

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR,

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LXIV.



LONDON :

Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1932

759TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 23RD, 1932,

AT 4.30 P.M.

SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, D.Sc., F.R.S. (*President*),
IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON SECRETARY announced the election of the following:— Miss E. R. Elverson as a Life Associate and the Rev. J. A. Harper and Brig.-General F. D. Frost, C.B.E., M.C., as Associates.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Mr. H. R. Kindersley to read his paper on “The Bible and Evolution: The Evidence of History and Science.”

*THE BIBLE AND EVOLUTION: THE EVIDENCE OF
HISTORY AND SCIENCE.*

By HENRY R. KINDERSLEY, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

INTRODUCTION.

YOU are listening to-day to views on the Bible and biology of the old orthodox description. They will not, I assume, suit the minds of everyone; nevertheless as those here present will impute to each other nothing but the highest motives, a fair presentation of the case should yield good results, either in modifying our outlook or (if the arguments are fallacious) in confirming us in our views.

I lay no claim to special scientific knowledge or superior intelligence. I have endeavoured to deal with the subject as a lawyer preparing a case with scientific material of the highest quality. I take it that we all desire to approach the subject with the unfaltering belief in the logic that “two and two make four,” or, in other words, that truth in the end must prevail. Realizing the undermining power of Darwin’s Evolution which,

together with the Higher Criticism, tends to loosen men's hold on Christianity, along with many others, I have felt drawn to examine the various views current among evolutionists to-day.

We cannot disregard Dr. Sayce' assurance when he tells us "that the 'Higher Criticism' is bankrupt whenever tested by the facts of modern discovery and scientific archæology. The rout is complete," and the backbone of the higher criticism is belief in Evolution, if Professor Bethune Baker, an accredited leader, is to be believed; for in the November number of the *Outline*, 1929, in answer to the question, "Is Modernist Christianity a new religion?" he said "*First, I must say something about 'Evolution' because every answer I can make depends on it.*"

By some evolutionists it is made to appear as if the objections to Evolution are based on blind and inveterate prejudice, where the logic of science is not permitted a hearing. I will endeavour to expose the fallacy of this prepossession by offering facts, from which you will gather that the real opposition to Evolution rests upon the merits of the case. Evolutionists have made an appeal to the logic of *History* and *Science*. Followers of the orthodox views have accepted the challenge, and claim an unbroken series of victories in many fields of scientific research—Biology, Physics, Archæology, Astronomy, Philology; while so far not a single destructive point has been registered to the credit of Evolution against the orthodox faith. This may seem to many people to be an unduly bold assertion; but it merely expresses the naked truth.

HISTORY.

As judges in these matters, whether from a religious or secular point of view, the men and women of to-day are ready to accept the evidence of their physical senses. They realize that, if the historical facts of the Old Testament are true, then Evolution is a fallacy, for the Biblical events stand for a record of God's intervention in the affairs of men and nature, in pursuance of a divine plan revealed to man's first parents; and these events are classed as "catastrophism," the very antithesis of Evolution.

Thomas Huxley said, "Evolution, if consistently accepted, makes it impossible to accept the Bible,"—quoted by W. Bell Dawson, D.Sc., in his foreword to *Evolution and the Break-up of Christendom*, by C. Leopold Clarke (1930.) Like many others

throughout the Old Testament, the troubled disciples of the risen Christ were mercifully granted that physical evidence which carried conviction—"Handle Me and see . . ." The same mercy is extended to the sceptics of this generation. Year by year unimpeachable evidence accumulates, testifying to the startling and unrivalled exactitude of the historical records of the Old Testament, labelled by evolutionists "tradition," "mythology" and "legend."

It is just this accuracy that has converted brilliant scientists, engaged to-day in archæological research in the Middle East, from open sceptics to avowed and ardent believers in the Christian faith as enunciated by the Creeds—Sir William Ramsay and Dr. A. H. Sayce among them. These and such like names cannot be brushed aside as nonentities: they are the greatly honoured scientists of the world in archæology and philology. These are no armchair philosophers tied to the skeleton of a once accredited theory of Evolution. The results to date of their enthusiastic labours, fortified by those of Dr. Garstang and Sir Flinders Petrie, have gone far to prove to our physical senses the marvellous accuracy of Old Testament records, and have falsified the view that "the Pentateuch is a patchwork of folk-lore and fable," the work of a body of designing and unscrupulous priests, supposed to have lived in the time of the Babylonian Exile.

It must influence our judgment that, one after another of the many assertions in denial of the cherished belief of Christians, issuing from Apostolic times and embodied in the Creeds, have been cast into the limbo of exploded fancies by facts which are ever emerging from the various fields of scientific research. Where to-day stands the allegation that Moses could not write, or that moral culture was not sufficiently advanced in his day to have allowed him to evolve the decalogue? In *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* and *Historical Accuracy of the Old Testament*, Professor R. Dick Wilson, D.D., together with other high authorities, among them the Rev. A. H. Finn, author of *The Unity of the Pentateuch*, has shattered the suggestion that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses, and that, consequently, "Jesus Christ was deluded" in ascribing its authorship to Moses (see *Modern Churchman*, Oct. 8th, 1928).

Where to-day are the incredulous smiles of Biblical critics over the fall of the Walls of Jericho, in view of the evidence supplied last year by Dr. Garstang, evidence of a quality that

appeals to our very hands and eyes? Are we not also entitled to call for explanations of the reiterated assertion that the flood of Genesis was a myth, in face of the physical proofs from Ur of the Chaldees, rendered by Professor L. Woolley and Dr. Langdon of that "flood of unexampled magnitude" upon which they quite unexpectedly stumbled?

SCIENCE.

Evolutionists have appealed to science, but they refuse to abide by its verdict that "*species blocks the way.*" The definition of *species* given by Professor Poulton to the British Association in 1926 is short but decisive—"An interbreeding community." The test is a breeding matter, pure and simple. Is it sufficiently appreciated, what a flood of light has been thrown upon the vexed yet vital problem of "species" by these few plain words of definition?

I wonder how many will agree that, "in the light of modern knowledge," this amounts to a complete solution. To employ this formula experimentally, recourse must obviously be had to living "species," which in the vegetable and animal kingdoms number perhaps a million—Darwin's estimate was "two to three millions." Yet, with this vast field of research open to them, evolutionists persistently refuse to allow the "genetics" of "existing species" to speak (the one department of science which alone has been productive of positive results in the matter of Evolution; its voice, whenever raised, is deliberately smothered), and almost entirely confine their barren investigations to the sphere of "comparative anatomy" (*i.e.*, similarities or resemblances in organic structures) with a special partiality for palæontology (science of fossil remains).

If any question this, let them examine the various contributions to current literature by Sir Arthur Keith, Professor Pycraft, Professor Elliot Smith and other biologists pledged to Evolution. This is all the more unaccountable when we recall Sir Arthur Keith's assurance, in his Presidential Address to the British Association in 1927, that "the guide to the world of the past is the world of the present." That staunch evolutionist, Mr. Julian Huxley, is evidently impressed by this studied neglect of "living species." He says that evolutionists "not only do not avail themselves of the new tool, but evince positive hostility to it. The new principles are indeed the *only tool* (my italics)

we at present possess which is capable of putting evolutionary theories to experimental test. Yet with a few honourable exceptions, most taxonomists and evolutionists prefer to stick to speculative methods."—*Nature*, April 12th, 1924, p. 520, (quoted by C. Leopold Clarke in *Evolution and the Break-up of Christendom*, p. 141). Here we have a lacerating wound for evolutionists received in the house of their friend!

By thus limiting their search to the field of "comparative anatomy," evolutionists exultingly produce a mass of similarities in organic structures and habits, which nevertheless have never yet furnished, and never seems likely to furnish, them with the line of small transitions necessary to make out even a conjectural case for evolutionary ascent; while they disregard the plain logic that these same similarities support the belief in "special creations" by *One Master Mind—similarities which are the hall-mark and sign-manual* of the almighty Architect and Author of all phenomena, organic and inorganic.

The case of the hare and rabbit affords a simple illustration of the futility of expecting "comparative anatomy" to furnish the missing evidence for Evolution; and at the same time it supplies a convincing example of the immutability of "species." Here are two types of rodents exhibiting such remarkable similarities of structure and "posture"—(see Sir Arthur Keith's address, British Association, 1931, on "posture") that if the case for Evolution rested on structural and postural resemblances then evolutionists would triumphantly declare that "all thinking men are agreed" that Evolution has now passed the stage of theory and entered the happy state of certainty. They would claim this to be a clear-cut case of ascent in the scale of life—or was it, perchance, a case of "degeneration"! Which first saw the light of day, the rabbit or the hare? And which of them claims priority of place in the scale of life?

Now let us exchange the hazy area of plausible appearances for the region of realities. Let us follow the advice of Sir Arthur Keith and Professor Julian Huxley and turn to the "species" of the present as the only guide to the "species" of the past. *Examined as living species*, we find that the hare and the rabbit absolutely refuse to interbreed. Moreover, one of them produces its young blind and naked and the other open-eyed and covered with fur. Under Professor Poulton's definition of "species" the fact of sterility proclaims these two types of rodents (*in spite of cogent appearances to the contrary as judged by comparative*

anatomy, and also that they are both said to chew the cud !) to be unrelated, separate "species"—each in itself an "*interbreeding community*"—*sterile with all others*. And this case is just one of the million similar prohibitive obstacles *in the shape of "living species"* which have faced evolutionists since Darwin launched upon the world his agitating theory of Evolution by "natural selection." *For Evolution to succeed, this massed wall of living obstacles must be breached or surmounted, one or the other.*

We can confidently challenge evolutionists to descend from unprofitable generalities to the particulars of the case, and give us in detail, from the million living "species" known to science to-day ("a sufficient field, one might think, for observation," as Darwin said), one single instance of the crossing of two "species" or the ascent of any one of them in the scale of life, *to form a new "species."* In short, "species" with its isolating factor of sterility stands for fixed rigidity, and that spells death to any theory of organic evolution, *since all life, vegetable and animal, is marshalled into "species."* That factor of sterility has never been known to be "acquired." It is the one determining patent of "species" all the while open to proof.

Sir William Bateson on this matter says: "If 'species' have a common origin, where did they pick up the ingredients which produce this sexual incompatibility [sterility]. Almost certainly it is a 'variation' in which something has been added!" (see *William Bateson, F.R.S., Naturalist*, by B. Bateson, p. 393).

This unique, because inviolable, "something added," viz., sterility, must mean "creation" or special intervention, and a little further on this view is clearly seen to be that of the great biologist. He says: "If thus one plant may by appropriate treatment be made to give off two distinct forms, why is not that phenomenon a true instance of Darwin's origin of 'species' ? . . . We know that that is not the true interpretation, for that which comes out *is no new creation.*"—(p. 396.)

All this goes to confirm the scientific accuracy of the record of Genesis, where we are told, nine times, as if to force the fact upon our attention, that the various forms of life were to appear "after their (or his) kind," that is, to follow some given order; and "kind" denotes a genetic and not a morphological distinction. Obviously the God-given factors of sterility were already added in the original stock determining the "kind" or "species" before the sea and earth brought them forth to order.

In varying degrees practically all these million "species" resemble, each one, some other "species" in structure or habits, if only to mark the unity of the Creator's handiwork; *yet none of them can be coaxed to transgress the bounds of their "specific" limitations.* At the same time, each "species" appears to be endowed with wonderful powers of variation—an elasticity capable (among other advantages) of adapting it to an ever-changing environment.

Professor Huxley said: "If this (*i.e.*, that variations never culminate in new 'species') was the necessary and inevitable result of all experiments, the Darwinian hypothesis would be shattered" (see *Sir William Bateson, F.R.S., Naturalist*, by B. Bateson, p. 461). After seventy years of searching by the greatest brains of the period, can evolutionists give us one solitary example among existing forms of life of a new "species" arriving from variations; and if not, how will they settle with Huxley? By "Darwinian hypothesis" Huxley evidently did not intend to limit himself to "natural selection."

What comment also do evolutionists make on the following unqualified admissions—just a few selected from a volume of similar admissions by leading scientists throughout the world? And how do they reconcile such admissions with their solemn assurances before the British Association last year—that Evolution is now a proved fact, and no longer merely a plausible theory? Let us hear what scientists are really saying:

SCIENTIFIC ADMISSIONS.

"For the moment . . . the Darwinian period is past; we can no longer enjoy the comfortable assurance which once satisfied so many of us that the main problem had been solved—all is again in the melting-pot. By now in fact a new generation has grown up that knows not Darwin."—*Dr. D. H. Scott, LL.D., D.Sc., F.R.S., Professor of Botany, University College, London: Address, British Association, 1921.*

"At the present moment we seem to have reached a phase of 'negation' with respect to the attempts of botanists to trace out lines of evolutionary descent."—*F. O. Bower, Professor of Botany, Glasgow University, President British Association, 1930—"Nature," March 8th, 1924.*

"At the meeting of the British Association at Oxford . . . 1926, Professor H. F. Osborn, in discussing the problem of the

origin of species . . . said, 'The word "creation" must certainly be linked with the word "evolution" to express in human language the age-long origin of species. Were Darwin alive to-day he would be the first to modify the speculations and conclusions of 1859.'—*Sir Ambrose Fleming, D.Sc., F.R.S., "Evolution and Revelation,"* 1926 (p. 12).

Professor Osborn's admission implies that, on something like a million occasions the Creator must have intervened to create life! Now Genesis had already revealed this secret by informing us that all life was ordered "*after their kind*"—a decree in "genetics" from which there is no escape." "*Species*" blocked the way to Evolution from the first "*Creation*" of life.

It is also worth observing that Professor Osborn, in making this profoundly important admission, omits all references to "genera" and "phyla" obviously because these and all other human attempts (in the interests of Evolution) to extend classifications in Biology, including the misnamed sub-species beyond those revealed in Genesis, are artificial and arbitrary conceptions, based alone on "resemblances" and wholly unrecognized by "species." Whereas the claims of "species" are demonstrable to our senses by a natural law of sterility, which is in active and universal operation among all living forms to-day.

The failure of evolutionists has lain in their endeavours to correlate morphology and "genetics." But these sciences are not fundamentally comparable. The hare and the rabbit have illustrated how "species" ignores "similarities" of form; and to show its disregard for "dissimilarities," what more ludicrous contrast in structure and appearance exists than that of the greyhound and the pekingese? Yet when breeding-time comes round the demands of "species" are undeniable. Here we have identity of "species" coupled with diversity of forms. Dog, Wolf, Jackal—call the "species" what you will, they are all interfertile and their progeny can reproduce; but none of them has ever been known to breed and reproduce a new type with the Fox!—though a few are said to have been known to breed (*vide* "Fox," *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Edition XI). The exception, however, is denied by authorities at South Kensington Natural History Museum.

The governing principle of all these experiments is solely the breeding capacity. Yet, strangely enough, in their pursuit of "species," the lure of likeness still holds captive a large body of evolutionists within the fruitless fields of morphology. If Sir

Arthur Keith's comparative measurements of ape and human remains are claimed to be valid as evidence of genetic relationship, the logic must hold good for the hare and rabbit and perhaps more so! But if applied to these rodents, it does not assist in the smallest degree to solve the problem of "species," for each is encased in its own impenetrable cell of sterility which no measurements can touch; and it is the obstacle of sterility that every evolutionist is endeavouring to surmount. *We submit that "species" or "kind" is (and ever has been) the only ordained unit of delimitation and order, operating equally throughout the entire realm of organic nature.*

So far as hybridisation is concerned—and I say this reverently—the reason for this inviolable law of sterility seems perfectly clear. Free crossing of all forms of life would spell chaos throughout the entire organic range; and, moreover, that variations might not wander off into utter confusion, it has been proved by Mendel, and confirmed by Sir William Bateson and others, that the workings of pronounced characters within the "species" are governed by laws of the strictest constancy, which leave no room for immutable added factors, the necessary postulates of any theory of permanent progressive change.

Let us return to our quotations: "We see no changes in progress around us in the contemporary world which we can imagine likely to culminate in the 'evolution' of forms distinct in the larger sense" (*i.e.*, new species).—*Sir William Bateson, F.R.S., Naturalist*, by B. Bateson, 1928 (p. 295). This President of the British Association died in 1925.

"We cannot see how the 'differentiation' into 'species' came about. 'Variation' of many kinds, often considerable, we daily witness, but no origin of species."—*Ibid.*, p. 392.

"We no longer feel, as we used to do, that the process of 'variation' now contemporaneously occurring is the beginning of a work which needs merely the element of time for its completion: *for even time cannot complete that which has not begun.*"—*Ibid.*, p. 393 (*my italics*).

From this we gather that Sir W. Bateson, who cannot be accused of being a half-hearted evolutionist, was reluctantly driven to admit that Darwin's child, "organic Evolution," never breathed. It was stillborn. And the millions of years in the past which Darwin's disciples have conjured up for the evolution of existing forms of life, even if true in point of time, accordingly have missed their purpose.

Why do evolutionists continue to blind the eyes of the world by centring attention on that poor fugitive, "the missing link" between man and the ape? Unquestionably the public have been led to believe that a single link alone was missing in an otherwise complete chain of evidence in proof of Darwin's mental creation—"organic Evolution." Have men not yet realized that there is no such thing as "the missing link"? For the truth is that, all the time, unappreciated by the public, the overwhelming fact existed (and no one knew it better than the evolutionist leaders) that all of the *genetic* links are missing between each of the million "species"—vegetable and animal—known to science.

It is this uncompromising fact that has driven (and is driving) distinguished scientists of many nations, without trumpeting their retreat, quietly to abandon the sinking ship of Evolution. Professor Kammerer to-day is not content with a negative view of Evolution. Though couched in the language of morphology, he says, "The theory of Evolution at the present time is pointing in that direction (*viz.*, the unchangeableness of types); it is returning to the theory of non-Evolution."—*Literary Review*, Feb. 21st, 1924 (p. 538).

Doubtless for the die-hard evolutionist a confession of failure is painful; but some of the more fearless, in the interests of truth, are already facing the facts, like Professor Macmurray in his review of Professor W. Schmidt's recent work, *The Origin and Growth of Religion* (1931), where the former says, in the matter of Evolution, "we are returning to a shame-faced sanity," and again, "If Professor Schmidt is even half right, then it looks as though the great struggle between Religion and Evolution were going to end after all in the triumph of Religion." This word "Religion" can mean nothing else but the Bible, or Creation as revealed in Genesis (see *Bible League Quarterly*, Jan.-Mar., 1932 (p. 33)).

Science now appears to be clearing the stage of the bric-à-brac of all morphological investigations, including those of the fashionable school of "mutations" (since for many scientists they have lost all evidential value, see *Predicament of Evolution*, by Professor McCready Price, p. 72); for the final judgment in the age-long controversy which has raged round the "origin of species," now centred in the practical question—*Is there evidence that new "species" can arise by any natural agency in operation to-day?*

The answer, clear and convincing, rests upon the application to each individual case of the solvent provided by Professor Poulton's definition of "species"—or in other words, "*Is the organic form in question which claims the status of a new 'species' 'an interbreeding community' sterile against all comers, including its parent stock?*"

If the answer is "yes," then a new "species" has arisen. But up to date, without a single exception, the verdict of science upon the thousands of cases presented for examination has been "no." *Whatever special characters of form or habit they may carry, and under careful segregation reproduce (vide De Vries' experiments with the willow-herb) they have all signally failed to break away in the matter of breeding from their ancestral stock or "species."*—(see Professor McCready Price, *Predicament of Evolution*, p. 17.) This verdict of science applies equally to the "mutations" of De Vries as to the "variations" of Mendel (see *Evolution and the Break-up of Christendom*, by C. Leopold Clarke, 1930, p. 142).

I would like to end these quotations by one from Professor D. M. Watson. You can gather from his Presidential address to the British Association in 1929 the parlous condition in which Evolution now stands—(see *The Times*, Aug. 3rd, 1929). He says, "Evolution is a theory universally accepted, *not because it can be proved to be true*, but because the only alternative, 'special creation,' is clearly incredible." Or, in paraphrase, because a number of men refuse to believe in a God Almighty capable of creating the heavens and the earth and every "species" of life, and thereafter sustaining and directing them by laws over which He exercises a perfect control, therefore they feel able to accept the crowning speculation that these organic phenomena "emerged," maintained and advanced themselves by a process of continuous evolution, a theory which "comparative anatomy" and the records of the past refuse to support, and all the investigations of science into living "species" reject as sheer fiction! We could go on to fill a booklet of similar admissions.

If evolutionist leaders persistently refuse to "face the music" of historical and scientific facts in the courts of logic and free discussion, by opening their periodicals and platforms (where temperate papers can be read and questions asked) to men who on reasonable grounds differ from them, they cannot complain if the "thinking" public condemns their attitude as evasive, and noting their "boycott" of living "species," proceeds to

draw its own conclusions. A thousand assurances of confident belief in Evolution, vociferously reiterated, will never do duty for (and in the absence of) one scrap of positive evidence. Nay more, the whole weight of evidence from existing "species" is thrown into the scales against Evolution.

To recapitulate : the Bible, the one and only, first and final authority for Christianity, unlike the sacred books of all other religions of the world, stands for acts of Creation by One Almighty Living Power, followed by a series of historical acts of intervention by the same Power in pursuance of a plan revealed to man's earliest ancestors. The amazing accuracy of these historical records—unique in the annals of history—in many cases has been (and is being) proved to satisfy our physical senses, and as none of these records have been falsified, it furnishes evidence acceptable in any court of law of the Bible's trustworthiness ; and to this estimate of the Bible, science to-day is lending its support, both interested and disinterested. What has Evolution to set against this ?

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Ambrose Fleming, F.R.S.), in some forceful remarks, commended the paper to the serious attention of members of the Institute. Quite clearly, Mr. Kindersley had devoted much attention to the subject, and his lecture was the fruit of careful research.

In conclusion, Sir Ambrose called for the thanks of the meeting, to the lecturer, and the vote was carried with acclamation.

Rev. Dr. H. C. MORTON said : Professor Poulton had framed a very neat definition, viz., " an interbreeding community " ; but long years before 1925 Bateson had laid immense emphasis upon the fact that species limits were determined by interbreeding capacities. In his great speech in Canada, 1921, and the subsequent controversy with Professor H. F. Osborn—a " last ditch " evolutionist—he declared that genetic series of fossils were simply illegitimate guesses, unless the interbreeding capacities of the fossils were known ; and with great scorn of the complacent evolutionary assumptions, Bateson declared that they had no more right to make assumptions about such fossils than they had to make assumptions about the contents of a row of bottles on a chemist's

shelf before they had examined the contents even to the extent of taking out the stoppers !

The speaker thought Mr. Kindersley was wise in emphasizing this matter, and thus confining Evolution, properly so called, to the *organic* realm. The only legitimate meaning of "Evolution" is "the transmutation of species." Evolution ought to be a question of science, not of philosophy ; but to-day the word is being steadily treated as if it were one of indeterminate meaning, the reason being that intelligent men know that there is no scientific evidence for Evolution. It is just a matter of faith, and (very emphatically) of arrogant dogmatism.

Hence, Professor J. A. Thomson and many others are trying to affirm that it only means "changing order, orderly change." But this is not so. The doctrine of Evolution was the pet theory of a small *coterie*, until Darwin by his clever and plausible advocacy made it the dogmatic belief of vast numbers of mankind. Darwin is the supreme representative of the modern evolutionary movement, and every ordinary man or woman means by "Evolution" what Darwin meant ; and there is no manner of doubt that for Darwin Evolution meant essentially the transmutation of species.

If once we allow the word to be taken to mean just "changing order," which in some senses, of course, everybody allows, the very next thing we shall find is that we shall be accused of allowing that species have been transmuted. Even Bergson gave this warning. Transmutation of Species is stamped so deeply upon the human mind as the meaning of Evolution, that if we allow any secondary and unreal meaning to be now given to it, and admit its truth in this secondary sense, we shall only be perpetuating the transmutation error ; and the discredited theory, being denied admission at the front door, will get in under false pretences at the back !

Evolution, in the sense of "transforming" or "transmutation," the worker of such mighty and incredible change that there is no need to bring in God, is the chief root of Modernism ; and it is being taught in almost all schools to almost all children, as the indubitable truth about the world of life and very particularly about man. This is an outrage of the most unpardonable description. Great numbers of the more intelligent men and women have very strong objection to this feature of our schools to-day, and ordinary fairness

demands that this abuse of the schoolmaster's position should be brought to an end.

MR. GEORGE BREWER said : Mr. Kindersley has, I think, produced undeniable evidence of the fallacy of the Evolution theory. Discoveries in the East continue to establish the accuracy of Bible records, and modern scientific knowledge (apart from human speculation and deduction) confirms our faith in the Bible as the inspired Word of God. Organic Evolution, a term used to describe a process of transformation, assumes that all species of animals and plants now existing have been derived from one, or a few, elementary forms, by gradual development extending over vast periods of time, through the agencies of matter and force, for the origin of which we are unable to account, the result being a natural ascent, of which man is the climax.

The Bible records that God created man in His own image ; being formed of the dust of the ground as to his body, and by the breath of God, man became a living soul ; and we learn that, being tested, man fell, and evidence of that fall has been manifest all through the world's history, but never more so, than at the present time (Gen. i, 26, 27 ; ii, 7 ; iii, 1, 19). The Bible stresses the appalling character and consequence of sin, while it reveals the marvellous provision, which God Himself made for sin's removal. According to Evolutionists sin is merely a surviving remnant of an assumed animal ancestry ; yet the depravity of the human heart and the appalling crimes of which the natural man is capable, notwithstanding his superior knowledge and intelligence, cast an unjust reflection upon any such supposed ancestry.

The Bible records (Gen. i, 21 and 24) that God created every living creature after his kind ; that Noah was commanded to take two of every living thing after his kind into the Ark (Gen. vi, 19, 20) ; the statement of the Apostle Paul on Mars Hill, that God hath made of one blood all nations of men (Acts xvii, 26) as well as that in his first letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv, 28-39) that God giveth to each seed a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body.

Mrs. BOYD said : I should like to draw attention to a verse in the Old Testament in which the Omniscient Creator explicitly

forbade the crossing of breeds (Lev. xix, 19) : "Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind : thou shalt not sow thy field with two kinds of seed ; neither shall there come upon thee a garment of two kinds of stuff mingled together." (R.V.) The Authorised Version mentions "linen and woollen." Had this law been obeyed, we should have had no adulteration of goods ; no "linsey-woolsey" ; and it has not been for the benefit of a civilized world that this law has been disregarded. In Deut. xxii, 9, 11, this command was repeated and amplified by the words, "lest the whole fruit of thy vineyard be defiled."

Rev. C. LEOPOLD CLARKE said : I should like to congratulate the lecturer upon the clear way in which he has shown the obstinate tendency of "Species" to conform to the Biblical account of their nature and origin, and not to that of the evolutionists. The process of exposing Evolution is now very much like "whipping a dead horse," for not only anti-evolutionist, but pro-evolutionist, is engaged in showing that the supposed evidences formerly relied upon must be abandoned. All that is required is the frank and honourable admission that this hypothesis, after the most protracted and experimental research, is known to be an utterly wrong hypothesis. It will awaken early memories for most of us to refer to the famous Jevons, but speaking about the process of "Inductive Logic," he says :

"If we meet with several distinct disagreements between our deductions and our observations, it will become likely that the hypothesis is wrong and we must then invent a new one."

I submit that the torturing of this hypothesis of Evolution has gone far enough—the observations give no ground for the deductions drawn in support of it. But by far the greatest reflection is the moral and religious consequence of the acceptance of this Pagan concept. Too much attention cannot be drawn to the aggressive manner in which Evolution combats Biblical Revelation, as if it were designed especially for that purpose. Huxley, indeed, was honest enough to admit that "if Evolution were consistently accepted, it was impossible to believe the Bible." I remind you of the more recent words of

Mr. H. G. Wells, who, in his *Outline of History*, says: "If all the animals and man had been evolved in this ascendant manner, then there had been no first parents, no Eden, and no Fall. And if there had been no Fall, the entire historical fabric of Christianity, the story of the first sin and the reason for an Atonement, upon which current teaching based Christian emotion and morality, collapses like a house of cards."

These amateur moralists think that it is sufficient, having removed confidence in the eternal sensations, to offer a grinning assurance of well-being to the human conscience, from a process of betterment; against which all history and all experience shouts a prolonged denial. Two further quotations show how thoroughly the acceptance of Evolution disturbs belief in God. Sir Arthur Keith said: "By this new knowledge, my youthful creed was smashed to atoms. My personal God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, melted away. The desire to pray—not the need—was lost; for one cannot pray for help to an abstraction." (*The Forum*, April, 1930.)

In the fifth of an excellent series of tracts on Evolution by Dr. Bell Dawson, of Toronto, the words of a young woman undergraduate are quoted from *The Bible for China*, November, 1927: "The boys and girls that I know, who have accepted the idea that they are only superior animals, are no longer interested in religion, and are wholly animal in their tendencies. Ninety per cent. of the immorality in our University is traceable to this notion. These girls and boys seem to think that all restraint has been removed by this discovery that God did not make them, as taught by the Bible, and that therefore there is no responsibility to God for their actions. The girls are often heard to excuse themselves on the very ground that God, and heaven and hell, and all the rest of it, have been ruled out of existence by Evolution." Most logical thinkers regard that as the inevitable conclusion from the acceptance of Evolution.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

Lieut.-Col. A. G. SHORTT wrote: Mr. Kindersley bases his argument on the one fact that there is no fertility between species. That there are varieties which have much in common, but which are infertile between themselves, is true. We call them distinct species. But he takes it as evidence that they cannot have had a

common ancestor. This surely is not a legitimate deduction. Variation among animals is, of course, common. Where they exist together, the variations are ordinarily bred out again. Where they are segregated from the main stock these variations will in certain cases persist, and become fixed. If they remain segregated, it is at least arguable that, in course of time, they may become less and less fertile with the parental stock, until, perhaps in thousands of years, inter-fertility disappears altogether.

Mr. Kindersley, on the other hand, *assumes* that, because interbreeding, he says, is now impossible, it has always been so. If he says that there is no evidence that it was ever possible, the obvious answer is that there is no evidence to the contrary. The period required is far too long for observation, and the argument for species necessarily fails. We must, therefore, turn elsewhere, and it is clear that the possession of characteristics common to both species is a factor of very great importance, which cannot be left out of consideration. The problem is one of great complexity, and cannot be solved by the quotation of people's opinions, however eminent, or reliance on any single point ; all the evidence available, of whatever kind, will have to be taken into consideration before conclusions of any value can be reached.

LECTURER'S REPLY.

It is most gratifying to find such unanimity in support of the facts and arguments offered in the paper which I had the great privilege of reading. Yet knowing the popularity of Evolution among sections of the community, a strong opposition openly expressed would have been welcome. Indeed, Col. A. G. Shortt alone raised a note of dissent, and in his written criticism he confined his objections to the matter of "species," past and present. He does not seem to question the fact that scientists are unable to disclose any evidence that Evolution, in the production of new "species," is in working order to-day ; but this conclusion does not deter him from arguing that organic Evolution, though undiscoverable now, may yet have been an active factor in the past.

Surely this suggestion shatters the twin pillars of "uniformity" and "continuity" upon which the theory of Evolution was built, and without which it would collapse. We may reasonably ask,

Why and when did a universal system of Evolution cease to operate as the prime factor of origin and maintenance of "species" throughout the vegetable and animal kingdoms?

In dwelling upon the necessity for "isolation" in the Evolution of new "species," Col. Shortt touches one of the weakest spots in the armoury of Evolution. While recognizing its importance of isolation, Darwin refused to allow that his theory was dependent thereon. See *Origin of Species* (Everyman's Library edition, pp. 100, 101); but Col. Shortt evidently regards "isolation" as indispensable in order to obtain purity of seed and prevent "breeding out" by the dominant and normal parent stocks in nature. In this he can count on the support of every practical hybridizer. But in the fields of nature how is "isolation" secured? Is Evolution to be dependent on some fortuitous circumstance of segregation? This was too hazardous a chance to be set to carry even Darwin's gigantic speculation, *who is here seen impaled on the horns of an awkward dilemma*. The factor of time also is raised by Col. Shortt, but this was dealt with in the paper by a forceful quotation from Sir William Bateson.

That "the problem [of life] is one of great perplexity," as he says, is undeniable with Evolution as its solvent, but "in the light of modern knowledge," with Genesis as a guide, doubts vanish, for Genesis with Geology and Biology are found to harmonize in a marvellous manner.