

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

# THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION UP TO DATE

BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

## THE RIGHT TO PASS JUDGMENT

SOMETIMES it is said that no one but the specialist in physical science has any right to form an opinion or pronounce a judgment in regard to the theory of evolution. Professor Edwin G. Conklin, of Princeton University, issued this edict in a recent publication: "Few opponents of evolution at the present time have either the technical training or even the desire to weigh critically the evidences for or against its truth. Properly to appreciate these evidences requires some first-hand knowledge of morphology, physiology, embryology, ecology, paleontology and genetics." He says the same regarding biology. Thus by the recital of a list of big scientific names he seems to want to frighten the non-specialist into lamb-like silence and acquiescence. In a recent brochure Professor Raymond C. Osburn, of the Ohio State University, makes this pronouncement: "An educated man should at least be able to draw the line between what he knows and what he doesn't know, and not attempt to pass judgment on matters outside of his field of training. An educated man without scientific training has no more basis for forming a proper judgment of the law of evolution than of the Einstein theory of Relativity."

In the presence of such assumptions of superiority shall the rest of us subside into silence? There are several reasons why we shall answer this question in the negative. One of them is that many recent books have been written in a popular style to explain the evolution theory to the plain, common mind, as, for example, "The A B C of Evolution," by Joseph McCabe. Other books, like those of Van Loon and J. Arthur Thompson, have been written for boys and girls of the high schools and even the grammar grades. How can these young people judge of the merits of evolution if it is too hard for adults to understand? If it were true that, in order to form a judg-

ment on evolution, one must have technical training in science, then all the attempts on the part of scientists to popularize the theory are so much labor lost. Even Conklin's recent brochure was a superfluous performance.

Again, some of us, while we do not claim to be specialists in physical science, have been giving much attention to it for many years, and believe we have mastered its fundamental principles. Having read a good many books in favor of evolution, including some of Darwin's, Huxley's, Spencer's, Le Conte's, McCabe's, Morgan's, Conklin's, and others, we think we have at least some right to have a say on the subject. Besides, we do not find it necessary to over-strain our intellects to master the fundamental principles and claims of the advocates of the evolution theory. True, we may not be quite so glib in naming the technical terms of the specialists, just as they would have some difficulty in understanding some of the technical terms used in scientific theology\*; but that does not prevent us from grasping the underlying and formative principles of physical science.

There is still another reason why Christian men cannot afford to permit the evolutionists to be the only vocal people at the present time. With their speculations they are trenching on the religious and theological domain. Whenever they deal with the subject of the origin of the universe, of life and of man, they are running right up into the sphere of Biblical teaching. They certainly propose a very different doctrine of man's origin from that taught in the Holy Scriptures; and they teach it everywhere—in books galore, and in our high schools, colleges and universities where the children and youth of Christian parents must sit under their instruction. Then the children of those parents come home and inform their parents that the Biblical narrative of man's creation in the image of God is out of date and is no longer believed

---

\*If the physical scientist would examine a scholarly work on Christian theology, he would at once discover that this branch of human learning has its scientific nomenclature, derived from the Greek and the Latin, just as other sciences have. Should he desire a sample, let him try Dr. C. E. Lindberg's recently issued work on "Christian Dogmatics" (1922).

by "anybody who is educated." In these circumstances it behooves Christian people to inform themselves, and to discover whether the theory of evolution has been established on a true scientific basis.

With the foregoing facts in mind, we feel justified in reviewing and criticising one of the latest and most authentic books on the side of evolution that has been put on the market. Its title is, "The Evolution of Man." It contains chapters by the following scientists: Professors Richard Swann Lull, Harry Burr Ferris, George Howard Parker, James Rowland Angell, Albert Galloway Keller, and Edwin Grant Conklin. Of these Lull, Parker, Ferris, and Keller are professors in Yale University, Angell is the president of that institution, and Conklin is a professor of biology in Princeton University. The book was issued in the fall of 1922, and the lectures which it comprises were delivered during the academic year of 1921-1922 at Yale University. Thus in this book we have evolution up to date.

The first word we wish to say of the book is, that it is written in a non-controversial manner. There is little attempt made to answer the objections of those who do not accept evolution. Indeed, they are treated for the most part as if they were non-existent. As a rule, the positive side of evolution is stated in a positive way, while, we are glad to say, many difficulties in the way of belief in evolution are frankly and honestly stated. There is, of course, the general assumption throughout that everybody, who is competent to form a judgment, believes in evolution; yet no epithets are employed and no one is abused. The objectors are simply ignored. Thus we may conclude that in this book the evolutionists have put forward their best foot. Everywhere there is evidence of technical training in physical science; yet there is nothing that the person who has himself devoted some study to the technique and principles of science cannot understand. The first half of the book contains a number of illustrations that help to elucidate the text.

## EVOLUTION PURELY NATURALISTIC

Our second word is this: The treatment of the subject is wholly and solely naturalistic. The origin of life, sentiency, personality, and mentality are all accounted for by purely natural processes of development. There is not a single reference to supernatural agency (unless there should be an obscure hint on page 42)\* The name of God does not occur in the book; there is not the slightest acknowledgment of His existence. So far as the deponents in this book have any witness to bear, man came to be what he is, body and mind, without an intelligent and purposeful cause. If the authors believe in a personal God or any other kind of a God, they give no sign. In the literal—though not the profane—sense of the term it is a *godless* book.

It is true, Professor Lull (p. 1) refers to "the Mosaic account of creation," which, he says, "would give us a very recent date for man's advent on this planet." Then in a mildly derisive way, he calls attention to Dr. John Lightfoot's calculations regarding Biblical chronology away back in 1654. Is this ancient citation made to cast scorn on the Biblical account and on Biblical believers and scholars? Afterward (same page), strangely enough, he adds: "One questions, however, not the Scriptural account, but the exactness of the interpretation. The researches of oriental scholars are bringing more and more into evidence the historical truth of the Old Testament narratives, and are establishing from other lines of evidence the historical character of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and other Hebrew patriarchs; but they are also tracing back into a more and more remote period the history of the Near Eastern people," etc. Here you find either ambiguity of statement, or else a direct contradiction between the first and last statements cited. On page 123 President Angell says: "Even in the field of

---

\*In order to be absolutely fair we quote the statement referred to above. It is from Professor Ferris: "It may be possible to explain many of the processes of life on the mechanistic or physico-chemical basis, but it is difficult to explain reproduction on that theory." Did the professor have just a little glint of higher truth here? If so, he at once dismisses it.

religion, where obvious evolution has occurred since primitive times, the modern mind has introduced modifications of the teachings of the founders of the great world religions, designed to adapt them more nearly to the conditions of contemporary life. The doctrines of Christianity, while based as truly as ever on the life and teachings of Jesus, are undergoing constant development and transformation to accommodate them to the needs of the life and thought of our time." This is so general a statement that you can interpret it to mean almost anything you like. On page 129 Professor Keller refers to the parabolic teaching of Christ in what seems to us a rather disparaging context. No doubt, if you would question him, he would reply, "Oh, you mistook my meaning!" In his chapter on "Societal Evolution" he speaks about "mores" and religion a few times, but accounts for them solely by natural evolution, never once hinting at any theistic ground or cause. "Mores" (the Latin for moral) are only "customs," and the reformer who would change the natural order is designated a tinkerer. Thus the work is throughout purely naturalistic.

Now, in all sincerity we would ask whether Christian people, scientific or non-scientific, dare have nothing to say in respect to these speculations of the naturalists? A theory that assigns to man a purely natural and animal origin surely runs counter to the teaching of Christianity, which gives quite a different account. Indeed, the two could not very well be more diverse. Moreover, the whole view of man, his nature, purpose and destiny, as set forth in the Bible, is the very opposite of that taught by these evolutionists. We are saying this in order that scientific men who promulgate such doctrines as scientifically established facts may not be so much surprised when Christian thinkers enter the arena against them, and want to be absolutely assured that evolution has been scientifically validated before they give up the teaching of the Bible, which has given them so rich an experience of pardon, truth, and salvation. Thus, it will be seen, that it is impossible to segregate a scientific hypothesis that aims to give a full-toned anthropology, and to say to all others,

**"Keep hands off!"** The trouble is, the scientists do not stay off of the territory of theology; they want to determine and interpret theology from a purely naturalistic viewpoint; and then, when we object to their speculations, they politely inform us that none but technical scientists have a right to say anything about the matter! Suppose we were to reverse the program, and say to the scientists that they have no right to pronounce any judgment upon the origin, religion, ethics, and destiny of man unless they have a technical knowledge of Christian Ethics, Dogmatics, and Apologetics, what would they think of so arrogant a claim? Those persons who suppose that any one science can be segregated and made immune from criticism, and at the same time impose from its narrow data a world-view upon everybody else, simply prove by that very token that they have no true conception of the nature of science itself nor of the sisterhood and reciprocal character of all the sciences. You cannot get a true, all-inclusive philosophy or world-view from one science alone; you must consider and correlate all the sciences, physical, psychological, ethical, theistic, and Christian.

#### MAN'S ANIMAL LINEAGE

All the scientists represented in this volume assign to man an animal ancestry, and that for both body and mind. This is full-fledged evolution; not the callow or half-fledged kind advocated by some liberalistic preachers and theologians. Man is a blue-blooded descendent of an animal stock still lower in the scale than the anthropoid ape, the orang, the gorilla and the gibbon (see the diagram on page 36; it is so very, very inspiring!). We shall make good our assertion by citations. Professor Lull speaks of man's "pre-human forebears" (p. 5), and indicates that he once lived in "the trees." According to the diagram on page 36, *Homo sapiens* grew out of the same animal trunk as the anthropoid apes. Professor Ferris says (p. 39): "Because of structural similarities he (man) belongs to the order of primates, together with the lemurs, monkeys, and apes." Again: "Structurally man differs from his nearest relatives, the anthropoid

apes, by differences of degree rather than of kind," etc. On page 78 we are thus enlightened: "It is pretty well agreed that the anthropoid apes and man came from a common ancestor, and he in turn from some primitive, broad-nosed ape. Some believe that the mammals were evolved from a primitive reptilian form. Others say that they came from the amphibians, which in turn evolved from a fish form, the latter from an invertebrate, and so on down to the protozoa. Evolution must likewise assume that under some favorable condition the earliest living forms were evolved from the inorganic world. Whether such a process is going on at present no one knows. However, the facts of man's development, structure, and variations, which have been given above, certainly can be best explained on the basis of man's descent from lower forms; and human fossils, as far as they go, as is shown in the previous chapter, definitely lead back toward a form from which both apes and man may have descended."

President Angell contributes the chapter on "The Evolution of Intelligence." On coming to this section, we cherished hopes of better things, but his essay is along the same naturalistic lines as the others. There is no hint that man's mind might have been created, that it might have been made in the image of God. Indeed, there is no sign of any recognition of the divine existence. The chapter begins in this way: "It may be assumed without argument that evolution has actually occurred within the field of intelligence, as it has within the field of organic structure, and I shall proceed at once to examine the major features of the process." And further on he declares that he does not intend "to postulate any fundamental difference between human and animal intelligence." On page 107 he evidently takes the side of those who deny that any "primitive intelligence" has directed the evolutionary process. Behavior is "essentially a function of structure, reflexes, instincts, and tropisms simply represent accidental variations which have survived," etc. . . . "As things now stand, acts of reflex and instinctive character, whatever their evolutionary history, are



as such intrinsically non-intelligent, non-adaptive to variation in environment. This is as true of man as of animals." To indicate the utter crassness of his line of thought, we drop down on page 113 where he is discussing the various opinions held by scientists concerning consciousness in animals: "One must, of course, admit that we have no direct access to animal consciousness, if such exists, but the same thing is true of one's human neighbor." What superficiality! What lack of insight! Our human neighbor can *tell us plainly* that he is conscious and self-conscious, that he is aware of himself and of the objects and persons around him; but the animal can do nothing of the kind. There is one remarkable concession which we must frankly cite (p. 118): "Primitive man as we know him, although often carrying on his affairs with an extremely limited vocabulary, nevertheless is able, through his language devices—to say nothing of others—to mark off and deal with abstract and general relations, and in so far he enjoys a technical superiority to animals which, in effect, is a difference in kind as well as a difference in degree." The next few paragraphs point out in several very unimportant and low-planned ways the difference between human and animal intelligence; but there is no reference to man's moral and spiritual nature, his high hopes and aspirations, and his communion with God as marks of his superiority to animals. Here we also hoped to find some reference to a supernatural origin of man's rational intelligence—but not a word; it is partly accounted for on the basis of man's finer brain structure. He has "a very much more delicate internal structure in the cortex," etc. "The frontal areas and the so-called association areas (of the brain) are relatively very large." Still he admits that these differences in structure and size of the brain and the nervous system are hardly sufficient to account for the "marked differences" between the intelligence of man and "even the most highly developed animal." But here he drops the matter, and gives no reason for this "marked difference." If evolution cannot furnish the adequate explanation, why not admit it frankly, and at least concede

that some other cause must be invoked? He speaks (p. 122) of "the primeval slime out of which organic life has come," and the context indicates that man with his intelligence came up from that "primeval slime." Man is "in his instinctive life close cousin to the brutes." "But he has also in his nature the deep-grounded tendencies of hundreds of thousands of generations of savage human ancestors."

But that man has an ethical and spiritual nature—of that fact no cognizance is taken in this essay. It is pitiful to realize that the president of a great American University—one founded, too, by the Christian Church—is so much more impressed with man's having been made in the image of the ape than of his having been created in the image of God. Is it any wonder that many of our institutions of higher education are turning out hundreds and thousands of earthly and earthy minded materialists?

In the next chapter ("Societal Evolution") the author, Professor Keller, takes the same position in regard to man's bestial origin. Of evolution he says *ex cathedra* (p. 126): "No informed person feels any longer the need of arguing the truth of the theory." Again he says (p. 131): "My predecessors in this course of lectures have shown that the evolutionary process does not stop short of man as an animal." Also (p. 132): "Over all the earth he is pretty much the same sort of animal." Like the muck-rake man in Bunyon's "Pilgrim's Progress," these scientists do not seem to be able to lift their eyes from the ground. Animals, brutes, monkeys, apes, and gorillas *galore*—but no knowledge of God!

The last lecture of this series, "The Trend of Evolution," by Professor Edwin Grant Conklin, of Princeton University—an institution also established by the Christian Church—soars no higher, but moves—yes, *creeps*—along on the same low, earth-born plane of thought. In beginning his essay, he refers to "the Olympian gods" and to the "modern movie," but that is as high as he gets. The God of Theism receives no recognition. Note his basal conception of the origin of things (p. 152):

"What merely human intellect could have foreseen, in those earliest protoplasmic particles, 'the promise and potency of all life,' the million species of animals and plants, the monsters of the deep, the giant saurians, the mighty beasts, and finally man?" There are more interrogations of the same grade. On the next page he implies that man, like all other living things, came from "the original amœba." Just to show how far he is from lifting up his eyes unto the hills, unto Jehovah, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, we cite here the "causes" which he assigns for the whole evolutionary process from protoplasmic slime and the original amœba up to man (p. 154): "Unfortunately our knowledge of the causes of evolution are not very complete, but the majority of biologists agree that inherited variations, or mutations, constitute the building materials of evolution, while natural selection, or the elimination of the unfit, is the workman or architect that selects or rejects these materials."\* Again *nota bene* (p. 182): "It is probably fortunate that men are not charged with the duty of directing future evolution, and we can only hope that nature, which has directed progressive evolution from amœba to man, without human guidance, may work still greater wonders in future ages." Observe, "nature" has done it all! It has all been done "without human guidance." This makes nature the only god and man merely the cat's-paw of nature. This essay contains a long discussion of the uncertainties in predicting the outcome of the evolutionary process, and concludes with the following unsatisfying statement as the result of all scientific investigation and thought: "We cannot see clearly the next scene; we can scarcely imagine the next act, and the end of the great Drama of evolu-

---

\*Think of the caliber of an intellect that would call "inherited variations" the "building material" and "natural selection" "the workman." These are terms that merely stand for a condition, a law, or *modus operandi* according to which a cause or a force works; they are not the cause or the force itself. The bottom question is, What is the *force* that pushes along the whole process and causes it to operate as it does? Is that cause merely a blind natural cause or is it an Intelligent Cause? But our point now is, that these scientists mistake laws and conditions for causes. It is these "drop-stitches" in logic that are doing untold harm to our science, civilization, and religion today.

tion, if there is to be an end, is a matter of faith alone." Surely, surely, evolution has made our age an "age sick with a deadly doubt."

THE CONJECTURAL ASPECTS OF THE THEORY

Thus far we have simply exposed the groundling character of the evolutionary hypothesis in the hands of its scientific exponents. We are wondering whether it would not be well for Christian preachers and theologians to walk warily before they enter into close fellowship with the evolutionists and become their partners in propagating this theory in the world. Here are five foremost naturalists who try to account for all phenomena in the natural and human world by the action of merely resident and natural forces. A previous book, issued by the Yale University Press and written by five Yale University professors, is of the same groundling character.\* Are Christians going to join this materialistic crowd? Is the theory of evolution a theory that can be Christianized, that can be harmonized with the Christian Scriptures, which must ever be the authority for Christian people? Let us look before we leap.

However, we admit frankly that, if evolution were really proven by the findings of natural science, all of us would, we hope, be honest and truth-loving enough to abide by the result. But it would be better and wiser to wait until the theory is proven on an empirical basis; it will be time enough *then* to see whether it can be adjusted to Christian doctrine. At present we do not see how the theory can be harmonized with the teaching of the Bible honestly interpreted as it reads; but we do not feel strongly impelled to attempt such a reconciliation as long as evolution rests only on a conjectural or hypothetical basis, and especially as long as so many outstanding and undermining facts seem to be against it.

In order to make good our assertion that the theory of evolution has not been empirically established, we shall

---

\*The title of the book referred to is, "The Evolution of the Earth and Its Inhabitants," and the writers who furnish the several chapters are Professors Barrell, Schuchert, Woodruff, Lull, and Huntington, all of Yale University. It was published in 1918.

now proceed to analyze the processes of reasoning and induction employed in the book before us. While the authors are, no doubt, excellent and painstaking physical scientists, they do not seem to have had careful training in the science of logic; hence throughout their productions two well-known logical fallacies are constantly recurring—namely, the *hysteron proteron* and the *non-sequitur*. The first means that the conclusion is mistaken for the premise, and therefore it amounts to “begging the question” or taking for granted the very issue that is in dispute. The second fallacy is that of drawing an unwarranted conclusion from given premises; it also includes the mistake of making over-broad generalizations from a small body of facts. In order to give a thorough exposition of these faults of logic we ought to have unlimited space; but since that is out of the question, we must confine our discussion to a few clear examples.

We shall begin with Professor Lull’s chapter on “The Antiquity of Man,” the first in the book, which sets forth “the paleontological evidence for the evolution of man.” In order to prove man’s antiquity in opposition to Dr. Lightfoot’s interpretation of the Biblical chronology, Professor Lull refers to several tablets, one of them at present in the Yale Babylonian Collection, which he holds to be “the oldest human documents thus far discovered.” We have no occasion to dispute his statements, nor shall we in any place call into question any statement of facts produced by our authors, our only purpose being to point out the flaws in their logical processes, that is, their inconsequential thinking and far-fetched conclusions. These Babylonian tablets, says our author, antedate Christ by some 5,500 to 6,000 years. Yet they are no longer ideographs or picture-writing, but have advanced to inscriptive writing. This proves, he says, that they “have progressed far along the evolutionary pathway,” etc. Here evolution is simply taken for granted; but it is the very thing to be proved and which the evidence is adduced to prove; thus here we have the *hysteron proteron*. We might interpret the situation differently, by saying that there may have been progress from one form of writing

to a more advanced form without its having been brought about by mere natural evolution; for man may have been so constituted from the start by his Creator as to be able to do inventive and creative work through the exercise of his native intelligence and volition. Our author thinks that the evolution from picture-writing to inscriptive writing was "a centuries-long process." But that may also be a *non-sequitur*; for, if man was originally constituted a rational being by his Creator, the progress referred to would not have needed to take very long. In the course of human history there are many instances of rapid progress along certain lines; and especially when all the world was new, and so many discoveries were just at hand, one would think that advancement would have been quite rapid. Why not look to higher sources for our interpretation of man instead of forever peering down at the poor overdone and much be-ridden ape? Our scientist also contends that even the protoscript (the very first writing) could have been invented only "by people of considerable intellectual powers who had long since emerged from savagery," etc. Here again occurs the same fallacy, that of taking the evolutionary theory for granted, while it is the very *crux* in the argument.

The writer then passes on to consider "the implements and weapons of vanished people, with their varying degrees of refinement." Here we have a discussion of the Eolithic, Paleolithic, and Neolithic periods. We are pleased that the author so frankly admits cases of doubt and of difference of opinion among the scientists. For example, with respect to the eoliths, the oldest of these implements, he states that there are scientific authorities who deny that they are of human workmanship, but "invoke the physical forces of nature to account for their seeming." But do not the scientists realize that this difference of opinion respecting eoliths throws doubt on the theory of the evolution of mankind at its very start? If they cannot agree whether certain implements were man-made or nature-made, how can they be so sure that man was even in existence as long ago as they suppose? You see, it is pretty much guesswork.

A little further on (p. 3) our author makes another concession which is a mark of his honesty, but is, at the same time, a *coup de maitre* against the evolution hypothesis. We shall state it briefly and simply, but give the true sense. All through human history people of various degrees of cultural advancement have been living contemporaneously in different parts of the earth; here they are highly civilized, there they are almost naked savages. For example, the last of the native Tasmanians died only in 1877; yet these people were in a cultural state as low as that of the eolithic, or at least the paleolithic, folk. Yes, and that right down to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, contemporaneous with the advanced civilization of Europe and America, within the memory of many people now living! Is not that a fatal count against evolution? Even if there were paleolithic, or even eolithic, people in existence in Europe centuries ago, may they not have lived synchronously with the great civilizations of Babylonia, Egypt, and even Greece, simply dwelling far off in the hinterlands? Even to-day there are wild, uncouth and savage people living in remote regions. Right here in America, before our very eyes, we have proof on proof of the rapid deterioration of people who have become segregated from the centers of civilization. Now, since we have proof *positive* and *prima facie* of such human deterioration in our own times, and since no instance of evolution by merely resident forces from lower to higher civilizations can be cited, is it not better reasoning to conclude that the eolithic, paleolithic, and neolithic folk were remote and therefore degenerate tribes living within historic times? Missionaries inform us that almost all people in darkest Africa furnish clear evidence that they are the decadent offspring of races that were once enlightened. The grammatical structure of their languages, the principles of which they themselves do not understand and of which they are not even aware, proves their descent from superior races, or at least points to that view as the only logical deduction.\* In fact, it is

---

\**Vide* the "Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute," 1921. We quote from several scientific laymen who have

utterly gratuitous to conclude that the lowest types of humanity living to-day are the representatives of the progenitors of the human race.

The author may be correct in holding that Asia is the birthplace of mankind; but when he argues that the physical and climatic conditions there during the Tertiary era were such as to force man's "pre-human forebears" to descend from the trees and to learn to live on the ground, he is again reasoning in a circle and taking for granted the very thing to be proved. Was man once an arboreal creature? That is the mooted question. It lacks empirical and historical proof; it is another extreme generalization from meager data. As far back as we can trace men historically, they have been terrestrial beings. The fact that they are so today, whether low or high in the scale of civilization, would seem to indicate that they have always moved about on *terra firma*. This also agrees with all human traditions. It also harmonizes with the greatest and best book in the world—the Holy Bible. You must go back to the monkeys and the apes again to get the tree-clambering idea of primitive man. We repeat that we do not believe in interpreting man by the beasts of the jungle, but rather by the fact that he was created in the image of God. Some people are always looking down; they ought to learn to look up.

The saving clause with our scientists is their honest admissions. On page 7 Professor Lull begins his dissertation on the fossil remains of human beings, which, he holds, furnish to the paleontologist the "most convincing line of evidence for the antiquity of man." Then he says that "these remains are rare," which statement he follows

---

made special researches in ethnology: "Fetichism bears traces of truths far above and beyond itself. How did these find their way in? The answer is difficult on the evolutionary hypothesis" (p. 153). "Is fetichism a first step up or a last step down, an evolution or a degradation? The former is contrary to experience" (p. 164). "Fetichism is a degradation from a purer faith, of which it contains traces, a far-off glimpse of a Supreme Creator" (p. 165). "I cannot believe that polytheism develops into monotheism; still less that polydemonistic tribal beliefs reach monotheism by the same route. History testifies to the contrary" (p. 167). "So far from civilization having been evolved from the savage state, the opposite is the case." "Monotheism preceded polytheism."



by showing that they must be rare from the very nature of the case. "One marvels," he adds, "not that the missing links in our chain of evidence are many, but rather that we possess any chain at all."

This frank concession must be analyzed. The admission is made that "the missing links in our chain of evidence are many." Then we would beg to know, since many of the links are missing, how the scientists can erect a vast scientific structure on the mere supposition that those missing links once existed. To set forth and propagate a theory on which the faith and fate of many persons may be at stake, and claim that it has been proved on a supposititious basis like that, is certainly assuming a great and solemn responsibility.

It is an evasion of the real question to say, the wonder is "that we possess any chain at all." If nature wrought all things through myriads on myriads of years by means of evolution, we would have a right to expect her to leave everywhere indubitable marks of her *modus operandi*, and furnish unmistakable clues of the same process today. One cannot help wondering why at least a fair number of those myriads of intermediate forms have not been found. They surely ought to be in evidence—if they ever existed. To say that they did exist, but we ought not to expect to find them, is merely, once more, to beg the question. The study of geology proves that there are missing links along the whole line of organic life; and they are always missing, too, at the strategic points where the evolutionists need them most.

The contention that man is of brute lineage over against the doctrine that he was created in the divine image an intelligent, moral, and spiritual being, as the Bible teaches, is a matter of such grave import, involving the welfare of humankind both for time and eternity, that it ought to rest on indubitable evidence, and ought not to be taught and propagated unless it is supported by such evidence. We cannot believe that acceptance of the theory of a brute origin for man will make men better and nobler; indeed, we fear it will only tend to debase them. Have the evolutionists ever thought of that? For our part, our sense

of responsibility as an instructor is so keen that we long ago made up our mind to teach no theory that bears vitally on the welfare of humankind, unless we are convinced of its truth by irrefragable proof and absolute assurance.

#### THE INADEQUACY OF THE DATA

Limits of space forbid our following the author page by page, although we wish this could be done. It is both interesting and surprising to note how many damaging admissions honest scientists are compelled to make. For instance, Professor Lull says of "a scattered skeleton and one overlaid by absolutely undisturbed deposits" (which are regarded as "good criteria of contemporarity"), that "chance often makes strange bedfellows." Then he narrates that he once found a glass bottle of recent manufacture "beneath the hip bone of an extinct horse in an apparently undisturbed Pleistocene deposit in Texas." Afterward he found that "the looseness of the surrounding sand betrayed a filled-in animal burrow into which the bottle had undoubtedly been thrust." Thus we see how a small circumstance may entirely reverse a situation. Anatomical distinction, though valuable as evidence, also has its difficulties, says our author, because modern types of men have been found in connection with geological formations of great antiquity or with long-extinct animals. Scientists seem to be shifting from their former view of "a single line of phyletic descent to modern man. . . . The belief is gaining ground . . . that there were several lines of descent, all of which may be of ancient origin, so that what have been called modern types of mankind might be found contemporaneous with, or even antecedent to, the remains of more primitive races" (p. 9). Thus we see how scientists continually reverse their positions to fit the case.

We can give only a passing notice to what Professor Lull has to say about the various fossil human remains that have been unearthed. Although we have read the whole presentation most carefully and conscientiously, we remain unconvinced; and for two reasons: 1. The

uncertainty connected with many of these finds and the paucity of the remains in many cases create the general impression on our mind that the theory of human evolution remains unproved empirically.\* 2. There is another explanation of the facts that is just as reasonable, that will, indeed, account more adequately for all the phenomena—namely, that man was originally created in the image of God and that all inferior types of human kind are the result of sin and degeneration. This last view becomes all the more patent when we remember that we see enacted every day right before our eyes the tragedy of human degeneration; whereas we see no decisive evidence anywhere of inferior plants, animals, and men evolving, by means of merely resident forces, into higher types. Every case of improvement comes about because some outside force of a higher character has been injected. If that is the law today, it is probable that it has been the law all along the history of the cosmos.

In his chapter on "The Natural History of Man" Professor Ferris makes a good deal of the recapitulation theory of man's development from the embryonic state (p. 62). Like his confreres, he can see nothing but resemblances to animals in the prenatal development of the human child. He evidently has overlooked what Colgrave and Short (two eminent British scholars) have to say on this point in their recently issued book, "The Historic Faith in the Light of To-day." Note (p. 15): "Nor will anyone who has any real acquaintance with the facts of human and animal embryology be disposed to accept without a great deal of qualification the old evolutionary theory that every man in his development climbs up his own genealogical tree. . . . As Professor Kellogg has writ-

---

\*To cite just one example: The remains of the Trinil Man (*Pithecanthropus erectus*) include only the skull-cap, three teeth and a left femur, the last in an injured or a diseased state. Says the author: "These *probably* pertain to a single individual, although they were found scattered through some twenty yards of space, and were not discovered at the same time." The fact is, the femur was found almost a year later than the cranium. From these meager and uncertain data learned men reconstruct a head that is half human and half simian, and then label the process "science"! To our mind, such "faith" seems like credulity.

ten, 'The recapitulation theory of Fritz Mueller and Haeckel is chiefly conspicuous now as a skeleton on which to hang innumerable exceptions. . . . The recapitulation theory is mostly wrong.'\*\*

But we shall do more than merely quote authorities. The resemblances between the embryo of the child and the animals are only superficial; the germ-plasm of the child is a *human* one from the start, and never develops into anything but a *human* being. This proves that it is essentially and generically unique. There are also a number of missing links in the process of the development, which, like other missing links, must be supplied by the imagination of the scientist. One scientist says that "the entire first half of the history of evolution is not even hinted at in the epitome." Moreover, the embryos of worms and other articulates lie doubled *backward* around the yolk; while all embryos of the vertebrates are doubled the other way from the beginning. If evolution is true, why does not the human embryo begin its development *a la mode* the worms? That is a hard nut for the evolutionists to crack.

But even if the human embryo does repeat all the steps in the cosmical process from the amoeba to man, it does not necessarily prove man's descent from those lower forms of life. It simply proves that man is in many respects like them. It is just as reasonable to believe that God created man to be vitally and organically connected with his natural environment, so that he would be "at home" in it. That view would readily account for the many resemblances between man and the vegetables and animals, and would at the same time give an adequate explanation of man's higher rational, moral, and spiritual characteristics.

In regard to the "blood relationship" existing between man and the anthropoid apes (p. 78), because of the apes' susceptibility to human diseases and their reaction to

---

\*The footnote references to scientific authorities cited by these authors are as follows: Kellogg, "Darwinism To-day," pp. 18, 21. See also Prof. Sedgwick, "Darwin and Modern Science," Darwin Centenary Volume, p. 174, and Article, "Embryology," Encyclopaedia Britannica.

various blood tests, we would again refer Professor Ferris to Colgrave and Short (pp. 14, 15): "Great capital has recently been made of the fact that the precipitin test shows no difference between the blood of an ape and that of a man, which is held to prove that they are chemically identical. But newer tests (agglutinins) have since been made use of, and it is safe to say that no surgeon in the light of our present-day knowledge would be so foolhardy as to transfuse any large quantity of an ape's blood into a man." As to these matters, the present writer cannot speak from first-hand knowledge, but he has much confidence in the authorities cited; for they are two learned, scientific laymen of Great Britain, and are not preachers nor theologians,\* although they are staunch evangelical believers.

More, much more might be said to show forth the *non-sequiturs* and *hysteron proterons* of this book on the side of evolution which we have been reviewing. The careful reading of the work, and the no less careful endeavor to weigh judicially the facts and arguments adduced by the authors, have convinced us more firmly than ever that the theory of evolution lacks a scientific foundation, and is based on mistaken inductions, while there are many facts that are against it. No one needs, therefore, to be in haste to throw overboard the Biblical teaching relative to the origin, purpose, and destiny of man. So far from being "in the bondage of fear," we Christian believers may feel greatly reassured regarding our rational, comforting and uplifting religion.

---

\*In order that the reader may share our confidence in the authorities we have cited, we impart the following facts from the title-page of their cogent book, "The Historic Faith in the Light of To-day": B. Colgrave has the M. A. from two English universities, and is described as "late scholar of Clare College, Cambridge, lecturer on English in the University of Durham." A. Rendle Short has the following titles: M. D., B. S., B. Sc., F. R. C. S., and is "Lecturer on Physiology in the University of Bristol, Examiner and Ex-Hunterian Professor in the Royal College of Surgeons." The book was published in 1922, and hence is also up to date.