, however, the situation is completely altered. We may, indeed, ask why such a purpose is entertained, but when we do so we are asking a question of a different order. We have come to the end of one road and are starting on another. The causes which *produce* a purpose are entirely different from the set of *secondary* causes which *result* from a purpose.³

1. Trueblood, *Philosophy of Religion*, 96, 97.

2. Baron Friedrich von Hugel, *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, 71.

3. Trueblood, *op cit.*, 97.

The process of explaining may come somewhere to an end, and it comes to an end only when we reach "principles deducible from nothing prior to themselves." In explanation we seek a connection between what is to be explained and what we already understand, at least in some measure. "The business of philosophy is not so much to explain things as to find the things that explain themselves."¹

Due to the correlation of the mind and the natural order which it apprehends, Trueblood contends, ours is the kind of a world in which science is possible. Hence, he affirms, the very existence of science supports what he calls the "fact" of evolution. (He is, of course, like A. Cressy Morrison, what is designated a *theistic evolutionist*.) He finds a conclusive support for this kind of evolutionism in the rationality of the objective order and its discovery by the human mind. Note the following statements:

"Thinking is grounded in the process of adjustment between organism and environment" [quoted from Temple, *op. cit.*, 128]. . . . The highest point in creation, so far as we know, is the capacity to comprehend the world, but this capacity has arisen by degrees in the natural order. At one end of the evolutionary series is unconscious life, and at the other is self-conscious life, but *it is all one series*. . . . The fact that a process is rational does not mean that the ground of that rationality is necessarily revealed in the beginning. In fact the ground of the rationality need not appear until the end of the series of events, but when it appears it illuminates the entire process. This is well illustrated in dramatic poetry and in the lives of good men. Seen in retrospect, such lives are thoroughly rationalized wholes because of what, all along, they were *becoming*. . . . If the general evolutionary theory is true and if man's life be included in the theory, we cannot escape the conclusion, once more, that mind and nature are akin. . . . The relation, "akin to" is a symmetrical relation. If mind is akin to nature, nature likewise is akin to mind. . . . "The more completely we include Mind within Nature, the more inexplicable must Nature become except by reference to Mind" [again quoted from Temple, *op. cit.*, 133]. A boldly accepted naturalism leads directly to supernaturalism! How can nature include mind as an *integral* part unless it is grounded in mind? If mind were seen as something alien or accidental, the case would be different, but the further we go in modern science, the clearer it becomes that mental experience is no strange offshoot. Rather it is something which is deeply rooted in the entire structure. *Science knows nothing of the entirely fortuitous.*²

Dr. Trueblood cites the Second Law of Thermodynamics as additional evidence for what he calls the "fact" of evolution. The Second Law must, of course, be understood in connection with the First Law, that of the conservation of energy.

The Second Law holds that the amount of energy in the world is constant though it changes in form. The fact that the amount of energy is constant does not mean that energy is always available. In so far as we can see, the time will come when energy is not available for work.

1. Quote is from William Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, 129.
2. Trueblood, *op. cit.*, 100, 101.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

Because there is constant diffusion and because there is no addition to the total energy, we must contemplate a final condition of absolute stagnation. And it is precisely this to which the Second Law points. In all physical systems we note a leveling process. A stone thrown into a pool raises waves, but these slowly dissipate until they are no longer observable. The hot stove radiates its heat into the closed room until a uniform temperature is reached. Just as nature may be said figuratively to abhor a vacuum, so nature abhors differentiation and concentration of energy. Thus, the stars radiate their energy, and this energy, so far as we know, *never makes a return trip*. It is a one-way process. This increase of leveling is called the "increase of entropy."

The following very clear definition of this phenomenon is quoted by Trueblood as follows:

"As the useless energy increases, the useful decreases by the same amount. The ratio of useless to useful energy is called *entropy*. The law of entropy states that the ratio is constantly increasing. This means that the amount of energy available for the energizing process of the world is ever growing less."

Dr. Trueblood goes on to say:

It is always possible for some new force, now unknown, to enter, but, on the basis of present observations, there seems to be no rational escape from the prospect of an ultimate dissipation of all energy. This means not only the "death" of our particular solar system, but of any physical system. The paradox is that the Second Law, depressing as it seems to be, actually supports the theistic claim in a remarkable way. We are driven to the conclusion that the physical world is something which not only will have an end, but also something which had a beginning. "If the universe is running down like a clock," says Dr. Inge, "the clock must have been wound up at a date which we could name if we knew it. The world, if it is to have an ending in time, must have had a beginning in time." The chief metaphysical significance of the law of entropy consists not in the evidence of a beginning in time, important as that is, but rather in the evidence that the natural world is not self-explanatory. According to natural law, energy loses its efficacy. But without the operation of a totally different principle there would be no energy to lose its efficacy. *Nature points beyond nature for an explanation of nature*. The Second Law of Thermodynamics thus points directly to theism as an explanation of the world, and the reasoning based upon it provides a modern counterpart to the cosmological argument. . . . The chief strength of atheistic naturalism has lain in the notion that the material world needs no explanation *external to itself*, that it is, indeed, a perpetual motion machine, which had no beginning and will have no end. But when we take the Second Law of Thermodynamics seriously we can no longer hold to this doctrine. The universe as we know it, by the aid of modern science, could not have originated without the action of a creative Source of energy outside itself, and it cannot be maintained without it. The more we delve, by the aid of natural science, into the secrets of nature the more it becomes clear that nature cannot account for itself in any of its parts or in its entirety. The stone which the builders rejected has become the head

1. *Op. cit.*, 102, 103
2. J. A. McWilliams, *Cosmology*, 42.
3. W. R. Inge, *God and the Astronomers*, 10.

of the corner. Science, instead of undermining belief in God, today becomes the first witness. Science means knowledge, and what we have to explain about the world is that knowledge has appeared. How, in a nontheistic world, would knowledge of its nontheism be possible? A. E. Taylor is extremely disturbing when he says we must ask of every theory about the world, "Would the truth of the theory be compatible with knowing the theory to be true?" That is a question on which a person may meditate profitably for a long time.¹

To recapitulate: Trueblood bases his acceptance of *theistic evolution* on three grounds, namely, (1) that of the very fact of the existence of science as the obvious product of the kinship of nature and mind; (2) that of the evident truth that *progressive* creation necessarily presupposes direction by Creative Intelligence and Power; and (3) that of the evidence provided by the Second Law of Thermodynamics, to the effect that the universe could not have originated, and indeed cannot be maintained, without the action of a Creative Source of energy. (Cf. Psa. 148:1-6) As a matter of fact, *if our universe were the product of sheer chance, it could not be a universe* (a word which means literally "turned into one whole"), *nor could there be such a thing as a science. "Science knows nothing of the wholly fortuitous."*

The credo, or perhaps it would be more in accord with fact to say, the *creedlessness*, of "materialistic evolution" with its doctrine of "chance-creationism," is fairly well expressed, and literally so, in the following lines (author unknown to this writer):

Once nothing arrived on this earth out of space;
 It rode in on nothing; it came from no place;
 It landed on nothing—the earth was not here—
 It worked hard on nothing for year after year;
 It sweat over nothing with mighty resolve—
 But just about then things began to evolve:
 The heavens appeared, and the sea and the sod;
 This Almighty Nothing worked much like a god.
 It started unwinding without any plan,
 It made every creature and ended with man.
 No god here was needed—there was no creation;
 Man grew like a mushroom and needs no salvation.
 Some savants say this should be called evolution
 And that ignorance only rejects that solution.

Another wag, has contributed a few lines on the subject before us, which read as follows:

1. Trueblood, *op cit.*, 103-105.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

Oh, the rising generation
Has lost its veneration
 For the fables and the fantasies of old
In the science of geology
And the study of biology
 Their hearts and heads alike are growing cold.
Since this terrible evolution
Has caused this revolution
 And geology has given us such shocks,
We shall have our legislature
Now repeal the laws of nature,
And pass a law abolishing the rocks.
 (identity likewise unknown)

It surely is profitable for "instruction in righteousness" (i.e., God's way of doing things) to consider the language of the Spirit as recorded in Peter's second epistle, chapter 3, verses 1-13, and note carefully its intimations with respect to the subject:

This is now, beloved, the second epistle that I write unto you; and in both of them I stir up your sincere mind by putting you in remembrance; that ye should remember the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and the commandment of the Lord and Savior through your apostles; knowing this first, that *in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for, from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.* For this they willfully forget, that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and amidst water, by the word of God; by which means the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished; but the heavens that now are, and the earth, by the same word have been stored up for fire, being reserved against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men. But forget not this one thing, beloved, that *one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.* The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some count slackness; but is longsuffering to you-ward, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing that these things are thus all to be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness, looking for and earnestly desiring the coming of the day of God, by reason of which the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? *But according to his promise, we look for a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.* (Italics mine—C.C.)

We are surrounded on all sides by the *Mystery of Being*. Certainly that which impresses itself upon our consciousness all the time requires some accounting for, some explanation. There can be only two views: neither logic nor experience allows for a third. *Either there is a Power in this universe, the Creator and Preserver of it, who is without beginning or end, whose*

ground of existence is within Himself; or the only alternative is that the Something which we experience constantly, originally came from nothing. There is no middle ground; no way out of the horns of this dilemma. To ask, Where did God come from? is to state the question improperly. Our God, the living and true God, has always been and will always be; He is without beginning or end (cf. Rev. 1:17-18, Isa. 46:8-11, etc.). Just this timeless sovereign Power is what we mean when we use the word "God." The real questions for consideration should be: Why is there Something instead of nothing? What is this Something? Whence came it into existence, and for what purpose? The three most far-reaching questions faced by every human being are these: What am I? Whence came I? Whither am I bound? One's answer to these questions, if he ever gives them any great measure of thought, will be his *Weltanschauung*. It follows, of course, that a man's World-View will determine the course and character of his life.

22. The tragically ill effects of the spread of materialistic evolution, with its creed of *chance—purposeless—creation* are to be seen everywhere today, and probably most of all in the world-wide deterioration of *morale* and *morality*. Relativity is the norm which man has blown up into an Absolute. Authority, if indeed there is such a thing, is vested, not in the church, nor in the state (civil society), but in the autonomous reason. Everything is relative to the individual. Truth, beauty, and goodness—again, if these words have any meaning—are what each person thinks them to be. There is no authority (i.e., moral power) beyond that of the individual human being and the social milieu which he, with others of his kind, sets up for himself in the form of custom or "law." There is no Absolute. (It is passing strange that the man who makes such a statement does not have sense enough to see that he is himself affirming an Absolute.) "Glory to man in the highest," shouts Swinburne, "for man is the master of things." And Henley, in true Walt Whitman style, thumps his chest as he cries out,

It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul!

Even Shakespeare is moved to protest this humanistic arrogance:

But man, proud man,
Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

His glassy essence, like an angry ape,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep.

Or, in the words of Alexander Pope:

Some are bewilder'd in the maze of schools,
And some made coxcombs Nature meant but fools.

The creedlessness of materialistic evolution is largely responsible for the theme of the sheer futility of living which has dominated both fiction and drama for many decades. Undoubtedly it accounts for the fact that contemporary literature has very little humor in it. Both writers and their writings are so ponderously earthy, so deadly serious (shall we admit, "realistic"?) Beginning with Ibsen, we find the Cult of Futility—of the meaninglessness of life—either explicit or implicit in the dramas of Eugene O'Neill, Arthur Miller, Edw. Albee, Tennessee Williams, and other lesser lights, the playwrights who have dominated Broadway for over half a century. (Williams has done as good a job of outFreuding Freud as Euripides did twenty-four hundred years ago.) Saturated with the same motif are the novels of Thomas Hardy, Dreiser, Maugham, Lewis, Steinbeck, Faulkner, Hemingway, Caldwell, Farrell, James Jones, Salinger, Mailer, and others of like outlook: these are the men who have produced most of the fiction with which the literary markets of the world have been deluged in recent years. (It will be recalled that Cronshaw's carpet, in Maugham's *Of Human Bondage*, is offered as an explicit analogy of the purposelessness of life.) I suppose, however, that the last word in pessimism has been spoken by the self-proclaimed atheistic existentialist, Jean Paul Sartre, in his terrible confession that life is only a vacuum with not exit signs. What a really terrible world this would be if this view were to prevail everywhere! (Cf. O'Neill's *Long Day's Journey into Night*.) No wonder that the faith and moral outlook of thousands of young men and women have been stultified, if not actually destroyed by the literary output to which they have been subjected in our secondary schools and higher institutions of learning!

This cult of chance-creationism has insisted on our treating man as a kind of glorified brute, an aggregate of protons and electrons, a creature of earth only, destined to pass through this "vale of tears" robbed entirely of what was once called "the music and the dream" of living. It would identify mind with perishable brain and so rob mankind of any hope of a

better "beyond." It would make death mean only the absorption of the whole person into the "ocean of undifferentiated energy" from which all things emerge and to which they return, according to pre-determined life cycles. For faith, hope and love, it substitutes their opposites, fear and despair and hate, as already evidenced by a whole world at war within itself, a world that is beginning to actualize Thomas Hobbes' notion of man's first state as "a warfare of all against all."

The effects of chance-creationism, with its inseparable corollary of the utter meaninglessness of life, become evident in many areas of human culture today, as, for example, in the supersedure of permissiveness for discipline in the home, of sociological statistics for legal precedent in the juridical order, of gross hedonism for the self-discipline of the moral life, of all kinds of cultism for true Biblical faith, of anarchy for the reign of order and law throughout the world, of universal chaos in man's interrelationships with his fellows and with his God. It is one of the main factors in filling our streets and highways with herdes of young men and women who, in trying to experience fully the "Playboy" philosophy of life, have been seduced by the appeal of pseudo-values into rebellion against society in general, becoming even violent revolutionaries, and into a life of parasitism on what they, in their gross ignorance, superciliously call the "Establishment." How many thousands of these pitifully tragic figures are wasting precious time and destroying themselves by doing little or nothing more than what Satan told God he was doing, just "going to and fro in the earth, and walking up and down in it" (Job 1:7). Insatiable restlessness is an un-failing characteristic of diabolism.

My good friend and ministerial colleague, Curtis Dickinson, has so well stated what we are trying to say here that I feel justified in excerpting his remarks from his excellent little periodical, *The Witness* (March, 1972, Lubbock, Texas), as follows:

Why do some have so little regard for life? Why are the rebels so careless with their own lives and the lives of others? Why do some think so little of their lives as to ruin their health in dissipation and drugs? One reason is faith in evolution. To the evolutionist life is no more than a tiny step in a long process of happenstance. There is no purpose for it and no plan, since there is no planner. One simply exists under prevailing conditions, and has no obligation to the past or hope for the future. His life is an accident, an interval, and with no intrinsic meaning. After millions of years perhaps a better breed and better condition might happen, but then that is of no value to our present generation. No wonder that so many young people, under this depressing

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

conviction, space out on drugs, cop out and foul up their lives in sin. They do not love life! They may love pleasure, but have no love for living, and the things they may do in this frame of mind tend to destroy chances for a good life.

Live for the pleasure of the moment, for the indulgence of the lusts of the flesh, "eat and drink and be merry, for tomorrow ye die," has been the cry of sinful man even from the ages before the Deluge. The truth lies in the parody, "Eat, drink, and be merry, and tomorrow you will have locomotor ataxia, cirrhosis of the liver, or delirium tremens." The overpowering sin of the antediluvian age was preoccupation with the things of this world, sheer secularism, and it is the universal sin of our age and time. (Cf. Mat. 24:37-39; Gen. 6:3-7, 11-12.)

Materialistic evolution, if put into practice universally in daily living, will eventually pressure man, through his insatiable thirst for power, into slavery to one or more of the lusts of the flesh (Gal. 5:19-21) and into ultimate eternal separation "from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might" (2 Thess. 1:7-10).

23. Let us now take a brief look at some of the inadequacies of the theory of evolution, as follows:

(1) *Evolutionism has no adequate explanation of the process by which a variation in the parent organism becomes embodied in the parental reproductive cells* (as in the fertilized ovum of the human male-female), obviously a change necessary to the transmission of the "acquired characteristic" to the offspring.

(2) *Evolutionism does not give us any satisfactory account of the origin of the life process.* Spontaneous generation (abiogenesis) is now *theoretically* considered to have been a possibility, but as yet no direct evidence of its actual occurrence in nature has been brought to light. As Wilder Smith puts it:

We have no evidence to date that the simple molecules postulated (that is, the first molecules alleged to have been formed by chance) could autoduplicate themselves. To propose this is to pose a problem as difficult as that of life itself. . . . For energy would be needed to operate such a duplicative process, which the heat or light of the sun could not supply without mediation of a complex metabolic motor. A complex association of matter would be indispensable to arrive at auto-duplication, yet Dr. Cedrangolo is postulating simple molecules as carrying on this process. We have no evidence for such an hypothesis. Viruses, in duplicating themselves, use the metabolic support of their complex host cells but the host cells are lacking under the conditions on earth before biogenesis. [This author goes on to say that some

scientists are convinced that proteins did not arise spontaneously from non-living matter.] If one cannot explain the spontaneous formation of proteins, a large percentage of scientists would believe that the origin of life was not explicable either.¹

The truth seems to be that it is not likely that a molecule can increase in complexity spontaneously and suddenly "like a man falling in one fell swoop up a ladder from bottom to top"! Up to the present time, credit must go to Louis Pasteur for demonstrating, as Spallanzani put it, that "even microbes have parents."

(3) *Evolutionism does not afford any explanation of the life process itself*, that is, of the mysterious movement of life; rather, it starts with this movement as an accepted fact, apparently indifferent to the importance of the *how* and *why* of it. One may watch the division of a single cell into two cells (as, again, in the fertilized ovum), but no one understands why the cell divides and the process continues in geometrical proportion (one into two, two into four, four into eight, etc.), or how the daughter cell inherits the particular forms and functions of the parent cell. Why does this movement of life push upward, by differentiation of structure and specialization of function, into vastly more and more complex forms and finally into the most complex form of all,—man? *There is no evidence that a potency can actualize itself*: it must have some help from outside itself. What, then, is the Efficient Causality which actualizes all these changes that are supposed to become stabilized into the multifarious forms that make up the living world? Is it "protoplasmic irritability"? But what is "protoplasmic irritability"? Who knows? Perhaps little more than a factotum brought in to support the unprovable hypotheses of the evolutionist.

(3) As stated heretofore, *evolutionism requires an almost unlimited extent of time to make room for all the changes envisioned by its advocates*. Apparently, they expect us to accept without question the indispensability of such an extent of time to any adequate explanation of the process, and at the same time they arbitrarily use this hypothetical stretch of time to support their theory. Is not this question-begging *par excellence*? In substance the argument is as follows: *A fossil is dated by the age of the rock in which it is found but the age of the rock is determined by the fossil it contains*. "Yet the geologic column (obtained by dating fossils on the assumption of evolution) is

1. A. E. Wilder Smith, *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*, 17ff.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

used as the chief evidence for evolution." Surely this supports our view that many scientists of our day and age need the discipline of courses in logic and metaphysics!

(4) *Evolutionism cannot account satisfactorily for the gap that exists between the intelligence potential of man and that of any known animal species existent or extinct.* That this gap is inconceivably vast is conceded by the evolutionists of our time. Indeed, there are eminent men in biological science who are prone to accept the view that man's appearance on the scene is explainable only in terms of a mutation, or series of mutations. Incidentally, it should be stated here that evolutionists do not take the view that man is "nothing but" an animal. On the contrary, they hold that he has "evolved" beyond the brute stage; that, in a word, he is animal *plus*. However, they insist that the difference is only one of *degree*, not one of *kind*. We hold, however, that such powers inherent in man as (a) *abstract thinking*, that is, in terms of symbols, (b) *creative imagination*, (c) *the sense of values*, and the *sense of humor*, accompanied as often it is by the *power of laughter*, set man apart from the brute creation as *far different in kind*. Hence, man alone has been vested with those powers which qualify him for his God-given responsibilities as lord tenant of the earth (Gen. 1:26-31, Psa. 8:3-9).

(5) The theory of mutations is that new forms come into being as wholes, as the result of sudden jumps in the process, and continue to "breed true" from the time of their "emergence." Do biologists have any explanation of the mysterious process by which a mutation is brought about? Obviously, they do not. They take it for granted, it seems, that resident forces of some kind, or of different kinds, either singly or collectively, work effectively in the genes to produce the mutation. Why this process occurs, or just how it occurs, no one knows. (Cosmic rays, we are told, have been known to produce mutations in fruit flies.) Yet it is inconceivable that evolution could ever have taken place unless the fact of mutations is granted. Many biologists, however, frown on the theory of mutations because they find it difficult to harmonize this theory with the mechanics of natural selection which they seek to establish. It is obvious that mutations have all the appearance of *special creations*.

The theory of mutations is treated very clearly, under the heading, "Neutral Observation of the Modern Basis for Evolution," printed in the *Bible-Science Newsletter*, May, 1972. The

author is Marinus W. Verbrugge of San, Jose, California, and he writes as follows:

The search for genetic change throughout the 19th century failed to produce any concrete results, Lamarck's idea that acquired characteristics are passed on to the next generation is wrong. *Somatic cells do not produce sex cells.* Darwin observed that domestic plants and animals have variable descendants and implied this is evidence of genetic change. He was wrong. This was only a re-combination of previously existing genes in hybrid plants. DeVries mistook the phases of a heterozygous species for genetic change. "Sports" in hybrid plants, which are observed occasionally by commercial growers, are generally caused by the weakening of a precariously dominant gene, resulting in the switch of dominance to the opposite gene in the affected pair. The demand for positive proof of genetic change became strong after DeVries' observation of mutations in *Oenothera* (evening primrose) appeared to be unfounded. Leading evolutionists prodded the Rockefeller Foundation to dig into its coffers. Morgan received the go-ahead and began breeding *Drosophila* (the genus containing the common fruit fly). This would settle once and for all the truth about mutations. After millions of normal flies, a different one was finally discovered which bred true. Hallelujah! Evolution was a fact. The happy news made headlines in the world press. But the pampered little mutant was not very healthy and homozygotes were lethal. It was the same story with later discoveries of mutants in *Drosophila*. Radiation experiments greatly increased the frequency of mutations, but the results were the same: sickly, unbalanced, weak, unproductive individuals which never could become a new species. Sequence photography with the recently developed electron microscope revealed the cause: broken chromosomes. There was a definite relationship between the severity of the damage to the chromosomes and the resulting individual. Some mildly affected individuals did not show visible damage to the chromosomes. Individual genes are so small that they cannot be detected with the most powerful magnification available to science. If all other mutants in the same culture are caused by chromosome damage, it is a logical conclusion that a minor mutation is caused by the same factor. This is a very important point in this discussion as will be explained. Later evolution is a process of change in stages. From a brand new heterozygous mutant to a homozygote, to a new species, genera, family, etc., etc. The goal of all laboratory experiments with fruitflies, molds, mice, etc., has been to detect the start of this process, to demonstrate a true first-generation mutant. This goal has been reached by Morgan, resulting in exuberant rejoicing in certain circles. But the second phase, *continuation*, did not materialize. On the contrary, all abnormalities in the first discovered mutants which have only one affected chromosome, are very much increased if both chromosomes are so affected. Those with more serious damage are unable to reproduce at all if paired with an identical mate. The very few which had the ability to reach the homozygote stage (with much loving care) were at best a degenerated form of an old type, *not a healthy new type.*

Even the prominent evolutionist, Prof. Theodosius Dobzhansky of Columbia University, states in his book, *Evolution, Genetics, and Man*; "All positively demonstrated genetic changes up to this day have only led to races within prevailing existing species."

Seven decades of extensive experiments in laboratories have confirmed what was known for a long time. Variations observed in species, are in degree only, not in kind. This type of variation does not lead to new types ever!!!

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

Only *different genes* can cause the emergence of a new species. Geneticists are well aware of this. And the changing of genes has *not* been demonstrated. All claims of *gene* changes are unproven assumptions. Modern evolutionists want to *see* gene changes; many changes are caused by something else. The new version of evolution is: (1) changing genes, (2) recombination of genes, (3) increased volume of genes by polyploidy. Technology in its present state is unable to resolve whether this is happening. The *results* of demonstrated facts are the only thing to go by. Plans, drawings and calculations of an airplane may seem perfect. The final test comes when it zooms up into the blue yonder. If its prototypes continue to crash, something is amiss. The persistent failure of all known mutants to perform according to expectation is the best proof of the type of change which has taken place. All evidence points in one direction: recombination of old material and loss of genetic material. "There is nothing new under the sun," said Solomon. That is still true today.

We recall that in the first chapter of Genesis it is revealed that God created both plants and animals according to "kinds": note the phrase, "after their kind," in verses 11, 12, 21, 24, 25. What particular categories of biological science, then, are to be identified with this Biblical speciation as to "kind"? *Speciation* in biology designates the process by which species are formed, "the process by which variations become fixed." Classification (in biology) is usually described as proceeding according to the following sequence: phyla, classes, genera, species, orders, families. On this subject Simpson writes as follows:

Most zoologists classify animals into about twenty major groups, called phyla (singular, phylum), each representing a fundamental anatomical plan. Some students recognize more than twenty phyla and some fewer, but the differences of opinion relate almost entirely to a small number of peculiar, soft-bodied living animals of uncertain origin, of no real importance in the modern fauna and practically without fossil remains. *Animals of real importance today or in the history of life may all be referred to only fifteen basic phyla.* Five of these are collectively called "worms" and have poor fossil records. The other ten have, by and large, good fossil records and their histories since the Cambrian or Ordovician can be followed satisfactorily in broad outline, *although it hardly needs saying that innumerable details need to be filled in.* [Italics mine—C]. [Again]: Several striking facts fundamental for the history of life appear. . . . First, all the phyla are of great antiquity. All date from the Cambrian or Ordovician. . . . Since sometime in the Ordovician, around 400,000,000 years ago, no new *major* type of animal has appeared on earth. It would appear that the fundamental possibilities of animal structure had then all been developed, although truly profound changes and progressive developments were yet to occur within each type. [Note well this phrase, *within each type.*] Note, second, that none of the basic types has become extinct. . . . The third major generalization is that on the whole life has tended to increase in variety. The usual pattern for any phylum, or for life as a whole, is to appear in relatively few forms and later to become vastly more diversified. [How account for this diversification?] [Simpson writes]: The same sorts of events have occurred within each class, and here may be seen still more clearly how a new type, once it was

originated, tends to spread and to become diversified in adaptation to a variety of environmental conditions and of ways of life. This process is known as "adaptive radiation."

It would seem entirely reasonable to identify the biological phyla with the Biblical "kinds." At any rate, *science thus admits the persistence of original basic categories of animal life, from which (as biology would have it) diversification followed, probably, in genera and species.* Of course science attempts to fathom the *modus operandi* of this diversification, not with any great degree of success; that is, with nothing better, it would seem, than suggestions based solely on inference, and inference that lacks the quality of strictness considered necessary to proof. And even this leaves the problem of all problems still up in the air, namely, the problem of the origin of the basic "kinds" from which the diversification takes place. On this subject, Simpson writes as follows:

How did life arise? Again, the honest answer is that we do not know but that we have some good clues. This ultimate mystery is more and more nearly approached by recent studies on the chemical activity of living particles, of viruses and of genes, the submicroscopic determiners of heredity and growth. The most fundamental properties of life are reproduction and change (or mutation). Particles with these properties would be, in essence, alive, and from them all more and more complex forms of life could really arise. [This would mean, of course, as stated heretofore, that these "submicroscopic" particles must be credited with all the attributes that theologians specify as belonging to God, including (at least the potentiality of) supreme intelligence, creative power, and eternal, autonomous existence. On the metaphysical principle that *being exists either potentially or actually*, these primitive particles of "First Matter" would have in them all the potentialities of the actualized cosmos and its manifoldness. But we are still in the dark as to the origin of these "particles." If they are unoriginated, then they must be regarded as timeless (*i.e.*, eternal), without beginning or ending. This of course would require more faith than is required to believe in the God of the Bible.]

We again quote Simpson:

Current studies suggest that it would be no miracle, not even a great statistical improbability, if living molecules appeared spontaneously under special conditions of surface waters rich in the carbon compounds that are the food and substance of life. And the occurrence of such waters at early stages of the planet's evolution is more probable than not. [Now we are back, first, to surface waters, then to carbon compounds, and finally to the planet itself. Just where is this regress going to reach an end? Or will it? Are we faced with infinite regress? Would this be any logical solution of the Mystery of being?]²

Note well Simpson's conclusion:

1. Simpson, *op cit.*, 13-21. (My comments in brackets—C.)
2. *Ibid.*, 13, 14.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

This is not to say that the origin of life was by chance or by supernatural intervention, but that it was in accordance with the grand, eternal physical laws of the universe. It need not have been miraculous, except as the existence of the physical universe may be considered a miracle.¹

What sophistry! Did man create himself or was he brought into existence by Power that antedated him? Obviously, if he created himself, he existed before he existed. But this is nonsense. Did the physical universe create itself or was it created by a Power that antedated it? If it created itself, then it, too, existed before it existed. This is arrant nonsense. We base our case on the Power who was before all things, and is in all things. The God of the Bible who is transcendent in His being (as opposed to pantheism) and who is immanent through His power (as opposed to deism) is our all-sufficient answer for these ultimate questions. There is no satisfactory answer but that of theism! (We refer the student here to the great Preservation Hymn, (Psa. 104; cf. Psa. 33:6, 9; Heb. 11:3, Col. 1:16-17, Psa. 148:1-6, 2 Pet. :1-7.)

22. Despite positive assertions to the contrary, in which, as a rule, the theory to be proved is taken for granted, *the simple truth is that as yet no one knows just how a new species emerges or could emerge.* As Alfred Russel Wallace is reported to have said to Darwin: "Your theory may account for the *survival* of a species, but it cannot account for the *arrival* of a new species." This statement is just as true today as when it was first made.

23. *Evolutionism is unable as yet to give us a satisfactory account of the origin of sex differences.* It is interesting to note here that the Genesis cosmogony is silent about the origin of females among subhuman orders, with the sole exception of the implication in Gen. 1:22. It is the human female, Woman, to whom our attention is especially directed in Scripture: Gen. 1:27-31.

24. *Evolutionism has no adequate explanation of the fact of instinct,* of the almost inconceivable manifoldness of instinctive responses among subhuman creatures. Instinct has rightly been called "The Great Sphinx of Nature." If complexity of instinct were to be made the criterion of the classification of living forms in ascending order, it is obvious that the lowly Insecta would stand at the head of the list and man, poor man, *homo sapiens*, would be somewhere near the bottom. Are not

1. *Op. cit.*, 13, 14.

instinctive responses the media by which Divine Intelligence ensures the preservation of non-intelligent species?

25. *It is doubtful that evolutionism could ever account adequately for the great variety of special organs in different species (characteristic of the entire complex of nature's adaptation to the needs of living creatures); organs such as wings, feathers, eyes, ears, fins and electric organs of fishes, poison glands and fangs of snakes, migratory powers of homing pigeons, and many others too numerous to mention. Perhaps the most amazing phenomenon of the subhuman world is the "radar" system of bats, which, whether it is instinct or not, certainly points up the mathematical precision which characterizes all nature. For example, the following facts about this phenomenon, as given in the Bible-Science Daily Reading Magazine, May-June, 1972:*

A 1951 Moody Bible Institute filmstrip titled *Flying Wonder* describes the remarkable radar of the bat. This radar enables the bat to feed at night without eyesight. Tests were made in an area with bars placed at intervals closer than a wingspread, yet their wings never touched the bars. The sound frequency of the bat's direction system is about 50,000 cycles, more effective than any man-made radar systems. Of the 1000 species of bats, 39 are found in the United States. The bat's wide gaping mouth enables it to catch flying insects. Bats hibernate in winter and may live up to 20 years. Bats are designated as unclean in the Bible. Few mammals are more odorous than the bat. They sleep while in a hanging position and like to roost in caves, old buildings, and hollow trees. They quickly build up large deposits of highly smelly guano which is often used as manure. Their unusual appearance and habits have long made them the subject of strange beliefs, sometimes with evil association, says G. S. Cansdale. Bats are an example of the wonders of God's creation. Bats are not necessarily harmful pests, and there is much we can learn from them to aid in scientific research. That Scripture considers them unclean is another example of a sin-contaminated nature. Only in the life to come will nature be free from this influence of sin and we will enjoy perfection forever.

For one of the most thoroughgoing treatments of the characteristics and varieties of instinctive behavior in subhuman orders, the reader is referred to the book by Ruth Crosby Noble, titled *The Nature of the Beast*. Mrs. Noble was the widow of the late Dr. G. Kingsley Noble, noted biologist of the American Museum of Natural History, and her book, published in 1945, is said to be based largely on his scientific publications and lecture notes. Mrs. Noble shared in her husband's work, we are told, and was herself an expert in the natural sciences. (See Bibliography.) This book develops the theme that animals are creatures of instinct in a world of sensations. She presents the following significant conclusions: (1) What often appears to us to be reasoned behavior in animals with insight as to the

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

outcome, is really a long line of instinctive behavior. In this connection, she writes as follows:

In 1824, Emerson at the age of twenty wrote in his *Journal*, "Man is an animal that looks before and after." We have noted the limited capacity of most animals for recalling past experiences. Planning for the future is even more difficult. Foresight, like insight, is largely restricted to humans, though we find in animals much that resembles it—usually falsely. It is doubtful that the squirrel hoarding nuts is able to picture the coming winter with its blanket of snow. Burying objects and hiding them in cracks are activities so natural to these animals than even pets in captivity will try to hide nuts and small articles about the house or in the folds of a bedcover. Even the mother squirrel building her nest probably has no conception of the family soon to arrive. Both hoarding and nesting are primarily instinctive. . . . Though there are many highly talented artisans even among insects and lower invertebrates it is in general only the most intelligent vertebrates who are capable of using *tools* in their trade. The very few who *invent* tools are prodigies indeed. . . . While man shares insight and ability to use tools with the apes, he alone communicates with his fellows by means of language. No other living creature has learned to use words as symbols of objects, situations, or acts. By means of these symbols he projects his ideas into the minds of others. Through them he is able to profit from the experience of others, both in the past and in the present. With the aid of language, written as well as spoken, he has entered into the realm of ideas, a realm probably closed to most animals . . . animals communicate with one another to some extent by means of expressive gestures and sounds, but this is quite different from having a language. . . . So we see that man has a priceless treasure in his highly developed thinking cap."¹

(2) The sense impressions of animals are quite different from those of man. The bat, for example, flies by sound instead of sight. The wood tick uses its skin to "see" with. Few animals have color vision. But the bee can detect ultraviolet colors and the ant senses infrared. How do we know these things? Over the space of years science has devised many ways to discover the secrets of animal behavior. (The author takes us behind one ingenious test after another: mazes, colored doors, ringing bells, etc.) The variability, selectivity, and specialization of instincts in the subhuman orders is too vast for any adequate explanation in terms of inheritance of acquired characters, natural selection, continuity of germ plasm, mutations, or all of these acting together. It defies human imagination and at the same time proves the universal adaptability of nature to the needs of all her creatures. We do well to recall here Pope's famous lines:

"Slave to no sect, who takes no private road,
But looks through Nature up to Nature's God."

1. *Op. cit.*, 53-64.

26. *Structural resemblance does not necessarily prove emergence of the higher form from the lower.* It could well be the product of the activity of the Divine Mind creating according to an archetypal pattern (as in the instance of man's invention of the wheelbarrow, buggy, chariot, wagon, automobile, airplane, all of which manifest a basic structural resemblance).

27. *Ordinarily, nature, when left to inherent resources alone, seems to deteriorate rather than to advance.* Any gardener knows that tomatoes produced by properly cultivated plants are always superior to those which are produced by seed or plant in what is called "volunteer" fashion.

28. *The apparent non-fertility of hybrids would seem to militate against the evolution theory.*

29. *Apparently useless organs are not necessarily reduced or rudimentary,* in many instances. Ignorance of the use or purpose of an organ is not in itself a proof that the organ has no necessary function at all.

30. *Neither similarity nor gradation (nor both together) can prove emergence,* that is, "continuous progressive change, according to fixed laws, by means of resident forces" (LeConte).

31. *Man has no known existing animal ancestors:* those alleged humanoid forms which are supposed to have existed prehistorically are now extinct, hence hypothetically identifiable only by isolated sparse skeletal remains which have been found in different parts of the world. These remains of prehistoric man—prior to Cro-Magnon—are too fragmentary to allow for any reliable reconstruction of man's ancestry from the so-called *hominidae*. Nor do these widely scattered skeletal remains necessarily indicate that there were "centers" of the origin of *homo sapiens*. What Dr. Broom has said about such finds in Southern Africa is equally applicable to all other such discoveries: "When we speak of Plesianthropus as a found 'missing link,' this does not mean that man came from even that species. We mean only that we have a member of the family from one of whom man arose."¹ As far as the present writer knows, no evidence has ever been found that would discredit the generally accepted view that the cradle of the human race was where the Bible pictures it to have been, that is, in Southwest Asia. Moreover, evolutionists must accept the fact that *there had to be a space-time locus* at which the transition from *hominidae* to *homo sapiens* actually occurred; and that with the appearance

1. Quoted by Douglas Dewar, *The Transformist Illusion*, 125.

of *homo sapiens*, reason also appeared (as indicated by the Latin *sapiens* or *sapientia*, "wise" or "having reason"), and along with reason, conscience, which is the voice of practical reason (cf. Gen. 3:9-11). In view of these facts, it must also be recognized that all humanoid forms existing prior to the transition were not forms of *homo sapiens*. The tendency of so many scientists to pontificate about these humanoid "finds" makes it necessary for us to put their significance in proper perspective in order that we may not be led astray by guesses and gross exaggerations.

32. The Mendelian laws of heredity have been generally accepted in biological science. However, it must be kept in mind that these "laws" are simply descriptions of what evidently takes place in transmission through the media of the genes; they do not tell us why these transmissions take place as they do, nor do they give us any information as to the *modus operandi* of the transmissions themselves. Even the genes themselves are only hypothetical "determiners"—we are told—of heredity. This is true, of course, of practically all facets of the evolution theory: nearly all that the advocates have to tell us is *descriptive* in character, of *what* occurs, not of *why*, nor specifically of *how*, it occurs. Perhaps these are mysteries that lie beyond the scope of human comprehension? The fact is that almost every argument put forward to support evolutionism is based on *inference*, and not on concrete evidence, and practically every one of these arguments leaves the big question open, namely, is the inference necessary, that is, unavoidable, or is it academic guess-work? (According to the *Herald and Presbyter*, the phrase, "we may well suppose," occurs over eight hundred times in Darwin's two principal works, not to mention, of course, such expressions, "apparently," "probably," and the like, all of which express uncertainty: the eminent scientist, like his successors, was simply guessing.) (See Bryan, *In His Image*, 90, 91.)

33. In the final analysis, *the arrival of a new species* is to be accounted for only on the basis of variations transmitted through the chromosomes and genes: as far as we know, inheritance in man takes place in no other way. If mutations be the final "explanation" of these genetic changes, then the mutations must have occurred in chronological sequence to have produced the continuous progressive changes (demanded by the theory) into more and more neurally complex organisms, culminating in the human organism. It is only a mark of sanity to conclude that there is reason and order back of this entire process, actualizing all such changes, and that the Cosmos is the

handiwork of the Universal Mind and Will whom we call God (Psa. 19:1-6).

34. In the areas of the astronomical, geological, and geographical sciences the theory of *uniformitarianism* plays a dominant role. This theory is stated in one geology textbook as follows:

To the uprooting of such fantastic beliefs ["supernatural explanations"] came the Scottish geologist Hutton, whose Theory of the Earth, presented in 1785, marked a turning point in thought on this subject. Hutton argued that *the present is the key to the past* and that, if given time, the processes now at work could have produced all the geologic features of the globe. This philosophy, which came to be known as *uniformitarianism*, is now universally accepted by learned men. It demands an immensity of time.¹

As another writer states it:

According to these modern ideas, the laws of nature have always been the same as they are today, so that the present state of nature is the explanation of its past state and of its future state too. Thus, geological formations, fossils, etc., arise today in just the same manner as they did millions of years ago. Hence the name "uniformitarianism" for this type of philosophy. And thus the concept arose that catastrophes and acts of God have nothing or little to do with the formation of the geological strata we observe today.²

It seems that the Holy Spirit warned against the rise of this kind of thinking "in the last days." He predicts for our benefit that in the last days mockers, who live only to satisfy their own lusts, will jeer at the notion of a Second Coming of Christ to save the redeemed and to judge the world. They will cry, "Where is the promise of his coming? for, from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (2 Pet. 3:3-7). It strikes us that so-called "learned men" are not intelligent enough to realize that the process of creation itself lies entirely outside the possibility of a continuous uniformitarian origin of the world as we know it and of the myriad forms of life that inhabit it. Evolutionists themselves will certainly agree that there was a time when man did not exist; that, farther back, there was a time when life had not come into being; that back beyond that, there was only the astronomical (celestial) world in process of being formed (according to their theory). We are now back to our original dilemma: We must accept the existence of Power that is without beginning or end, or the "Almighty Nothing" as the First Principle. *On the basis of the metaphysical principle that there must*

1. Schuchert and Dunbar, *Outlines of Historical Geology*, 35.
2. A. E. Wilder Smith, *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*, 49.

be as much reality in the cause as in the effect—a principle which evolutionists are not aware of, or else ignore or even ridicule—only the God of the Bible, the theistic God, can be the First Principle of all things. Again, on the basis of the metaphysical principles (1) that being exists either potentially or actually (the full-grown oak tree is potentially in the acorn), (2) and that a potency cannot actualize itself, we must conclude that the God of the Bible is the Efficient Cause (the Power that unites the matter and the form—the form being the plan which, e.g., puts each tree in its specific kind or species—to bring the tree into actual existence) of the Totality of created beings. Again, we affirm that both science and theology need the disciplines of logic and metaphysics. No better example of this could be cited than the closing statement of the first of the quotations immediately above: “It [their theory] demands an immensity of time.” But as we have noted already, claims of the immensity of time become little more than question-begging devices. If more time is needed to establish any phase of their theory, evolutionists simply hypothesize—that is, assume—it.

35. *The doctrine of biopoiesis* (the creation or making of life from non-living material) completely overlooks the fact that the necessary power—possibly in the arrangement of the atoms in the “parent” molecule—had to be there, before life could have been generated “spontaneously.” Is not this a matter of pushing the problem of origin a notch farther back? How did the necessary conditions come to exist in the first place to bring into existence the first living form? What Power equipped the “parent” molecule with these necessary conditions? Who indeed, but the living and true God? Creation, we are told in Genesis, was decreed (executed) by the Logos and actualized (consummated) by the Eternal Spirit (Gen. 1:1-31; Psa. 33:6, 9; Gen. 148:1-6, Heb. 11:3).

Man cannot have created himself or any of his kind. Man cannot even make a seed. Man cannot add to, or take away from, the total energy of the cosmos. Man cannot bring into being any creature greater than himself. Man cannot per se bring about racial distinctions. Man’s role in life is to love and serve God here, that he may enjoy Him hereafter.

36. Let us consider for a moment the problem of dating in relation to the mystery of time. *Time is indeed a mystery.* On this point Wilder Smith’s excellent analysis is helpful, as follows:

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT — HIS PERSON AND POWERS

In the beginning God is reported as having taken the "dust of the earth" and as having formed Adam from it. He then breathed the breath of life into him and Adam became a living soul. The Bible does not report Adam as having arisen as a newborn babe. According to the scriptural record, no parents were there to take care of him. So he must have been adult at his creation and have possessed immediately his five senses in full state of development so as to have been able to fend for himself from the start. Let us now consider some consequences of this creative act. Adam is standing there in all the beauty of new creation, straight from the Creator's hand. Shall we say, for the sake of argument, that he is just two breaths, or some five seconds old? His lungs have just filled themselves with the pure air of Eden. But just how old does Adam look, judging his age by our time-measuring experience? He is adult, perhaps handsome, mature. It takes, according to our way of reckoning time, some twenty to thirty years to allow a man to come to maturity, and Adam is obviously a mature man. Accordingly, we would guess Adam's age to be some twenty to thirty years. But in reality, we know he is just two breaths, or about five seconds old. This example makes it clear that where creation is concerned the laws of thermodynamics, as we know them, are turned upside down. Here the laws governing time do not function either. Adam is just five seconds old and yet looks as though he were twenty to thirty years old. What is more, at every act of creation there must be the same illusion of age. Dr. Karl Barth, the famous Swiss theologian and founder of neo-orthodoxy, maintains a similar idea of creation in his well-known saying that when God created, He created with a past. There must be this built-in illusion of the passage of time. This must be the case, for our concept of entropy—and thus of the passage of time—cannot be valid during any creative act. In a primitive sort of way, the same applies to any true synthetic act, even today. If, for instance, we measure time by the natural half life of a biologically active compound, then any synthetic act involving cancellation of the natural decay of biological activity would be in a way a reversal of "time" and decrease of entropy as far as that system is concerned. This must also be the case with respect to the creation of the cosmos and the earth. Here too, an act of creation must bring with it an illusion of age and this illusion lies in the very nature of creation *ex nihilo*. That this illusion is a built-in one may be seen from the following example: If a mixture of lead and uranium in an ore was created at the beginning, it would automatically give an illusion of age. For we know that certain isomers of lead arise at the end stage during the radioactive decay of uranium. By measuring the amount of lead in a uranium ore we can determine the ore's age. Since it takes X years to form so many milligrams of lead from a given amount of uranium, by measuring the amount of lead in the ore we can determine the ore's age, for this decay rate remains constant. But after an act of creation in which an ore is made containing, for example, five grams of lead and five grams of uranium, later calculations must go awry for the following reasons: the five grams of lead will automatically produce the illusion of having been derived from the uranium over millions of years. But it was actually not derived, but created *de novo*. In reality the mixture of lead and uranium has been created as such, but after creation it cannot avoid producing the illusion that it is millions of years old. . . . An act of creation lies so much outside our present-day knowledge that we do not really know how to calculate to take it truly into account, even though all physics demands an active creation to explain the very being and order of life, atoms and of the subatomic world of particles, waves, and orbits. For this basic reason of an act of creation at the back of the cosmos, it is on principle impossible to arrive at an abso-

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

lutely definitive and meaningful date for creation. Science demands an act of creation as an explanation of being, but this act of creation must produce an illusion of age and time. We must remember too, in addition to all this, that before matter and space existed, no time existed either. So, to be scientifically sound, we must be very cautious in matters concerning time in general and dating in particular. . . . If there are, in fact, no fundamental reasons why time should not stop or even run backward, it is obviously going to be very difficult for us to fix a date for creation, or indeed for any other event in the very distant past. So that dogmatism on dating and methods can usually be attributed to an ignorance of fundamental issues at stake in this area of thought. This also applies to statements on the historicity, or lack of it, in biblical chronology.¹ [Vide, in this connection, Sir James Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe*, New Revised Edition, pp. 36, 37.]

The fact is that the dating of fossils, or of anything in the early historic or in the prehistoric past, is a very precarious business. *Man has always been prone to multiply problems for himself unnecessarily by obtruding his notions of measured (mathematical, temporal) time into the realm of God's timelessness, that is, eternity.*

37. *Theistic evolutionism.* This is the view, stated in simplest terms, that evolution was, and is, God's method of creation. The problem involved in thinking of evolution from this point of view is, primarily, whether theistic evolution can be harmonized with the Genesis narrative of the Creation. There are educated and sincerely religious persons who hold that this view if "properly stated" (that is, within certain limitations) is not necessarily in conflict with the teaching of Genesis, if the latter is also "constructively interpreted."

(1) For example, there is a clear correspondence between the Genesis cosmogony and present-day scientific thinking, especially with reference to the order of creation: first, energy, matter, light; then, atmosphere; then, lands and seas and plant life; next, measurement of time (chronology); then, the air and water species, the beasts of the field, and finally man and woman, in the order named.

(2) It must always be kept in mind that the major aim of the Genesis Cosmogony, and indeed of the Bible as a whole, is to tell us *who* made the Cosmos, and not *how* it was made. It was what God said, that "was so," that is, "was done." (Gen. 1:3, 7, 11, 15, 21, 25; Psa. 33:6, 9; Psa. 148:6). However, the inspired writer makes no attempt whatsoever to inform us as to *how* it was done. It is crystal clear that the narrative is intended to be a *religious*, and not a *scientific*, account of the Creation.

1. A. E. Wilder Smith, *op cit.*, 150-153.

(3) In relation to theistic evolutionism, very much depends on the meaning of the word "day" (*yom*) as used in the Genesis account of the Creation. Substantial evidence can be adduced to support either of the two views of the seven "days" involved, namely, the *solar* or twenty-four hour day, or the *aeonic* day, a long period of time. Certainly, there is nothing in the Genesis account that constrains us to accept the ultra-literal view that God spoke all living species into existence at one and the same time. On the contrary, according to the narrative itself, the activity of Creation was extended over six "days" and a fraction of the seventh. This is true, however, we may see fit to interpret the word *yom*.

(4) The language of the Genesis Narrative itself seems to allow for a divinely progressive development, through the media of secondary causes, throughout the Creation. This is implicit surely in God's decrees, "Let the earth put forth grass," etc., "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures," "Let the earth bring forth living creatures," etc.; and even in the earlier decrees with reference to non-living forms of being, "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters," "Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together into one place," "let the dry land appear," etc. The idea implicit in the original here is that of *causation*, as if to say, "let the earth *cause*, let the seas *cause*, it to be done," etc. We see no reason for rejecting the view that God whose Will is the constitution of the universe and its processes, should operate through the majesty and sovereign power of His own established decrees. After all, what science calls "laws of nature" are really the laws of God. Law is always the expression of the will of the lawgiver; hence, laws of "nature" are really the expression of the Will of the God of nature; His will is the constitution of the cosmos: "He hath made a decree which shall not pass away" (Psa. 148:1-6) until the "times of restoration of all things" (Acts 3:21) (Cf. Heb. 1:10-13, 2 Pet. 3:8-13, Rev., ch. 21).

(5) As we have noted heretofore, there are philosophers and theologians who take the position that at certain stages in the Creation, God, by *direct* action (that is, *primary*, as distinguished from *secondary*, causation) inserted ("stepwise," as it is sometimes put) new and higher powers into the Cosmic Process, the first above the inanimate world (matter-in-motion)

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

being the *life process* (cellular activity), then *consciousness* (the product of sensitivity), and finally *self-consciousness* (person and personality). Obviously, these are phenomena which mark off, and set apart, the successively more complex levels of being, as we know these levels empirically. On the basis of this theory, it is held that even though variations—both upward (progressive) and downward (retrogressive)—by means of *resident* forces, may have occurred on the level of plant life and that of animal life, the actualization of the first form of *energy-matter*, first *life*, first *consciousness*, and first *personality* (homo sapiens) must surely have been of the character of special creations. It is interesting to recall the fact here that Wallace, the author with Darwin of the theory of natural selection, held that there were three breaks in the progressive continuity, namely with the appearance of life, with the appearance of sensation and consciousness, and finally with the appearance of spirit. These breaks seem to correspond, in a general way, to *vegetable*, *animal*, and *rational* (human) life, in the order named. (Wallace, *Darwinism* 445-478. Quoted by A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 473.)

(6) Finally, it must be admitted that one of man's most common fallacies is that of trying to project his own puny concepts of time into the sphere of God's *timelessness*. God does not hurry; His timelessness is Eternity. (2 Pet. 3:8, 2 Cor. 4:18).

(Obviously, theistic evolutionism must be studied particularly in relation to the meaning of the word "day" as it occurs in the Genesis account of the Creation, and in relation to creation and constitution of man as given in Genesis 2:7. According to present plans, a complementary treatment of the Biblical doctrine of the Holy Spirit will be presented in a second book, to be entitled *The Eternal Spirit: His Word and His Works*, to be published in the near future.)

38. *The following summarizations of the status of the theory of evolution at present writing will suffice to conclude our study here. The first is from G. T. W. Patrick, as follows:*

On the whole, all the theories of organic evolution, including Darwinism, are somewhat disappointing to the student of philosophy, who is trying to understand the world of living things. There are more gaps and unexplained factors than we supposed—and they are found in very critical places. Most disappointing of all is the complete failure of any accepted theory to determine the causes of evolution itself. The fact is that evolution is a very much over-worked word. . . . Evolution means unwrapping, unrolling, or unfolding. It indicates a process in which the implicit is becoming explicit, the potential, actual. There is no evidence that evolution is in any sense an unwrapping process. On the contrary,

it is distinctly of an epigenetic or upbuilding character. Even the simplest Darwinian variation, much more a mutation, is a real increment, a novelty, a new creation, a veritable plus. Neither is evolution a process in which the potential is becoming actual. We speak of the evolution of the automobile—but the latest skilled product of this art was not potential in the first crude machine. Every improvement has been a new creation, a new thought. . . . Since we do not know the causes of evolution, we do not know of any developmental potency in matter. The only way to support this proposition, would be to argue that since all life has come out of matter, it must have been contained potentially in it, where the only authority for the major premise is the etymological meaning of the word *evolution*. One might as well say that one sees in oxygen and hydrogen the promise and potency of water and all its forms, or in the behavior of apes the promise and potency of the infinitesimal calculus. Water satisfies thirst, and revives the drooping plant, and freezes at zero Centigrade. But certainly there is no promise of any of these qualities in oxygen and hydrogen. There is something more than oxygen and hydrogen in a molecule of water, namely, a certain peculiar organization with the accompanying characteristic qualities of water. Briefly, then, the meaning of evolution is that it is a creative process, something new appearing at every step of the developmental history. Every change is a transformation. The French word *transformisme* is a happier word than the English *evolution*, or the German *Entwickelung*. . . . Evolution is a history of new forms and functions. Every new form is a plus—a new creation. . . . Creation does not mean the production of something out of nothing. The architect creates a Gothic cathedral, but not the stone and mortar. The promoter creates a new organization, but he does not create the men that compose it. Creation means just this—the production of something distinctly new and unique. Reality is found, as Aristotle told us long ago, in structure, form, organization, and function—not in the mere stuff which happens to compose the material. . . . Thus Darwinism has nothing to teach us concerning either the origin or the nature of life and mind. It records only the unexplained appearance of an unending series of new events, one of which is the great event of mind. If we seek to know the origin of life and mind, we must go beyond Darwin in some deeper analysis of the process called evolution. It is not a movement from the potential to the actual. It cannot be defined as a series of orderly changes, for as far as the changes are evolutionary, they are disorderly. . . . It seems like the work of a creative imagination. It reminds ever of the work of an artist.¹

Why should not Creation remind us of the work of an artist? Is not our God the God of Love? 1 John 4:16—"God is love; and he that abideth in love, abideth in God, and God abideth in him." And is not Love always sacrificial, always outgoing, always creative? Back of all the "scientific" aspects of our Cosmos are the aesthetic. The God of the Bible is the superb Aesthete! His very outgoingness, as Divine Love, is, in all likelihood, the very *why* of the whole Creative Process!

The following is from the pen of Dr. Radoslav A. Tsanoff:

The philosophical interpretation of evolutionism has been complicated by the fact that Darwinism explained the survival results of fit

1. *Introduction to Philosophy*, 144-147.

ADDENDUM: ON EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTIONISM

variations, but did not provide an explanation of the causes of variations or proceed to ultimate cosmological inferences. Regarding the heritability of variations, opinions differ. The Lamarckians have definitely lost ground, though they have never been without allies. The theory of mutations, as developed and interpreted by careful geneticists, has reached specific conclusions regarding the evolutionary results of changes in the germ plasm. But the longer pattern of evolutionary cosmology can scarcely be regarded as ascertained. Is it a pattern of strictly mechanical determination? Or does biological evolution produce results that cannot be reduced to merely antecedent causal determinants, that indicate a certain natural creative activity? Or does the stream of existence, unlike water, somehow rise higher than its source; do lower processes produce their self-transcendence, in higher types of being? Philosophy since Darwin has explored these and other theories. Many evolutionists have taken a basically materialistic position; the initial opposition to the theory of evolution was led by those who regarded it as undermining the recognition of spiritual values. Writers like John Fiske (1842-1901) advanced a reinterpretation of evolution as God's cosmic design, the progressive realization of intelligence and spiritual powers in nature.¹

Arthur Kenyon Rogers writes:

The importance of natural selection as an agency is now indeed generally admitted, but also it is widely believed that it does not explain all the facts. For one thing, it is plain that selection does not *cause* advance in the first place. Selection can only take place on the basis of an advance already made; and so we now have to ask the further question: What is the cause and nature of the original variations that are afterwards selected as well as of the factor of heredity which Darwin also took for granted. Evolution is therefore not necessarily identical with Darwinism.² [This author, however, subscribes to the "principle" which, as he puts it, has been applied with results that "have put a new face on all our knowledge."].

Evidently, infinity in God has no reference to any kind of magnitude because God is Spirit (John 4:24). Rather, the term designates the inexhaustible Source of Power by which the cosmos was created and is sustained in its processes. Therefore, we must always keep in mind that the basic problem before us here is not one of *power*, but of *method*. Whatever the method, the Efficient Causality in operation was that of Power. And we are surely thinking "straight" when we declare our conviction that *all Power is of God*.

I think it fitting to conclude at this point with another excerpt from *The Witness*, written by my colleague Curtis Dickinson:

Modern education has undermined today's children by denying them the knowledge of this basic fact, that they are created by a loving, wise, just and merciful God. What kind of character is to be expected of the person who sees himself as the chance product of "nature"? What purpose can exist for something that is a mere step in the

1. *The Great Philosophers*, 567-568.
2. *A Student's History of Philosophy*, 451.

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT — HIS PERSON AND POWERS

purposeless ladder of evolutionary development? Who am I? The ten-billionth stage of the growth of a cell that began in primordial ooze 60 billion years ago? Even the thought of such meaninglessness chills the mind! And to think that today's children are compelled to sit under such teaching practically one-third of the time, many of them continuing in public class rooms through college until they are past the twenty-second birthday. The official doctrine of the state school system is atheistic evolution, with the truth of God's creation attempted only by a small minority of brave teachers who are generally ignored. Thus the very system that is supported for the purpose of education leaves the young people without purpose and direction, and apt to follow whatever voice is the loudest.

Is it possible that the facts stated in this excerpt account for the tragic consequential fact that the United States of America is now a pagan nation? Is it too late now to pray—

“Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget”?

* * * * *

I would again call special attention to the book by A. E. Wilder Smith, *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*, for a genuinely critical treatment of evolutionism and Christianity. The book may be secured from Harold Shaw, Publishers, Wheaton, Illinois, 60187, or from the Bible-Science Association, Inc., Box 1016, Caldwell, Idaho, 83605. Any of the publications by this group of scientists is well worth reading. I am grateful for the privilege of quoting from some of these publications.

I would also call attention here to a recent publication of the National Geography Society, Washington, D.C., 20036 entitled *The Marvels of Animal Behavior*. This is an eye-opener about the manifoldness of instinct in the subhuman life-world. C.C.C.