

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

4-15-1939

### The Bearing of the Theory of Evolution Upon the Christian Doctrine of Man

Theodore Martin

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, [ir\\_martint@csl.edu](mailto:ir_martint@csl.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Martin, Theodore, "The Bearing of the Theory of Evolution Upon the Christian Doctrine of Man" (1939). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 31.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/31>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE BEARING OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION  
UPON THE  
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF MAN

A Thesis presented to the  
Faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Divinity

by

Theodore A. Martin

Concordia Seminary,  
April 15, 1939

Approved by

Theodore A. Martin  
Ph. Engelder

*Eloquent and incisive in  
the presentation of a technical  
subject.*

*T. G.*

## CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION	1-15
	AIMS OF EVOLUTION	1
	EVOLUTION AND GOD	5
	EVOLUTION AND THE BIBLE	10
	EVOLUTION AND MAN	14
II	ORIGIN OF MAN	16-30
	CREATION	16
	THE DIVINE IMAGE	21
	METHOD OF FORMATION	26
III	NATURE OF MAN	31-52
	INTELLIGENCE	31
	MORALITY	37
	RELIGION	42
	THE SOUL	47
	EVOLUTION'S LOW ESTIMATE OF MAN	50
IV	THE FALL	53-62
	PRIMEVAL STATE OF MAN	53
	THE FALL ITSELF	55
	SIN	56
V	Conclusion: THE VICIOUSNESS OF EVOLUTION	63-65

## INTRODUCTION

### AIMS OF EVOLUTION

Evolution is an attempt to explain present conditions. In reality it consists of a number of explanatory attempts, none of which are satisfactory. All involve change, a development of the simple into the complex. Evolution has been defined as a "change due to circumstances,"<sup>1</sup> but this is only a part of the story. As it is generally understood, evolution means much more than this. It means a development in matter resulting from the action of forces resident in matter itself.<sup>2</sup>

The different ideas of evolution are classified according to their subject. Thus cosmic evolution deals with the universe. Inorganic evolution deals with lifeless matter, while organic evolution treats of living things, from the tiny one celled plant up to man, the highest of all the animals. These are not easily kept separate, because they run into one another. They overlap. There is as much curiosity as to the universe and the world as there is to the living creatures in the world. There had to be an earth before life could exist on it. Since evolution purports to be an explanation, it is not necessarily to be restricted to one part of what is said to need an explanation. The different kinds of evolution all involve a denial of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Graebner, Theo. Essays on Evolution, pp.34-35  
<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp.35-36

creation story as found in Genesis, and here there is little difference between them.

According to evolutionists the earth was at one time a molten mass. Life is supposed to have appeared on the earth millions of years ago.<sup>1</sup> This, they say, was a very low form of life, and organic evolution tries to show the process by which this first living matter developed into higher animals, and finally man. This required a long time, but the evolutionists have millions of years to bestow where they deem it necessary, so that the average span of life is far too short to witness any evolutionary changes taking place.

The original living matter changed its habits, and this in turn resulted in a change in its structure. Evolution, or the "ascent of life," has been described as "a history of the acquisition of new habits."<sup>2</sup> This concise and seemingly harmless description cannot be applied to evolution as claimed, because the physical changes which result from changed habits are not transmitted by heredity. Darwin's hypothesis, the "survival of the fittest," depended on structural variations, which affected the struggle for existence. Those who possessed the advantageous variations survived, while the others became extinct. This struggle, says Darwin, is most severe with species which have very similar habits and structure and for this reason come into the closest competition with each other. Thus each species will try

---

1 Fairhurst, A. Organic Evolution Considered, p.429

2 Mason, Frances The Great Design, p.157

to exterminate its nearest of kin.<sup>1</sup> This makes for wider variation, and, when the variation becomes wide enough, we are justified in recognizing a distinct species.

One of the frequently mentioned "evidences" of evolution is the similarity in structure and function of corresponding parts of men and other vertebrates, especially mammals, and monkeys in particular. We are told that we "should not waver" in ascribing these manifold resemblances to "genetic relationship." "The more detailed the resemblances, the closer must be the common ancestor." The one who wrote these words immediately added: "This is not evolution. It is a statement of facts, described and classified, plus an indication of the direction in which an interpretation must lie."<sup>2</sup> The mere denial of the name cannot change the evolutionary nature of the claims. If it is not evolution, it is the rose with the familiar odor, and suggests that this author is aware of a stigma attached to the term "evolution," and while he still adheres to the idea, he tries to avoid the term. Other evolutionists calmly assume that the animal ancestry of man is an obvious fact and spend their time arguing about just what the ancestors of man were. Thus it is claimed by one writer that the larger apes could not have been the ancestors of mankind,<sup>3</sup> because they are too large.<sup>4</sup> "Giants do not beget other kinds of giants." This author would have it understood that he is not giving

---

1 The Hibbert Journal, Vol. XXVII, No. 4, July, 1929, p. 666

2 Goldenweiser, Anthropology, p. 5

3 Davis, W. (ed.) The Advance of Science, p. 223

4 Ibid., p. 224

up evolution, "not denying man's kinship to other mammals."<sup>1</sup> Whether or not these men agree on the meaning of evolution is unimportant, as their claims consistently contradict Scripture, but this is one indication of the disunity of evolutionists.

One of the obvious teachings of the Bible is the possibility of miracles. Evolution denies this. The process of evolution must exclude miracles,<sup>2</sup> since evolution is an attempt to explain away the miracle of creation. It "disputes the miracle."<sup>3</sup> The evolutionist must exclude miracles; otherwise he would not be a consistent evolutionist.<sup>4</sup> Objection has been made to this reference to the evolutionists' exclusion of miracles. It is claimed that evolution is no less a miracle than any other miracle, and for this reason the argument about miracles should also be excluded.<sup>5</sup> They prefer to ascribe the ordered universe to chance, rather than to the direct work of God. This removes the miraculous element and permits a natural explanation, but one that is far more improbable than the miracle it seeks to avoid.

Among the more absurd ideas propounded in modern times is that which holds that life was brought to the earth by a meteor from some other [planet, or even a] star. This is too fantastic to deserve much attention, and it is unsatisfactory

---

1 Ibid., p.224

2 Fairhurst, op.cit., p.383

3 W.J.Bryan in The World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.178

4 Fairhurst, op.cit., p.427

5 Goldsmith, W.M. Evolution or Christianity, p.88

even to evolutionists, because it fails to explain the problem of the origin of life, and instead puts it so far distant in time and space as to preclude scientific investigation. Instead of helping to explain, it makes an explanation practically impossible, but it does remove the necessity for special creation on earth and also lends support to agnosticism.<sup>1</sup>

Amid all this wrangling of the evolutionists, Catholicism sits back and takes no definite stand. A Catholic writer claims that the "Fixity of Species" and "Special Creation" never were a part of Catholic philosophy, and for this reason the claims of scientific evolutionists failed to cause Catholicism any trouble.<sup>2</sup> A statement like this shows the regard that Catholicism has for Scripture and also for mankind, as well as its indifference to the false doctrines that follow from this laxity.

#### EVOLUTION AND GOD

Evolution involves a denial of God, although this is not always immediately apparent. The many different ideas of evolution are classified as theistic or atheistic, on the basis of whether or not they have room for God in their scheme of things. The theistic evolutionists do admit that there is a God, but a God in name only, not possessing all the attributes that must belong to a Being deserving of the name of God. To them the acceptance of a God is a matter of

---

1 Princeton Theological Review, Vol. XXIV, 1926, p. 398

2 Kolbe, A Catholic View of Holism, pp. 24-25



convenience. It aids them in smoothing over some of the rough spots in their evolutionary schemes. They use Him only where they need Him, and otherwise He is kept out of the creation and operation of the universe. Thus for the questions of the origin of matter and of life the evolutionists bring in God just long enough to fill their requirements, after which He is relegated to a place and condition of inactivity.

MacBride states that, since all the available evidence leads to the conclusion that the earth was at one time red-hot, and, since life cannot exist even at the temperature of boiling water, "we must postulate for the origin of life an 'act of creation' at some time in the past."<sup>1</sup> He admits that "no natural process known to science will explain the beginning of life."<sup>2</sup> Another, faced with the problem of the emergence of "new forms of relatedness", admits that no clue is to be found in the process. "We may only 'consider and bow the head'; we must accept emergents 'with natural piety.'"<sup>3</sup> Such statements or admissions as these are no real concessions on the part of the evolutionists. They are an indication of defeat in that they show the failure of evolution to account for everything by natural causes, but, since an absentee God is hardly a God at all, the evolutionists are clinging to their anti-Scriptural claims.

---

1 MacBride, E.W. The Oneness and Uniqueness of Life, p.142  
in Mason, F. op.cit., pp.133-158

2 MacBride, op.cit., p.143

3 Anglican Theological Review, Vol.VII, 1925-1925, p.181

The idea of the existence of a God is natural and reasonable. The cosmos itself directs attention to God. Similarly microscopic examination has shown that the cell is a microcosm, a "world of order in itself." <sup>1</sup> It is "just as illogical to suppose that it could have originated by chance, as that a house could grow from a mere aggregation of wood, sand, cement, and iron, without the help of a thinking mind." <sup>1</sup> Evolutionists claim to accept this and still do not yield their evolutionary position.

Many picture God as the One who winds up the universe as a man would wind a clock, after which God has nothing to do with the operation of the universe. Evolution, they say, is God's way of doing things. An example of this is the idea that God created matter and energy, committing to them, as secondary agencies, all subsequent creative acts. This restricts the work of God to "one far off divine event." It puts God out of human history and makes miracles impossible. <sup>2</sup>

Theistic evolutionists claim that after the original act there was no need for God to do anything further. This deistic conception of God is obviously not the correct one. "There is no place left for a personal God who has any present relation to nature or to man." "The most we are allowed to believe is that there is in the universe a 'vast Mind Energy that we call God.'" <sup>3</sup>

---

1 Princeton Theological Review, Vol.XXIV, 1926, p.397

2 Fairhurst, op.cit., p.382

3 Dawson, W.B. The Bible Confirmed by Science, p.61

Monsignor Kolbe of the University of Cape Town, a Catholic, states:

"The Creator sent matter into existence with all its potentialities, endowing it with some of His own creativeness, so that passing higher and higher from form to form it gave forth the voice that had caused it, and perpetually increased the volume of the chorus of creation's praise to its Maker." 1

All this sounds pious enough, but it too is deistic. It appears to honor God, yet it detracts from His glory and power by keeping Him out of world history. This is characteristic of theistic evolution.

"If the demands of evolution are accepted in good faith, then God certainly is robbed of some of the functions traditionally attributed to Him by the orthodox creed of the Christian religion." 2 So states one author, with a great deal of truth. Evolutionists can speak of God in glowing terms, and yet they rob God of His glory and power and make of Him a slave to natural laws, a principle instead of a person. C. Lloyd Morgan, in his *Emergent Evolution*, says:

"If we acknowledge a physical basis of so-called matter and energy as ultimately involved in all natural events, may we not also acknowledge God, as the directive Activity on whom the manner of going in all natural events ultimately depends?" 3

He speaks of God as an important part of evolution, but only as a "directive Activity."

The idea of a God is reasonable. This is obvious from the universal idea of God found in human beings. As Fleming

1 Kolbe, *A Catholic View of Holism*, p.19

2 Cunningham, G.W. *Problems of Philosophy*, p.240

3 Morgan, *Emergent Evolution*, quoted by Chas.L.Dibble in *Anglican Theological Review*, Vol.VII, p.181

says, " ... very deep in the human mind there is and always has been a sense that the ultimate cause of Things and Events is a Self-conscious and Personal Living Being." <sup>1</sup> Yet we find some evolutionists trying to show that there can be a God. Instead of attempting to show that their ideas on evolution are not inconsistent with belief in a God, some follow the opposite procedure and seek to show that the idea of a divine Being can be harmonized with evolution. These try to justify not so much evolution as the belief in God, assuming evolution as the undisputed truth.

Evolutionists, theistic or atheistic, all regard man as descended from the lower animals, and at the same time they profess to have a high regard for man. One says: "The fact that man is the offspring of the brute creation does not prevent him from being also the offspring of God." <sup>2</sup> Man could be the product of the directive Activity which the evolutionists call God, descending by an evolutionary process from the brute. This is degrading both to God and to man. It makes God impersonal and man a beast, the product of evolution.

Some claim that all living beings are divine, and that this divinity differs only in degree in the different species. This divinity is given a mental significance, so that man's mental powers differ from those of the brute only in being more highly developed. T.J.Hudson, in *The Divine*

---

1 Fleming, Ambrose *The Origin of Mankind*, p.3

2 Strong, Augustus H. *Christ in Creation and Ethical Monism*, p.168

Divine Pedigree of Man, states:

"We find ... in the lowest unicellular organism known to science, psychical faculties that by development become the highest mental attributes of man, and by extension to infinity, the highest conceivable attributes of an Omniscient Deity." <sup>1</sup>

The original living cell, he says, possessed potentialities of manhood. It possessed the divine attributes, differing only in degree from God Himself, and, being descended from this specimen of divinity, man has his "divine pedigree."

#### EVOLUTION AND THE BIBLE

This is certainly not the Biblical doctrine of creation, although many profess to believe both evolution and the Bible. Allyn K. Foster claims that "evolution when rightly taught not only does not condemn the Bible and the Church, but is a great factor in strengthening the Christian Church." <sup>2</sup> A statement like this shows extreme lack of understanding of the Bible and Christianity. Another writer says that "Christ is the principle of evolution." <sup>3</sup> Christ, he says, is the wisdom and the power of God, and, stretching things a bit more, he says that "attraction of gravitation" and "medium of knowledge" are other names for Christ." <sup>3</sup> The next step would be the claim that all who believe in gravitation or evolution are Christians. This is not the Christ presented in the Bible, but merely an attempt to introduce the name of Christ into the evolutionary hypothesis,

---

1 Hudson, Thompson Jay The Divine Pedigree of Man, p.273  
 2 Goldsmith, Evolution or Christianity, p.29  
 3 Strong, Christ in Creation and Ethical Monism, p.10

to make it appear less repulsive to Christians.

Evolution has no use for the Bible. It denies that God has revealed Himself to mankind outside nature.<sup>1</sup> Yet evolutionists often try to show that there is no conflict between the Bible and evolution or between Christianity and evolution. This was shown clearly in the well known Stokes trial at Dayton, Tennessee. The aims of the defense were to show that evolution was the truth and that it was not in conflict with religion. The defense introduced the statements of eminent evolutionists to substantiate the contentions of the defense. One of the "experts," Kirtley F. Mather, Chairman of Harvard's Department of Geology, claimed that a choice between evolution and Christianity was absolutely unnecessary.<sup>2</sup>

Such a statement cannot refer to true Christianity, which accepts the entire Bible as God's Word. Modern liberalism, which rejects the Bible and clings to the name of Christianity, can and does embrace evolution. The evolutionists can say that their ideas do not conflict with religion, but by religion they mean little more than a belief in the existence of something divine. By putting the divine Principle into their ideas, they claim to be in harmony with religion, or even Christianity. Wm. J. Bryan said: " ... even if they put God back there, it does not

---

1 Macartney, Clarence E. A Christian's Difficulty with Evolution, in The Presbyterian, Vol. CVII, No. 23, June 10, 1937, p. 5

2 The World's Most Famous Court Trial, p. 248

make it harmonious with the Bible." <sup>1</sup>

That evolution is not in complete harmony with Christianity was indicated by the attitude of the defense toward the customary prayers at the opening of the court sessions. Clarence Darrow voiced his objection: "I object to prayer, and I object to the jury being present when the court rules on the objection," <sup>2</sup> thus betraying his fear that the jury might be influenced by the prayer. An additional indication is given by objections on the part of several ministers to prayers offered by fundamentalist ministers. The objecting clergymen were two Unitarians, a Congregationalist, and a Jewish Rabbi, whose sympathies were naturally with the defense. As one of the principles summed it up: "They say ... that evolution ... does not contradict the Bible - does not contradict Christianity. Why are they objecting to prayers if it doesn't contradict the Bible - doesn't contradict Christianity?" <sup>3</sup>

The position of the defense was stated by a certain Mr. Malone: "... we wish to state ... that the defense believes there is a direct conflict between the theory of evolution and the theories of creation as set forth in the book of Genesis. Neither do we believe that the stories of creation as set forth in the Bible are reconcilable or scientifically correct." <sup>4</sup> Then, lest this create a dis-

---

1 World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.178

2 Ibid., p.89

3 Ibid., p.96

4 Ibid., p.113

advantageous impression or a hostile attitude, he said: While the defense thinks there is a conflict between evolution and the Old Testament, we believe there is no conflict between evolution and Christianity." <sup>1</sup> This is the contention of many evolutionists, who fail to understand or refuse to acknowledge the true nature of Christianity. Mr. Malone, however, while insisting for the defense that evolution and the Old Testament conflicted, said that the defense would show that there are millions of people who believe in both evolution and the Bible stories of creation.<sup>1</sup>

Christianity accepts the Biblical accounts of creation as well as the rest of the Bible. To Christians the Bible is divine truth, and nothing that contradicts Scripture can be true. Wm. J. Bryan expressed this in his statement published after his death: "

"Christianity welcomes truth from whatever source it comes, and is not afraid that any real truth from any source can interfere with the divine truth that comes by inspiration from God Himself. It is not scientific truth to which Christians object, for true science is classified knowledge, and nothing therefore can be scientific unless it is true." <sup>2</sup>

He characterized evolution with the words: "Evolution is not truth; it is millions of guesses strung together." <sup>2</sup>

"'We may well suppose' is not a sufficient substitute for 'Thus saith the Lord.'" <sup>3</sup>

Evolution denies creation. Even theistic evolution,

---

1 World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.113

2 Ibid., p.323

3 Ibid., p.325



which makes allowance for divine power, does not have a creation as described in Scripture. Bryan speaks mildly when he says that evolution "tends to put the creative act so far away as to cast doubt upon creation itself."<sup>1</sup> Evolution does more. It denies creation outright. Bryan continues: "And while it is shaking faith in God as a beginning, it is also casting doubt as to a heaven at the end of life."<sup>1</sup> Man's past and his future, as described in Scripture, are attacked by evolution.

This attack reaches also to God. Even theistic evolution is an attack upon God, which explains why many theistic evolutionists turn to atheism. As a certain Presbyterian puts it, "... theistic evolutionists are a rapidly vanishing species."<sup>2</sup> Evolution is unstable. It "leads us in the end," says one writer, "to the clear choice between belief in a personal Creator and the acceptance of the Pantheistic idea in some form."<sup>3</sup> Theistic evolution, which teaches that God is the One who carried out this "gory struggle," offers a low, degraded idea of God. Thus theistic evolution often leads its exponents to outright atheism.<sup>4</sup>

## EVOLUTION AND MAN

Evolution denies to man the honor of special creation

- 
- 1 World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.325
  - 2 Macartney, A Christian's Difficulty with Evolution in The Presbyterian, Vol.CVII, No.22, June 3, 1937, p.8
  - 3 Dawson, The Bible Confirmed by Science, p.59
  - 4 Keyser, L.S. in Christian Faith and Life, Vol.37, No.2, p.62

and makes him the descendant of the brute. It teaches that man is steadily improving, both physically and morally, and that evil is but an inheritance from the lower animals. The emphasis on the satisfaction of lust and greed leads only to disastrous ruin. The supposed moral improvement of mankind was disproved by the bloody experience of humanity during the four years of the World War. <sup>1</sup>

While the various ideas of evolution deal with practically everything, the richest subject, the most fertile ground for the evolutionists, is man himself. Evolution deals mainly with the origin of man, but does not restrict itself to this. In conjunction with the origin of man himself evolution embraces man's intellectual, ethical, and religious development. The "theological system" is treated as a developing conviction and included under social evolution. <sup>2</sup> Evolution can no more apply to the psychic, social, and moral phenomena of humanity, <sup>3</sup> than can it demonstrate that there is any truth in the claims made about man's origin.

From beginning to end there is no possibility of harmony between evolution and Christianity, and this is seen very clearly in the teachings of both regarding man. There is irreconcilable conflict in every point. Evolution contradicts the Bible in everything it says about man, from his origin to his future existence.

---

1. Walther League Manual, p.1

2. Cunningham, Problems of Philosophy, p.218

3. Mullins, E.Y. Why is Christianity True? p.70

## ORIGIN OF MAN

The proper place to begin the treatment of man is at his origin, and here begins the conflict between evolution and Christianity. All the other errors of evolution regarding man can be traced back to its false teachings concerning man's origin. All that Scripture teaches about man is in complete harmony with its teaching on man's origin and in direct conflict with the claims of evolution.

## CREATION

The Bible states: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: ... So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." <sup>1</sup> The Bible speaks plainly. Man was made, created. Evolution has man developing, evolving through countless centuries. The conflict is at once obvious.

The verbs used for "make" and "create" are עָשָׂה in verse 26 and בָּרָא in verse 27. These words "mean to make something outright; they do not connote a growing, evolving, or developing process." <sup>2</sup> בָּרָא is the verb used in verse 1 for the creation of the earth, and real creation is implied, that is creation out of nothing. Thomas Huxley admits that some say בָּרָא means to make out of nothing, but

<sup>1</sup> Genesis 1, 26.27

<sup>2</sup> Keyser, L.S. The Problem of Origins, p.78

he hastens to add; "I venture to object to that rendering not on the ground of scholarship, but of common sense. Omnipotence can surely no more make something out of nothing than it can make a triangular circle." <sup>1</sup> This is itself a contradiction, in that it limits the power of omnipotence.

Actually the Bible does not claim that man himself was created out of nothing. Scripture says: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground," <sup>2</sup> but first God created the material. The materialist denies this, claiming that matter always existed. Evolution claims that matter developed by itself into all the forms in which it is found, including also living things, even man himself. This teaching, which admits God only as a Principle, denies the creation of man. The Bible distinguishes between the creation of the animals and that of man. The earth "brought forth" the lower animals, while of man we are told that "God formed man." The claim is made that, if we speak of man being formed, we must also say the animals were similarly formed. <sup>3</sup> This again denies Scripture and adheres to the evolutionary idea that man is but a brute and consequently must have developed in the same way as the brute. Since the Bible opposes this view, evolutionists have no use for the Bible. Huxley expressed his reluctance to assume the creation story to be Mosaic, hence he referred to it as the "Miltonic hypothesis." <sup>4</sup> He admitted that he

---

1 Huxley, Thomas H. Science and Hebrew Tradition, p.186

2 Genesis 2, 7.

3 Goldsmith, op. cit., p.49

4 Huxley, op. cit., p.65

had "no hesitation in affirming" that the story of the creation is "pure fiction."<sup>1</sup>

This is typical of the attitude of the evolutionists, even theistic evolutionists, to the Bible. They regard it as fiction, and yet they seek to harmonize their ideas and the Bible. Since there is no harmony, this involves a mutilation or a misinterpretation of the Bible. Thus evolutionists have claimed the support of Ps. 139, 15.16:

"My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."

Of this passage treating of the formation of the individual it was said: "Here there is a distinct statement that the human body was created by the process of evolution."<sup>2</sup>

The human body grows from a single cell, developing into a mature human being, and evolutionists often use this as an illustration of the process of evolution whereby all living things developed through the ages from simple unicellular organisms. Herbert Spencer, in his *First Principles*, says: "Advance from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous is clearly displayed in the progress of the latest and most heterogeneous creature - Man."<sup>3</sup> This "progress" required thousands of years, according to evolution.

---

1 Huxley, Thomas H. op. cit., p.234

2 The World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.230

3 Spencer, *First Principles*, Part II, Chap.XV, 121  
reprinted in Rand, Benjamin, *Modern Classical Philosophers*, p.721

Henry Fairfield Osborne, President of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, said: "Man as we know him did not come into the world overnight. He was not created instantly." <sup>1</sup> Another writer speaks of "the human organism which ... has sprung from lowly origins and developed through aeons of slow, halting, and tragic effort."<sup>2</sup> Yet the Bible tells us that man was created on the sixth day of creation. <sup>3</sup>

Scripture tells us: "And God said, Let us make man, ... So God created man." <sup>4</sup> God determined to make man, and then made man. It was not an accident. God deliberated and purposely made man. Evolution teaches that the human race is the result of chance. James Jeans, lecturing at Cambridge, said: "Human life arose as a mere accident."<sup>5</sup> He insisted that God was not specifically interested in either life or humanity.<sup>6</sup>

Evolutionists dwell at great length on man's ancestry. Man, they say, was an accidental development from lower animals, which in turn were all the result of chance. All are evolved from one-celled organisms, and the climax of this development is man himself. Evolutionists would have us believe that our ancestor was a one-celled being. One

---

1 Keyser, L.S. The Problem of Origins, pp.119-120

2 Cunningham, Problems of Philosophy, p.240

3 Genesis 1, 27. 31.

Graebner, A.L. Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, p.65

4 Genesis 1, 26.27

5 Nov. 4, 1930 (UP Dispatch)

Dawson, The Bible Confirmed by Science, p.61

6 Dawson, op. cit., p. 61

writer says that "the potentialities of manhood reside in the primordial cell,"<sup>1</sup> but merely ascribing the possibilities of humanity to the original cell does not change evolution nor remove its vicious character. The evolutionists here are not glorifying the cell, but degrading humanity.

The Bible presents man as the crowning work of creation. It presents man as distinct from the brute, not descended from nor related to the lower animals. The difference between man and the lower animals is qualitative, not quantitative, as the evolutionists claim. They regard man as practically a brute himself, a brother or cousin to the anthropoid ape.<sup>2</sup> Gerrit S. Miller maintains that man's relations "according to the flesh" are to be found among the primates, the order of animals including the lemurs, monkeys, apes. This in itself is nothing new. Evolutionists have said this repeatedly, but this one looks for man's ancestors among smaller animals of this order, animals now extinct. The great apes, he says, are too highly specialized along different lines from those of man's own development.<sup>3</sup> Man's ancestors, he says, were about the size of the organ grinder's monkey, who comes close to being an "average" specimen of the great order of mammals to which we all belong. Compared to his relatives man is a

---

1 Hudson, T.J. The Divine Pedigree of Man, p.175

2 Keyser, L.S. The Problem of Origins, p.117

3 Davis, W. (editor) The Advance of Science, p.224

giant. <sup>1</sup> Osborne says man's growth paralleled that of the apes, but was of a separate and distinct stock, even lower in the scale than the apes. <sup>2</sup>

### THE DIVINE IMAGE

Scripture teaches that God made man in His own image. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, ... So God created man in His own image." <sup>3</sup> "Man was created after the image of God, in wisdom, holiness, and righteousness." <sup>4</sup> The divine image consisted in that man was originally endowed with intelligence, will, and rationality that distinguished him from animals, and "above all in the right disposition of his intellect and will, so that ... he knew God and divine things and ... desired only that which God wills." <sup>4</sup> Colossians 3, 10 refers the image of God to knowledge, and Ephesians 4, 24 speaks of the "new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." <sup>5</sup>

Evolution, whether theistic or atheistic, denies the Christian doctrine of man's creation in the divine image. One evolutionist who denies that man was created in the image of God expresses the general contention of his kind when he claims that man, from a low beginning, has been gaining slowly but surely in "character and in moral power." <sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Davis, W. The Advance of Science, p.225

<sup>2</sup> Keyser, op. cit., p.121

<sup>3</sup> Genesis 1, 26.27

<sup>4</sup> Mueller, J. Th. Christian Dogmatics, p.205

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p.206

<sup>6</sup> Graebner, Th. God and the Cosmos, p.188



Evolution empties the origin of man of any religious element. <sup>1</sup> The evolutionists, in spite of all their claims to the contrary, "are invading the territory of religion."<sup>2</sup> There are two ways in which they deny the Scriptural doctrine of the divine image. Some are plain and definite in their denials. Others claim to accept and believe that man was created in God's image, but what they mean by this is far from the Biblical meaning. Not only do they oppose Scripture, but they disagree widely among themselves. They try to harmonize the divine image with their evolutionary claims, and since no harmony exists, either one or the other must fall. Evolutionists refuse to alter their own ideas, and so they distort the Bible to make it agree with evolution.

God said: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Dr. H. E. Murkett, on the side of the evolutionists in the Dayton trial, denied that this meant the making of a new creature, called man, who was to be made in the image of God. Murkett claimed that this passage spoke of man as already existing, already known, a part of the animal life, who was to be made after God's image. "He was then endowed with the spirit of God, possessing His moral, spiritual, and intelligent nature."<sup>3</sup> This maintains evolution and yet pretends to accept the fact of man's creation in the divine image.

---

<sup>1</sup> Keyser, op. cit., p.118

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p.119

<sup>3</sup> The World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.229

Evolutionists claim that the teaching that man was made in the image of God can be harmonized with evolution.<sup>1</sup> They hold that through millions of years evolution was taking place, and finally an organism developed which was to become a person made in the image of God. Into this body that had been evolving through all the ages God breathed His spirit, and man was born.<sup>2</sup> This is opposed to Scripture, which teaches the special creation of man in God's image.

One evolutionist, taking the "image of God" intellectually,<sup>3</sup> says:

"The divine part of man is his subjective mind - the mind of his immortal soul, which exists independently of the body or any of its physical organs; which is literally a spark of the divine intelligence, - literally a part of the mind of God."<sup>4</sup>

He claims that, to one who knows the divine origin of man's mental faculties, these faculties show the "conception of deity which is necessarily derivable from a knowledge of their existence and their divine origin."<sup>5</sup> This statement he follows with a table showing the faculties of the human mind and the attributes of God that are derived therefrom. From man's instinct or intuition, his deductive powers, and his memory, we derive the idea of God's omniscience. From the telekinetic energy that the human mind is supposed to exert, we have the idea of God's omnipotence.

---

1 Hudson, T.J. op. cit., p.175

2 Goldsmith, Evolution or Christianity, p.103

3 Hudson, op. cit., p.363

4 Ibid., p.364

5 Ibid., p.367

His omnipresence is suggested by the telepathic capabilities of the human mind. From our natural human emotions we can see that God must be a being of infinite love. <sup>1</sup> This idea would seem to make God himself the product of evolution. The author denies to Christ any deity or any more divinity than is possessed by other men. Telekinetic energy, the supposed power of the mind to move matter at a distance, is offered as the explanation of the walking of Jesus and Peter on the water. <sup>2</sup> This power, then, according to this author, was possessed by both Peter and Jesus, and also by the rest of humanity. This, he says, is the force used in levitation and so called spirit phenomena. The only difference between this power as possessed and manifested by Jesus, and the same power as possessed by other men, is the fact that in Jesus it was very highly developed. <sup>2</sup>

This would mean that Jesus and all other men are essentially the same, that Jesus merely represented a higher stage of development. His "divine" qualities were much more

1 Hudson, op. cit., p.367

GOD	MAN
Omniscience	Instinct or intuition /perfect) Deductive powers (potentially Memory (potentially perfect)
Omnipotence	Telekinetic Energy
Omnipresence	Telepathy
Infinite Love	Natural Emotions

2 Hudson, op. cit., p.91

highly developed than those of other human beings. He also had descended from the original germ, just as had the rest of humanity. Not only the potentialities of man are in the primordial germ, but "the quality of mind exhibited in man's remotest earthly ancestor is essentially godlike, differing from Omniscience only in degree, and not in kind." 1

The same author claims that the prophets wrote by intuition, not by inspiration in the Scriptural sense, 2 intuition differing from omniscience only in degree. Some of these prophets had developed greatly in this respect. They were "highly endowed with the power of intuition," he says, as the accuracy of some of their prophecies indicates. 3 In fact, since inspiration is intuition, the claim is made that it was by intuition that the prophet knew that man was made in God's image. 4 This makes the Bible a human book and weakens the force of man's creation in the divine image, since all animals would be similarly made in God's image.

H. G. Wells, in his Outline of History, gives a verbal picture of what he calls the "Old Man," <sup>x</sup> the primitive man. 5 If such a being, as beastly and filthy as Wells describes him, was the first man, it would be sacrilegious to intimate that he was created in the divine image. 5 If such

1 Hudson, op. cit., p.275

2 Ibid., p.368

3 Ibid., p.213

4 Ibid., p.368

5 Keyser, op. cit., p.45

x  
I think Wells  
refers to  
the  
God.

ideas as these are maintained, man can claim no distinction at all from the brute, since he is a brute, and the divine image would apply no more certainly to him than to the rest of creation.

Thomas Huxley does not hesitate to assert his rejection of Scripture's authority. Of the statement of man's creation in the divine image he says that it shows that the writer's "conception of אֱלֹהִים was completely anthropomorphic." <sup>1</sup> To him all that this statement in the Bible indicates is an attitude on the part of the one who made the statement. That this is divine truth is lost on evolutionists. They are willing to allow it only as long as it fits in with their own preconceptions.

#### METHOD OF FORMATION

Scripture describes the formation of one mature male, from the dust of the ground. One mature woman was made out of a rib taken from man. From these two the entire human race descended. There were only two, one male and one female. These were mature when they were created. They did not develop nor evolve through centuries from a single one-celled animal. They did not result from the mating of brute parents. They did not grow up. They were made adults. Had they evolved, had they grown up the children of brute parents, it would be natural to assume that more of them would appear at about the same time, although it would be

---

<sup>1</sup> Huxley, T.H. Science and Hebrew Tradition, p.199

difficult to distinguish at precisely what stage any two or more of these would be worthy the name of human beings.

Since evolutionists do deny the special creation of man and hold that man was descended from the lower animals in constantly progressing generations, they maintain, consistently, that a number of men developed. One evolutionist declares: "One certainty on which we can build is that a number of experimental types of mankind emerged in the dawn ages. The sole survivor today is our species which we modestly call *Homo sapiens*." <sup>1</sup> Whether or not he considers the entire human race today to be descended from the same first two human beings is relatively unimportant, but the general contention of evolutionists regarding man's animal descent would seem to indicate a leaning toward the belief that there were more than a single pair of human beings who evolved, and it would be almost miraculous that the closest parents common to the entire human race should be the first two beings to pass the imaginary line separating man from the brute, who perpetuated their kind, one male and one female. Such coincidence is too much to accept. Since, however, this line of demarcation between mankind and animals is no problem at all in actual practice, only becoming a problem if mankind is held to be evolved from the lower animals, and, since this problem itself is the result of human speculation, the evolutionists can draw the line arbitrarily wherever it suits their

---

<sup>1</sup> Davis, W. (ed.) *The Advance of Science*, p.330

purpose, so that the parents of the human race come just on the human side of the line. This is unnecessary, for the evolutionists care little whether the common ancestors of the human race were a pair of brutes or a pair of human beings.

Scripture teaches that the human race descended from two individuals, a male and a female, and these were mature when created, all other human beings having been descended in the natural way from these two. Evolution not only claims that the ancestors of mankind developed from lower animals, but also that, as has been stated, "a number of experimental types of mankind emerged in the dawn ages." <sup>1</sup> If God, working through the processes of evolution, had to experiment before producing a satisfactory human being, His wisdom and power are denied. The Bible tells of only one pair of human beings, the man made from dust and the woman from the man. These were made perfect, as we should expect of God's work. Evolutionists speak of a number of types of humanity emerging; Scripture speaks of a single pair being specially created by God. Evolution has a number of "experimental" types of humanity emerging by chance from the lower animals and requiring a great period of time so to emerge. These conflicts regarding the number of human beings, their fitness, that from which they were made, the manner of their formation, and the time required, cannot be overlooked. Scripture and evolution cannot be har-

---

1 Davis, W. (ed.) op. cit., p.330

monized.

The human race is descended from Adam. This fact is in agreement with the Bible, but even this is perverted to give support to evolution. A certain Rabbi Rosenwasser, testifying for the defense in the Dayton trial, brought out the idea that, since the name Adam means a living organism containing blood, we, being descended from Adam, are descended from a lower order, a living organism containing blood. <sup>1</sup>

Another adherant of evolution takes the statement that man was made from the dust of the ground, and brings up the following:

"The dust from which the body of Adam was made was animate dust; lower forms of life were taken as the foundation upon which to build man's physical frame and man's rational powers; into some animal germ came the breath of a new intellectual and moral life." <sup>2</sup>

These efforts to show the harmony between evolution and Scripture are futile, and would be better unstated, because, instead of showing the harmony, they show the impossibility of harmony, because they all pervert the sense of Scripture. Any outward harmony must involve such a perversion, since the Bible in no way supports nor leaves an open door for evolution.

Evolution is often opposed because it presents a degraded idea of man. Christianity has a high regard for humanity, but the opposition of Christianity toward evolution

---

<sup>1</sup> The World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.228

<sup>2</sup> Strong, A.H. Christ in Creation and Ethical Monism, p.169  
p.169



is not based on any arbitrarily elevated conception of mankind, but on the fact that evolution is opposed to Scripture. Evolution does degrade mankind, but the claim is made that evolution is no more degrading to man than the Christian conception as found in Scripture, that it is no more degrading to say that man was made through animal ancestry than directly from dust, since the horse and dog and monkey belong to higher orders of existence than clod and stone. <sup>1</sup> The matter, however, is not to be decided on the basis of whether the monkey or the dust represents a higher order of existence, The Bible speaks definitely. God formed man of the dust of the ground, and, if God in His wisdom chose to make man, the crowning work of creation, in this way, the Christian can have no complaint. God created the dust as well as the monkey, and the Christian doctrine of God's special creation of man from the dust offers a conception of man far higher than the evolutionary contention that man developed from the primates.

---

<sup>1</sup> Goldsmith, Evolution or Christianity, p.50

## NATURE OF MAN

Man, as he was created, was intelligent and moral, a being consisting of body and soul, united in one complete person. <sup>1</sup> These are characteristics that distinguish man from the brute creation, and these have been the possession and nature of man as long as mankind has existed. They did not develop gradually, as evolutionists claim.

## INTELLIGENCE

Man has intelligence, and this is man's by creation, not by development from his supposed brute ancestry. The intelligence of mankind is said to be based on the reaction of organisms to stimuli. The form of behavior known as "trial and error" is based on such reaction, which is "fundamental to all learning" and is "the beginning of intelligence and wisdom in man as well as in higher animals." <sup>2</sup> It is true that we learn by experience, but to base our own intelligence on the reactions of animals from which we are supposed to be descended is unscriptural.

From evolution there follows naturally the behavioristic idea that human beings are like animals in reacting to stimuli and in building up a series of reactions. Thought is regarded as "conditioned reflexes." Thought, reasoning power, is said to be merely the process of trial

---

<sup>1</sup> Graebner, A.L. Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, p.66

<sup>2</sup> Conklin, E.G. A Generation's Progress in the Study of Evolution, in the Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, 1934, p.218

and error. <sup>1</sup>

C. Lloyd Morgan claims that, as the animal or human being learned, so the mind has been advancing by experience, since the beginning. <sup>2</sup> In the evolutionary advance of events since life appeared on the earth, and in the development of each individual human being, there has been an advance of mind. The mind has advanced "from sentience, with little more than awareness in living, through new products in perception towards the further novelties of the far richer life in the light of reflection." <sup>3</sup> This is a frequently expressed idea, and it follows from the evolutionary view as applied to man's body. If man's body was developed gradually from the lower animals, it is not a great step further to assume that also his mind so developed. This is obviously against Scripture, which teaches not only that man was specially created, but that he was created intelligent.

The Bible ascribes volition to man, but not all evolutionists are willing to admit this. Huxley says that the feeling which we call volition is not the cause of a voluntary act. <sup>4</sup> He denies that volition is able to produce muscular motion. <sup>5</sup> To him volition means nothing.

- 
- 1 Demiashkevich, Michael, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education, pp.81ff.
  - 2 C. Lloyd Morgan, The Ascent of Mind, in Mason, The Great Design, pp.113-132
  - 3 Morgan, op. cit., in Mason, op. cit., p.130
  - 4 Fairhurst, Organic Evolution Considered, p.388
  - 5 Ibid., p.389

He regards it as a by product of muscular action, a mere delusion, a "happy mistake." <sup>1</sup> He claims that all states of consciousness in human beings, as in brutes, have as their immediate cause molecular changes in the brain substance, not only that these states of consciousness are accompanied by such molecular changes, but that they are caused by them. <sup>1</sup> He makes animals out of human beings and denies to human beings the intelligence and will with which they were endowed at creation.

From the beginning of the human race, as Scripture depicts it, man is spoken to and dealt with as a being of rational understanding. <sup>2</sup> Adam himself was aware that he was of a higher genus than the rest of the earthly creation. The command given him to dress and keep the garden implied intelligence greater than that of any of the animals. <sup>3</sup> The naming of the animals by Adam showed his intelligence from the start. <sup>4</sup>

Evolutionists admit the great gulf that exists between mankind and the brute, but they claim that by a protracted education, with an obliging inheritance to preserve what is gained, the animal can be converted into man. <sup>5</sup> This claim, while admitting the great difference between man and brute, is based on the assumption that this difference is solely quantitative, and not qualitative. Darwin said, " ... the

---

1 Fairhurst, op. cit., p.389

2 Keyser, The Problem of Origins, p.90

3 Ibid., p.79

4 Graebner, A.L., op. cit., p.66

5 Fairhurst, op. cit., p245

difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, is certainly one of degree and not of kind." <sup>1</sup> He stated that "there is no fundamental difference between man and the higher animals in their mental faculties." <sup>2</sup> This view is common among evolutionists. Man's faculties are said to differ in no way from those of the animals, except in degree. <sup>3</sup>

Even if this could be proven, it would offer no support to the claim made by the evolutionists that the brain of man and that of the animal are related. <sup>4</sup> Physical similarity is no proof of relationship, and it is admitted that the psychic differences between man and the highest of the apes are greater than the physical differences. <sup>5</sup> Physically man is similar to the primates, and yet this cannot prove relationship. Thus the admittedly smaller psychic similarity can never prove that man and the animals are related. Yet the claim is made, even by the theistic evolutionists, that not only man's body, but also his mind, descended from the lower animals. <sup>6</sup>

The argument that the special creation of man's mind is inconsistent with the evolution of animal brains is obviously futile. The evolution of animal brains cannot be proven, and, even if it could be proven, the conclusion

- 
- 1 Darwin, Descent of Man, Vol.I, p.101, quoted in Fairhurst, op. cit., p.236
  - 2 Fairhurst, op. cit., p.402
  - 3 Gibbs, J.W. Evolution and Christianity, p.7
  - 4 Goldsmith, op. cit., p.92
  - 5 Fairhurst, op. cit., p.236
  - 6 Hudson, T.J., op. cit., p.152

that also the human mind has evolved is unwarranted. To the contrary, the weakness of the evolutionary claims is exposed. <sup>1</sup> The evolution of the animals is unprovable, while the special creation of man, besides being Scriptural, is consistent with all the known facts. If either of the two must be discarded, the reasonable choice for exclusion would be the evolutionary hypothesis.

One of the theories advanced to account for the early superiority of the human species over the others in the struggle toward civilization is that he may have had better tools. <sup>2</sup> It is an undisputed fact that man's possession of tools has aided him greatly in the advance to what we call modern human civilization, but the question remains unanswered. The superiority of man must have preceded his possession of better tools. Without man's superior mental powers he could never have devised these tools.

Evolutionists have a productive imagination when they deal with the early history of mankind. It is said that preglacial man, if he ever existed, lived in days of ease, without the necessity of exerting himself to obtain a living. Thus these early specimens of humanity would have been content to continue very much like their cousins, the apes, "clever and entertaining up to a certain point, but dull beyond that," and very irresponsible and improvident. <sup>3</sup> Into this somewhat rosy picture came the glaciers, and con-

---

1 Goldsmith, op. cit., pp.92-93

2 Davis, The Advance of Science

3 Ibid., p.222

ditions were changed. Things were not so rosy. By the middle of the ice age man was taking good care of himself and his family, having learned to keep warm in spite of glaciers. <sup>1</sup> He had invented and improved weapons of stone, which no ape ever did or even thought of doing, Man had made the most important discovery of human history; he had learned the use of fire. <sup>2</sup> For this story evolutionists say they have "plenty of evidence." <sup>1</sup> That men learned the use of tools and improved them as the need arose is not to be denied. It is in full accord with Scripture. <sup>3</sup> It is going on at the present time. Men are inventing new devices daily. This, however, is not evolution, nor are human beings any more intelligent today than they were at creation.

*Smith*

Darwin himself saw certain Pacific islands inhabited by cannibals. Twenty five years later these had been converted and civilized. Darwin, impressed by the change in these people, donated twenty five pounds a year to the Missionary Society. A fact like this is a blow to the evolutionists, showing as it does the difference between man and beast. No missionary or missionaries, working for generations on end, could convert gorillas into soul-conscious Christian beings. <sup>4</sup> Yet the lowest, most degraded of human beings are capable of being uplifted, not by evolution,

<sup>1</sup> Davis, op. cit., p.222

<sup>2</sup> Davis, op. cit., p.223

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p.222

<sup>3</sup> Gen.4,22: " ... Tubalcain, an instructor of every arti-

<sup>4</sup> Fairhurst, op. cit., p.242

ficer in brass and iron."

but in their own lives and persons. <sup>1</sup>

## MORALITY

Man is a moral being. He was created a moral being, with a capability of distinguishing between right and wrong, and with a conscience that accuses or excuses. Immediately after their first disobedience the parents of the human race felt the effects of an accusing conscience. This working of conscience, which manifested itself already in Adam and Eve, is still evident today.

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another." <sup>2</sup>

Paul, after listing a number of the evils practiced by the heathen, wrote that these evildoers knew "the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death." <sup>3</sup> Men "shew the work of the law written in their hearts." Mankind possesses a natural knowledge of right and wrong and a conscience that urges its owner to do what is right. This is part of the nature of man, given him by God at creation.

This fact is denied by evolutionists. It is said that men gradually acquired a moral nature, and that this acquisition required countless ages. Men are claimed to have

---

<sup>1</sup> Dawson, The Bible Confirmed by Science, p.132

<sup>2</sup> Romans 2, 14-15

<sup>3</sup> Romans 1, 32



learned the difference between right and wrong by experience, by the experience of pain and pleasure like that of animals. <sup>1</sup> A sectarian preacher writes of primitive men:

"What would such creatures know about the difference between right and wrong, or about the principle which underlies moral judgments? Nothing at all. It was at this low level that the evolution of moral standards and moral judgments began." <sup>2</sup>

This is the view of a theist, who, having the Bible, discards it and denies the Scripturally attested moral nature of mankind.

The Dayton trial brought out a number of claims and opinions of all shades, from Christianity to the rankest atheism. One of these regarded the original nakedness of man as wrong, and, since man was not conscious of any wrong connected with this, it is assumed he was ignorant of right and wrong. Then, it is said, we are given the story of a man awakening to the consciousness of right and wrong and the consequences, and he begins the attempt to allay the pangs of conscience and remedy the lack of harmony between him and his Creator. <sup>3</sup> This view involves a Creator, but not the God of Scripture who created man with intelligence and morality. Instead man is pictured as developing a consciousness of right and wrong and an accusing conscience, which it is presupposed he had not previously possessed.

Another evolutionist says: "An organism emerged that

---

1 Graebner, Theo. God and the Cosmos, p.188

2 Gilkey, James Gordon, What Can We Believe? p.100

3 The World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.229

was in possession of two distinctive faculties, called rational reflection and moral conscience - namely, man." 1

These are two similar views. Both regard the moral conscience as the product of evolution. The first regards man as having developed a conscience and a sense of right and wrong. The second speaks of the development of an organism possessing this faculty, which is man, implying that, before this development took place, the organism was not man, that he only became man with the possession of rational reflection and a moral conscience. Both these views are unscriptural in that they regard the moral sense and conscience as the products of evolution.

The latter view, that, as the rational powers and moral conscience developed, man emerged, admits that intelligence and morality are part of the nature of man, but the idea of evolution connected therewith removes it far from the Christian doctrine of man.

The former view, that man existed for a time without a knowledge of good and evil, gradually developing a moral sense and a conscience, is an attempt to harmonize evolution with the Biblical account of the fall of man, but it is a futile attempt. It is true that the parents of the race had no accusing conscience in the beginning, but this was not because of the lack of morality. It was because they had done nothing for which they could be accused. They were perfect. Evolution pictures the "awakening to

---

L. Driesch, Hans, The Breakdown of Materialism,  
in Mason, The Great Design, p.299

the consciousness of right and wrong," the development of the "moral conscience," as progress, but Scripture regards the fall of man, which precedes and results in the accusing conscience, as the first and greatest downward step in the history of mankind, having as its result death. Evolution pictures man as doing wrong even before the development of a sense of right and wrong. This, however, is regarded as excusable, since in those early days, according to evolution, man was not a moral being, having no sense of moral distinction.

The Bible presents man as a moral being by nature, having been created so by God. "Man was made an ethical being from the start." The fact that he was forbidden to eat of that certain tree "implies some perception and sense of moral distinctions!" <sup>1</sup>

Evolutionists are practically unanimous in ascribing the conscience to evolutionary processes. It is claimed to have been developed and then passed on by heredity. <sup>2</sup> Evolutionists say that ethics have developed from the first spark of conscience to the "highest moral ideal" of the Christian. <sup>3</sup> To Adam and Eve, after their sin, the accusing conscience was a new experience, since it was the first time they had done anything of which to be accused,

- 
- 1 Keyser, op. cit., p.79  
 Graebner, A. L., Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, pp. 66.67
- 2 Hudson, T.J., op. cit., p.208
- 3 Spencer, H. First Principles, pp.347.359  
 Mullins, E.Y., Why is Christianity True? p.59

but this not what evolutionists mean when they speak of a developing conscience; otherwise the development of conscience would be dependent on and synchronous with the increase in wickedness. That evolutionists have no such intention is shown by their evaluation of Christ. They regard Him as mere man, a product of evolutionary processes. They admit that He was of exemplary character, that He was, perhaps, the best, most virtuous man that ever lived. This being the case, they must admit that Jesus did not suffer the pangs of an accusing conscience, having done nothing of which to be accused. If, then, the evolutionists regard the conscience as highly developed where its accusations are most severe, they would be driven to the conclusion that Jesus had practically no conscience. This is not the case. Evolutionists speak very highly about the conscience of Jesus. His "conscience was, without doubt, developed in absolute perfection." <sup>1</sup>

"We have numerous examples, culminating in Jesus of Nazareth, where a conscience based upon a harmonious development of the three great instincts -- namely, the instinct of self-preservation, the altruistic instinct, and the instinct of religious worship -- was reinforced by an intuitive perception of eternal principles of right and wrong." <sup>2</sup>

Jesus, it is said, had a highly developed conscience, while the parents of the human race had no conscience. The development of conscience culminated in Christ. This should then put Christ and the first human beings on opposite ends

---

1 Hudson, op. cit., p.212

2 Ibid., p.214

of the moral scale, Christ being the best, the first human beings the worst. This conflicts with Scripture, which teaches man's original perfection, and, if this is any indication of conscience, as the evolutionists themselves assume regarding Jesus, then our first parents had better consciences than any of their descendants, and any change that took place must have been for the worse. This is the Scriptural teaching, which opposes the evolutionary vision of constant moral progress.

## RELIGION

This evolutionary idea of progress is applied also to religion. Spencer declares that religion "arose by a process of evolution." <sup>1\*</sup> Goldenweiser calls supernaturalism a "man made realm." <sup>2</sup> Another writer says that, as soon as man grew distinct from the animal, he became religious. <sup>3</sup> The general idea of evolutionists is that religion is a human institution, which from low beginnings, like the human race itself, has advanced to the noblest teachings of modern Christianity. Often this is confused with morality and ethics. One writer, for example, speaks of an inner sense, "gradually developing," a spiritual sense which loathes any degrading action and admires nobility. When, as in some, this sense is more developed,

---

1 Hudson, op. cit., p.53

2 Goldenweiser, Anthropology, p.208

3 Anderson, Robert, A Doubter's Doubts about science and Religion, p.28

\* Under social evolution the church is included under evolution of institutions. Cunningham, op.cit.,p.218

the Christians call it faith. <sup>1</sup> Christian faith is thus called a highly developed sense, <sup>2</sup> those having it very highly developed being called mystics. Here we have a confusion of religion and morality, an attempt to render Darwinism consistent with Christian ethics. <sup>3</sup>

The earliest men, say the evolutionists, knew no God at all, but they feared certain imaginary beings in the familiar objects of nature. <sup>4</sup> From animism, ancestor worship, and such superstitious beliefs evolution has religion developing "to the loftiest monotheistic faith." <sup>5</sup>

One writer claims that in the Sealand, in Arabia, there may be found the origin of some of the Hebrew religious ideas "which appear without background in the Bible."<sup>6</sup> He speaks of the early days, when most gods were far from godlike, when temples were places of horrible sacrifices and wickedness. Already at such a time the people of the Sealand had an idea of an absolute, beneficent, merciful God. The existence of such ideas is said to be a source and an influence which "must be taken into account in attempts to trace the origin of early Hebrew religious concepts." <sup>6</sup>

The assumption is here made that the Hebrew religious concepts were derived from some other people. This assump-

---

1 Hibbert Journal, Vol.27, No.4, p.672

2 Ibid., p.673

3 Ibid., p.672

4 Graebner, Theo. God and the Cosmos, P.188

5 Spencer, First Principles, pp.347.359,

in Mullins, op. cit., p.59

6 Davis, The Advance of Science, p.308

tion is based on an anti-Scriptural attitude , a disbelief in revelation. According to the Bible man was created with a perfect knowledge of God, and even after the fall man retained a natural knowledge of the true God, although this was perverted by human wickedness. While knowing the true God, men "glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened." <sup>1</sup>

The religion of the Hebrews was the result of direct revelation by God. It was not copied from any other neighboring people. There were pagan elements that crept in, but these were foreign, not a part of the revealed religion. They represented not a higher form, but a lower form of religion. Israel repeatedly fell away from the true worship of Jehovah, and God sent His prophets. These did not introduce a new, advanced religion, but called Israel back to the true religion from which Israel had fallen.

Apostasy from the true worship of Jehovah was a common thing among the Israelites. Huxley tries to show that the worship of Israel was not as pure as is often claimed. He declares that even the worshippers of Jehovah were polytheists, <sup>2</sup> in that they admitted the existence of other אֱלֹהִים of divine rank beside Jehovah, but that they differed from other polytheists in their belief that Jehovah

---

<sup>1</sup> Romans 1, 21. See Romans 1, 19-25.

<sup>2</sup> Huxley, Science and Hebrew Tradition, pp.315-316

was the supreme God, "the one proper object of their own national worship." <sup>1</sup> The different אֱלֹהִים differed from each other only in degree, <sup>2</sup> the term being used also of unseen powers, disembodied souls, according to Huxley, for the proof of which he appeals to 1.Samuel 28, 13, where the witch at Endor sees gods ascending out of the earth. <sup>3</sup> In addition the Israelites had their teraphim. <sup>4</sup> That there were numerous cases of idolatry, not only by individuals, but by the nation, cannot be denied, but these were not part of the Hebrew religion. They were downward steps from the original monotheism, the pure Jehovah worship, as the Old Testament repeatedly indicates. Huxley speaks of the modification of polytheism by the selection of only one God who is to be worshipped by the nation. <sup>5\*</sup>

This is an assumption that polytheism preceded monotheism. It is admitted that monotheism is a higher form of religion than fetishism, animism, or the like. Evolutionists claim the change is naturally toward monoth<sup>e</sup>ism, <sub>1</sub> but this is opposed both by Scripture and observation.

A few statements from the Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute will show the views of some who

---

1 Huxley, op. cit., p.350

2 Ibid., p.307

3 Ibid., p.298

4 Ibid., p.309

5 Ibid., p.349

\* "What we are usually pleased to call religion nowadays is, for the most part, Hellenized Judaism," and the Hellenic part brings in a great deal of paganism. Huxley, op. cit., p.162



have made special researches in ethnology.

"Fetishism bears traces of truths far above and beyond itself. How did these find their way in? The answer is difficult on the evolutionary hypothesis." 1

"Is fetishism a first step up or a last step down, an evolution or a degradation? The former is contrary to experience." 2

"Fetishism is a degradation from a purer faith, of which it contains traces, a far off glimpse of a Supreme Creator." 3

"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." 4

The advance of religion from the primitive to the modern Christianity is a dream of the evolutionists, unaffected by evidence and observations which clearly corroborate the Scriptural statements of the natural knowledge of the true God and the perpetual processes of degradation and perversion which were active during Biblical times and are still active today. Scripture presents mankind as being originally in full accord with God, but this happy condition was not permanent, and man started on the religious downgrade. This Scriptural picture of man's religious lapses is supported by investigations, history, and observation. It is directly opposed to the evolutionary idea

- 
- 1 Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, 1921, p.153, quoted, in Keyser, op. cit., p.245
  - 2 Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, 1921, p.164, quoted in Keyser, op. cit., p.245
  - 3 Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, 1921, p.165, quoted in Keyser, op. cit., p.245
  - 4 Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, 1921, p.167, quoted in Keyser, op. cit., pp.245-246

of constant progress. Evolution would make of Christianity a man made religious system, developed by human beings and without divine authority.

#### THE SOUL

While evolution seeks to take authority from Christianity, it tries also to remove the necessity for religion, claiming that God, if there is a God, is not interested in humanity, asserting that man is steadily improving by himself, and denying the immortality of the soul. <sup>1</sup>

Scripture speaks clearly of man as a being consisting of body and soul, joined in one complete person. <sup>2</sup> There are different methods by which the evolutionists can and do deny the Scriptural doctrine concerning the soul. They can profess to believe what Scripture states and interpret or bend Scripture to suit their own preconceived ideas. They can admit that man has a soul, but deny what the Bible says about man's soul. They can deny outright the existence of the soul and declare that the idea of a human soul is foolishness. Naturally, evolutionists accept only as much as they like, although often claiming to accept more.

So Haeckel, who admits his denial of the immortality of the soul, while appearing at the same time to express

---

1 Fairhurst, op. cit., p.390

2 Graebner, A.L., op. cit., pp.66.67

belief in the soul's existence, says:

"The human soul is not an independent, immaterial substance, but, like the soul of all the higher animals, merely a collective title for the sum total of man's cerebral functions; and these are just as much determined by physical and chemical processes as any of the other vital functions and just as amenable to the law of substance." 1

Evolution regards man's soul, if any, as having developed or evolved like man's body, differing in no way except in degree from the "soul" of the animals. They admit that man has a soul, but only in the same sense in which animals may be said to have souls. Scripture ascribes such dichotomy only to man and not to animals, regarding man as differing in his very nature from the animals, man having been made in God's image, perfect, and intended for immortality.

The contention of the evolutionists that man's soul, just as his mind, developed along with his body is irreconcilable with the Christian doctrine of man. The gap between the brute brain and human intelligence, and between the mortality of animals and the immortality of human beings are unbridgeable chasms. 2

One evolutionist uses this very fact to defend evolution. To call into being such a low order of life with latent possibilities of morality and immortality and con-

---

1 Gibbs, Evolution and Christianity, p.7

2 Kaufmann, Fred H., Evolution, - That Mental Cancer in Concordia Junior Messenger, Vol.XV,1937, No.11, p.263

sciousness of a Creator, he says, "is a far more amazing act of creative power than the Mosaic account of the genesis of man supposes." <sup>1</sup> He starts with his own assumption and then, finding it more "amazing" than the Biblical account, he claims that this is a point in its favor, as if this would lend any credence to his story or would placate God by ascribing to Him greater creative power, at the same time denying God's own account of creation, implying also God's absence from world affairs, His inaccessibility by prayer, in short, everything that deism implies.

Scripture presents man as the crowning work of creation, not produced by a mere word, but specially formed, made in God's image. Evolution presents a cheapened idea of man, <sup>2</sup> regarding him as an outgrowth or even a part of the animal world. It makes the difference between man and the rest of creation one of degree or of time, instead of one of essence. <sup>3</sup> Huxley, not ready to acknowledge that man appeared at a later time than other animals, says that man merely "consummated" his class, just as did the horse, being the "last term of the series of which he is a member." <sup>4</sup> He would put man hardly above the other animals, no different except in being more highly developed. In opposition to this Scripture treats man as differing in

---

<sup>1</sup> Anderson, Robert, op. cit., p.25

<sup>2</sup> Ellwood, Charles A., Sociology and Modern Social Problems, p.44

<sup>3</sup> Macartney, C.E. A Christian's Difficulty with Evolution, in The Presbyterian, Vol.CVII, No.23, June 10, 1937,

<sup>4</sup> Huxley, op. cit., p.153

essence from the animals, the highest creation of all, with a "gulf fixed between man and the whole creation under him." <sup>1</sup>

#### EVOLUTION'S LOW ESTIMATE OF MAN

Evolution's cheap evaluation of man is evident from the statements of the evolutionists. Herbert Spencer says: "Man is of far less importance than he thinks he is. He is nothing but an insect buzzing in the air for a moment, and living on a little planet, the earth, which will last only for an instant." <sup>2</sup> True, man is small in size, but he was made to be immortal, to be master of the world, whom everything else is to serve. Man is to live after the world is destroyed, for eternity.

The low value placed on human life <sup>3</sup> is the natural result of the low esteem in which evolutionists hold humanity. Consistent Darwinism would hold that man should struggle constantly to kill other men or animals of similar species. <sup>4</sup> This struggle, it is said, has been lifted to another plane in human society, where the competition, except in the lower classes, is not so much for food as for position and supremacy, but this struggle results ultimately in the elimination of the weak and inferior, so that in human society, as in the animal world,

---

1 Macartney, C.E. A Christian's Difficulty with Evolution, in The Presbyterian, Vol.CVII, No.23, June 10, 1937, p.5

2 Keyser, op. cit., p.110

3 Ellwood, Charles A. loc. cit.

4 Hibbert Journal, Vol.XXVII, No.4, July, 1929, pp.666-668

progress depends on the elimination of unfit individuals.<sup>1</sup>  
 According to Darwin humanity is inviting degeneration by  
 caring for the poor and weak instead of letting them die.<sup>2</sup>  
 Darwinism implies extermination of the unfit.<sup>3</sup>

According to the Christian doctrine man is not a being to be treated with contempt.<sup>4</sup> Scripture places a high value on man. The smallness of man is not an indication of man's lack of importance.<sup>5</sup> He was not developed at the convenience of nature. "Nature was made for him."<sup>6</sup> He was specially created in God's image, and this fact is fully consistent with the importance attached to redemption, showing God's high regard for man.<sup>7</sup> God was so greatly concerned with man, His "choicest jewel of the creation," that, when man fell into sin and trouble, God was willing to sacrifice His Son in order to rescue mankind, so that man might enjoy an eternity of bliss and glory with God.<sup>8</sup> God is interested in man's welfare, and not only that of the entire race, but the welfare of the individual, as Jesus' parables of the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the prodigal son indicate.<sup>9</sup>

- 
- 1 Elwood, Charles A. Sociology and Modern Social Problems, p.44
  - 2 The World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.335
  - 3 The Hibbert Journal, Vol.XXVII, No.4, July, 1929, p.674
  - 4 Keyser, L.S., Is Man an Accident? In Christian Faith and Life, Vol.37, No.2, Feb, 1931, p.62
  - 5 Keyser, L.S., The Problem of Origins, p.110
  - 6 Ibid., p.48
  - 7 Ibid., p.109
  - 8 Ibid., p.113
  - 9 Ibid., p.114

By denying the Scriptural account of man's creation opens the door to the denial of man's importance, which leads also to the denial of man's salvation.

#### THE STATE OF MAN

Humanists paint a somewhat gloomy picture of man's original condition. Speaking of the first man, they say: "He was adorned with talents, but it was not his lot to hold them out against cold, hunger, and wild beasts."<sup>1</sup> Scripture, on the other hand, presents man as the highest of all the creatures, living in full accord with God and being served by all the rest of nature. This continued as long as man remained in his state of moral perfection. He was sound of body, without disease or death. He had intelligence, knowledge, and wisdom, bestowed on him at creation. He was without sin, perfectly good and righteous, being in the image of the Father God.<sup>2</sup>

These conditions that existed before the fall are regarded as a divine error by evolutionists, who like to picture man as steadily improving, coming out of the animal world, advancing to his present position of grandeur, developing physically, intellectually, and morally. The Bible, however, sets us perfect at the beginning, as having been made from his original state of perfection. Genesis 1, 21 states that God saw every thing that He

<sup>1</sup> Bible, ch. viii, p. 151

<sup>2</sup> Genesis, 1, 26, 27, 28, 29

<sup>3</sup> See also the following page in this volume

## THE FALL

## PRIMEVAL STATE OF MAN

Evolutionists paint a somewhat gruesome picture of man's original condition. Speaking of the first human beings one says: "We can admire their endurance, for it was nip and tuck with them to hold their own against cold, hunger, and wild beasts." <sup>1</sup> Scripture, on the other hand, presents man as the highest of all the creatures, living in full accord with God and being served by all the rest of nature. This continued as long as man remained in his state of moral perfection. He was sound of body, without disease or death. He had intelligence, knowledge, and wisdom, bestowed on him at creation. He was without sin, perfectly good and righteous, being in the image of the Triune God. <sup>2</sup>

These conditions that existed before the fall are regarded as a utopian dream by evolutionists, who like to picture man as steadily improving, coming out of the animal world, advancing to his present position of prominence, developing physically, intellectually, and morally. <sup>3</sup> The Bible presents man as perfect at the beginning, and moving ever down from his original state of perfection. Genesis 1, 31 states that "God saw every thing that He

---

1 Davis, op. cit., p.331

2 Graebner, A. L. op. cit., p.67

3 See under # on following page in footnotes



had made, and behold, it was very good." This "very" has superlative significance,<sup>1</sup> and, since the "very good" comes after the creation of man, man is included in this judgement.<sup>2</sup> The designation "very good" could hardly be applied to a man like that being pictured by the evolutionists as just emerging from the class of brutes, still bearing many of the more vicious qualities of his brute ancestors.<sup>3</sup> God's "very good" pronouncement referred not only to man, but to the entire creation, the lower animals, fish, birds, plants, and inanimate creation as well. The rest of creation was very good as created, but this is no longer true. The entire creation has been permeated with sin and its results. "The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly." "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."<sup>4</sup> The whole creation, originally perfect, now suffers from the effects of man's fall into sin, and especially man himself, who, being the only earthly creature with

---

1 Keyser, *The Problem of Origins*, pp.108-109

2 Gesenius, *Hebrew-German Lexicon*, under *טָרַף*

3 Keyser, *op. cit.*, p.109

4 Keyser, *loc. cit.*

4 Romans 8, 20.22.

# Fairhurst, *op. cit.*, p.301: "By evil I think we commonly mean suffering, and we speak of an environment as being evil when it produces suffering."

*Ibid.*, p.302: "Enjoyment arises largely from the adaptation of the organism to its environment, and suffering from a lack of such adaptation. Suffering comes, therefore, as an incentive to the animal to adapt itself to its environment."

*Ibid.*, p.302: "Suffering in our present condition is absolutely necessary for our protection and preservation, and to this extent it must be pronounced good, and not evil, in a moral sense."

moral consciousness is the only one that sins. At creation man was holy, just as God the Creator is holy. <sup>1</sup>

#### THE FALL ITSELF

This original holiness evolutionists deny, and, since they refuse to admit the original perfection of man, they naturally reject also the fall of man as it is presented in Scripture, regarding it as the first stirring of the troubled conscience. The historicity of the fall is denied. <sup>2</sup> The serpent's speaking and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil are called mythical, unhistorical elements. <sup>3</sup> Man's condemnation resulting from the fall is denied, just as the eating of the forbidden fruit is also denied. <sup>4</sup>

While evolutionists deny that there was ever a time when man or his ancestors were without viciousness and lusts, they claim that in the animal state these lusts were not evil. <sup>5</sup> The Bible is even quoted as a proof of this. In Romans 7, <sup>7</sup> Paul writes: "I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." From this one evolutionist attempts to show that there was no sin until the law came, <sup>6</sup> but Romans 5, 13 states that "until the law sin was in the

---

1 Keyser, The Problem of Origins

2 Graebner, Theo., God and the Cosmos, p.188

3 Ibid., p.187

4 Ibid., p.188

5 Goldsmith, op. cit., p.104

6 Goldsmith, loc. cit.

world." The fall is taken as an experience of the individual, the awakening of the consciousness of evil. The fall, it is said, is not necessary in every man's life, but will probably occur until men's spirits master their flesh. <sup>1</sup>

## SIN

"Sin is moral evil," <sup>2</sup> thus no being can sin unless he has conscience and freedom. Since animals have not conscience and freedom, they cannot be sinful. <sup>2</sup> Man, being a moral being, is capable of sin. Theistic evolutionists cannot explain how man came to be a moral being. They say he developed into one, but they cannot tell at what point man was evolved into a moral being. They do not know at what stage man was being made in the image of God. <sup>3</sup> The Bible presents man as a moral being from the beginning, the only earthly creature that suffers under the accusations of a troubled conscience, <sup>4</sup> and the original absence of a troubled conscience was due only to the absence of sin to cause the anguish of conscience. Not the conscience, but the trouble was missing.

Even evolutionists, with all their rosy views, admit that conditions on the earth are far from perfect, but they view everything as constantly improving, especially

<sup>1</sup> Goldsmith, op. cit., pp.105-106

<sup>2</sup> Keyser, L.S., Is Sin an Animal Legacy? in The Bible Champion, Vol.36, No.2, Feb.,1930, p.61

<sup>3</sup> Keyser, op. cit., in Bible Champion, Vol.36, No.2, p.62

<sup>4</sup> Dawson, The Bible Confirmed by Science, pp.144-145

man himself. Truly, the human race is not perfect, and the moral imperfection is particularly noticeable, but the evolutionists regard human beings as "nothing but a bundle of characteristics derived from our brute progenitors." <sup>1</sup> Scripture, however, knows nothing of our brute progenitors. The Biblical explanation of all the trouble in the world is the sin of mankind, <sup>2</sup> who by the fall plunged the world into sin and the resulting ills and troubles.

Here evolution goes wild with its denials. It makes God the Author of sin. Theistic evolution, in a form which differs little from atheism, holds that God performs everything that occurs by "direct volition," which makes Him responsible also for evil. <sup>3</sup> God would be thus responsible for everything that happens, good or bad. "So far as human nature is concerned, it would be fatalism," <sup>4</sup> since men would be merely machines operated by the principle, the volition that theistic evolutionists call God. <sup>5</sup>

This would remove responsibility from man, for, if man has no will of his own, he has no respect for law. Yet Scripture does hold man responsible for his deeds.

Those also who hold that man's moral sense developed

---

1 Macartney, op. cit., in The Presbyterian, Vol. CVII, No. 23, June 10, 1937, p. 6

2 Keyser, The Problem of Origins, p. 45

3 Fairhurst, op. cit., p. 413

4 Ibid., p. 382

5 Ibid., p. 413: "Atheism which holds that God performs all that occurs by direct volition, makes Him responsible for evil; it also denies the freedom of the human will, and miracles, for all -- so to speak -- is one continuous miracle."

from that of the animals take away most of man's responsibility. Any wickedness can be attributed to the ways of the animal, <sup>1</sup> which retain a hold on man. A soulless being as man is assumed to be by descent would have respect for no law, being motivated only by fear and the gratification of every impulse. <sup>2</sup> "There are no laws that, in conscience, he who is without conscience must heed." <sup>3</sup> Animals are not held responsible, hence, they can continue, human beings, who are animals themselves by descent, should bear no moral responsibility. This is claimed, in spite of the voice of the human conscience, as well as the accusations in Scripture.

The defenders of evolution, especially those who are theologically inclined, claim that sin is "merely the remains of man's heritage of animalism." <sup>4</sup> A well known Modernist preacher of New England expresses this without the customary beating around the bush.

"The theory of evolution, propounded in the middle of the nineteenth century and soon substantiated by a mass of evidence, offered a new and convincing explanation of the evil impulses in human hearts. Men realized at last that life had first appeared in lowly forms, that it had worked its way up through the animal to the human realm, and that cruel and vicious tendencies which disfigure human character today represent the survival of ancient animal instincts. Greed, gluttony, sexual passion, hatred of enemies, the thirst for revenge -- all these things are legacies from a far-off jungle world. In that world such insistent and

---

1 Goldsmith, op. cit., p.104

2 McCann, Alfred W. God -- or Gorilla, pp.271-272

3 Ibid., p.272

4 Keyser, op. cit., p.209

resistless desires had an obvious value in the protection and preservation of the species." 1

"The New Protestantism ... abandons completely the notion of original sin and the belief in demonic activity, and traces all the dangerous impulses in men's hearts to inheritances drawn from the jungle world. In the case of certain sins -- greed and lust, for example -- the connection between the animal and the human realms is clear." 2

Human beings, then, do wrong, not because the sin of Adam perverted their nature, not because evil spirits tempt them to wickedness, but because they are the descendants of animals, and traces of the jungle beast are still present and active in all of us. 3 Naturally, if man regards himself as merely a highly developed ape, and assumes that he must inevitably yield to even the grossest impulses inherited from the ape, it is easy for him to find some justification for any crime that he can commit without detection. 4 This tends to weaken morality.

That sin is an inheritance from our animal ancestry is against reason as well as against Scripture. Men could not inherit sin from animals, because animals are not sinful. 5 Yet evolutionists insist that sin is an ancestral heritage. John Fiske, a theistic evolutionist, in his *Destiny of Man*, says: "This original sin is neither more nor less than the brute inheritance which every man carries

---

1 Gilkey, J.G. op. cit., pp.122-123

2 Ibid., pp.123-124

3 Ibid., p.123

4 McCann, op. cit., p.271

5 Keyser, L.S., *Is Sin an Animal Legacy?* in *The Bible Champion*, Vol.36, No.2, Feb.,1930, p.61

with him." 1

Another theistic evolutionist, Sir Oliver Lodge, says in his *Science and Immortality*:

"As a matter of fact, the higher man of today is not worrying about his sins at all, still less about their punishment... As for original sin, or birth sin, or other notion of that kind, by which is partly meant the sin of his parents, that sits lightly upon him. As a matter of fact, it is not existent, and no one but a monk could have invented it." 2

That we have been shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin is boldly denied. 3

The very term "fall of man" is opposed to evolution, which claims that man is constantly rising. The effects of the fall as found in Scripture are denied by evolution just as the fall itself is denied. Man lost the divine image, which evolutionists refuse to admit that man ever possessed. Man was no longer able to be perfect, as evolutionists deny that he ever was. Man was no longer immortal, but faced temporal death and eternal damnation as a consequence of this sin. "... By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." 4 And "... by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation." 5

This is diametrically opposed to the evolutionary ideas. Scripture presents man as "dead in trespasses and

- 1 Macartney, C. E., *A Christian's Difficulty with Evolution*, in *The Presbyterian*, CVII, No.23, June 10, 1937, p.6.
- 2 Macartney, op. cit., in *The Presbyterian*, loc. cit.
- 3 Graebner, Theo., op. cit., p.188
- 4 Romans 5, 12
- 5 Romans 5, 18

sins,"<sup>1</sup> but consistent evolution cannot have mankind spiritually dead, because this would preclude progress.<sup>2</sup> Theistic evolution denies that man is "handicapped by a preponderance of evil in his nature," claiming instead that "the strongest instinct of his soul impels him forward," in constant progress toward a "realization of the highest ideals of the Master."<sup>3</sup> Evolution cannot conceive of a God of progress who created intelligent beings and then denied them a progress upward,<sup>4</sup> but man's fall and his inability to rise are not due to God but to man himself. \*

According to evolution sin is not an act ~~nor~~ state of disobedience or opposition to God, but "merely a negative deficiency or inadequacy which will be remedied by further development."<sup>5</sup> This idea removes the need for forgiveness and redemption, which are fundamental for Christianity.<sup>6</sup> "A kind God," says the Modernist preacher,

---

1 Ephesians 2,1.

2 Goldsmith, op. cit., p.101

3 Hudson, op. cit., p.186

4 Goldsmith, loc. cit.

5 Dawson, op. cit., p.63.

6 Ibid., p.63

\* Evolutionists like to watch people advance and become civilized, but this does not occur. Instead, some highly civilized peoples have lapsed back almost to savagery. There is what appears to be a universal tendency toward degeneration. Anderson, A Doubter's Doubts, etc., p.27

Dawson, op. cit., p.132: "Instead of the lowest of men being the most primitive, the best evidence points in the other direction, in showing that they are in reality degenerate."

Keyser, The Problem of Origins, p.246 (quoting): "'So far from civilization having been evolved from the savage state, the opposite is the case.'"



"would surely not prepare everlasting torment for those in whom the relics of animalism are still too strong and the essential human qualities of ambition and moral idealism too weak." <sup>1</sup> In short, "the remedy is superfluous, for man is not a sinner." <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Gilkey, op. cit., p.130

<sup>2</sup> Macartney, op. cit., in The Presbyterian, Vol.CVII, No.23, June 10, 1937, p.6.

"... if the created moral being had not fallen into sin, there would have been no history of redemption to record and no doctrine of redemption to teach." Keyser, The Problem of Origins, p.69

"... they eliminate the doctrine of atonement, and they believe man has been rising all the time, that man never fell, that when the Savior came there was not any reason for His coming, ... and that He lies in His grave." Wm. J. Bryan The World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.178

## CONCLUSION

## THE VICIOUSNESS OF EVOLUTION

Anything that opposes Christianity is a Satanic device, and evolution is no exception. Claiming to be in perfect harmony with religion, or even with Christianity, the evolutionists deny the fundamental Christian doctrines. The religion of the evolutionist is not that of Scripture, but "unbiblical and antibiblical."<sup>1</sup> No one has ever been saved from sin by belief in evolution,<sup>2</sup> but many have been started on the road to damnation.

Regarding the first chapters of Genesis as the only section of Scripture vitally affected by the evolutionary hypothesis, its proponents observe little restraint in their antibiblical claims, assuming that they can explain these chapters or show that there is some harmony between them and evolution, and thus maintain a harmony between evolution and Christianity. This is a false view, since the entire Bible opposes evolution, and is in perfect agreement with the first chapters in Genesis, which treat of creation and the fall. Canon Liddon asserted that the trustworthiness of the Old Testament and the trustworthiness of Christ were inseparable.<sup>3</sup> Even Huxley, who admitted his rejection of Scripture, said: "I am fairly at

---

1 Keyser, The Problem of Origins, p.161

2 Ibid., p.145

3 Huxley, Science and Hebrew Tradition, p.209

a loss to comprehend how anyone, for a moment, can doubt that Christian theology must stand or fall with the historical trustworthiness of the Jewish Scriptures."<sup>1</sup>

The Jewish Scriptures treat of Christ, and while attacking the Old Testament the evolutionists are attacking also Christ. Evolution "robs Christ of the glory of a virgin birth, of the majesty of His deity and mission, and of the triumph of His resurrection," says Bryan, adding: "It also disputes the doctrine of the atonement."<sup>2</sup> Evolution eliminates the virgin birth,<sup>3</sup> making Jesus the product of the laws or forces active in nature and society.<sup>4</sup> The evolutionist makes of Jesus the flower of humanity, the highest product of evolutionary development,<sup>5</sup> but no more than this, no different in essence from any other man. The importance of His work is made negligible. He is relegated to a position of relative unimportance, looked on as a great teacher, who can show men how to conquer.

The only hope that the evolutionist can find for the human race is the expectation of continuous improvement over an indefinitely long period.<sup>6</sup> This improvement, the future of the race, lies in human hands.<sup>7</sup> God must

---

1 Huxley, op. cit., p.207. (esp. concerning the Messiah)

2 The World's Most Famous Court Trial, p.338

3 Ibid., p.178

4 Graebner, Theo., op. cit., p.188

5 Macartney, op. cit., in The Presbyterian, Vol. CVII, No.24, June 17, 1937, p.6

6 Dawson, op. cit., p.155

7 Ibid., p.62

be ruled out of human and worldly affairs, say evolutionists, first because man has no need of divine aid in making progress, and also because God ceased to be concerned with the development of the world long before humanity appeared on the earth. <sup>1</sup>

As to the future of the individual evolution has nothing to offer. Spencer, Huxley, and Haeckel, while approving self-preservation as the law of life in the world, frown on the hope for life beyond the grave as selfish. <sup>2</sup> Evolutionists speak of immortality, by which they mean either the continuance of the species or the endurance of the accomplishments and fame of individual human beings, but not the resurrection of the body as Scripture presents it. Evolution will have nothing to do with the idea of a bodily resurrection from the grave. <sup>3</sup>

The doctrine that man has gradually risen from the animal level leaves little basis for morality. <sup>4</sup> Christianity is subverted, and hedonism is the natural consequence. The denial of the sinfulness of sin, the resulting denial of any need for salvation, the rejection of Christ, and eternal damnation, all follow consistently. For the welfare of the human race evolution must be conquered.

---

1 Dawson, op. cit., p.62

2 Gibbs, Evolution and Christianity, p.9

3 Macartney, op. cit., in The Presbyterian, Vol.CVII, No.24, June 17, 1937, p.6.

4 Dawson, op. cit., p.63

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Anderson, Robert, A Doubter's Doubts about Science and Religion, R.V.Bingham, Toronto, Canada, 1923
- Cunningham, G. Watts, Problems of Philosophy, An Introductory Survey, Revised, Henry Holt, New York, 1935
- Davis, Watson, (editor) The Advance of Science  
Doubleday Doran, Garden City, 1934
- Dawson, W. Bell, The Bible Confirmed by Science  
Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, London, 1936
- Demiashkevich, Michael, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education, American, New York, 1935
- Driesch, Hans, The Breakdown of Materialism, in Mason, The Great Design, pp.281-303
- Ellwood, Charles A., Sociology and Modern Social Problems, New Edition - Revised, American, N.Y., 1924
- Fairhurst, Alfred, Organic Evolution Considered, Second Edition, Standard Publ.Co., Cincinnati, 1913
- Fleming, Ambrose. The Origin of Mankind  
Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, London

- Gibbs, Jessie Wiseman, Evolution and Christianity  
Gibbs, Memphis, 1930  
Printed by Kingsport Press, Kingsport, Tennessee
- Gilkey, James Gordon, What Can We Believe? A Study of  
the New Protestantism, Macmillan, New York, 1933
- Goldenweiser, Alexander, Anthropology, An Introduction  
To Primitive Culture, Crofts, New York, 1937
- Goldsmith, Wm. M., Evolution or Christianity? God or  
Darwin? The Anderson Press, Winfield, Kan., 1924
- Graebner, A. L., Outlines of Doctrinal Theology  
Concordia, St. Louis, 1898
- Graebner, Theo., Essays on Evolution  
Concordia, St. Louis, 1925
- Graebner, Theo., God and the Cosmos  
Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1932
- Hudson, Thomson Jay, The Divine Pedigree of Man  
A.C. McClurg & Co. Chicago, 1899
- Huxley, Thomas H., Science and Hebrew Tradition  
Appleton, New York, 1896
- Keyser, Leander S., The Problem of Origins  
Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa, 1926  
Copyright 1926 by Macmillan, printed by Little &  
Ives Co., New York

- Kolbe, Monsignor, A Catholic View of Holism  
Macmillan, New York, 1928
- MacBride, Earnest William, The Oneness and Uniqueness  
of Life, in Mason, The Great Design, pp.133-158
- Macfie, Ronald Campbell, Science Rediscovered God  
T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1930
- Mason, Frances, (editor) The Great Design, Order and  
Progress in Nature, Macmillan, New York, 1934
- McCann, Alfred Watterson, God -- or Gorilla  
Devin Adair, New York, 1925
- Morgan, C. Lloyd, The Ascent of Mind, in Mason, The  
Great Design, pp.113-132
- Mullins, E. Y., Why is Christianity True? American  
Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1905
- Rand, Benjamin, Modern Classical Philosophers, (compiled)  
Houghton Mifflin, N.Y. Riverside, Cambridge, 1908
- Spencer, Herbert, sections of First Principles of a New  
System of Philosophy, in Rand, Modern Classical  
Philosophers, reprinted from 6th American copyright  
edition, New York, D.Appleton & Co., 1903.  
These sections reprinted in Rand, pp.703-732

Strong, Augustus Hopkins, Christ in Creation and Ethical  
Monism, Griffeth and Rowland, Philadelphia, 1908

World's Most Famous Court Trial, The, Tennessee Evolution  
Case, Third Edition, National Book Company,  
Cincinnati, 1925

#### PERIODICALS

Anglican Theological Review, Vol.V II, 1924-1925,  
Lancaster Press, Lancaster, Pa.

Dibble, Charles L., Emergent Evolution, a review  
of C.Lloyd Morgan's "Emergent Evolution" Pp.179-183

Bible Champion, The, Vol.36, No.2, Feb,1930

Frank J.Boyer, pub., Reading, Pa. pp.61-62

Keyser, Leander S., Is Sin an Animal Legacy?

Christian Faith and Life, Vol.37, No.2, Feb, 1931

Frank J. Boyer, pub., Reading, Pa.

Keyser, Leander S., Is Man an Accident? pp.62-64

Concordia Junior Messenger, Vol.XV, 1937, Nos.10.11.

Concordia, St. Louis,

Kaufmann, Fred H., Evolution -- That Mental Cancer

Oct., 1937, No.10, pp.231-232, 239-240

Nov., 1937, No.11, pp.251-252, 262-263



Hibbert Journal, The, Vol.XXVII, No.4, July, 1929

Constable and Co., London; Phillips, Boston.

The Bishop of Exeter, writing about Sir Arthur

Keith's "Darwinism and What it Implies," pp.666-675

Pre sbyterian, The, Vol.CVII, No.22,23,24.

Philadelphia, Pa., June, 1937

Macartney, Clarence E., A Christian's Difficulty  
with Evolution, Part 1 in No.22, June 3, pp.8-9

Part 2 in No.23, June 10, pp.5-6. Part 3 in

No.24, June 17, pp.6-7

Princeton Theological Review, Vol.XXIV, 1926

Princeton University Press, Princeton

Hamilton, Floyd E., Modern Aspects of the Theory  
of Evolution, pp.396-448

Smithsonian Institution, Annual Report of the Board of  
Regents of The, 1934, (Publication 3305)

U.S.Government Printing Office, Washington, 1935

Conklin, Edwin G., A Generation's Progress in the  
Study of Evolution 22

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALSO QUOTED OR REFERRED TO

Fiske, John, Destiny of Man

Gesenius, Hebrew - German Lexicon

Lodge, Sir Oliver, "Science and Immortality"

Morgan, C. Lloyd, Emergent Evolution

Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute,  
1921.