

FOREWORD AND SUMMARY

THE main object of these pages is to show that Evolution is incompatible with the vital doctrines of Christianity. This is maintained by the leaders who are most loyal to the truth of Scripture.

It is first necessary to ascertain just what Evolution properly means. If its claims are to be maintained, it must explain the development of all that exists, from primary material to life and intelligence. When the various departments of science are examined, it is found that in the inorganic realm or material universe, there is no trace of evolutionary development; which in that realm would be the transformation of a simple substance into a different substance of higher type. Evolution is thus without any foundational basis for a starting point in its theories.

In the realm of life, there is no evidence of evolutionary change in the great world of one-celled creatures where it is most to be expected and could best be observed. In the higher grades of life, from the radiates upward, the forces or tendencies which Darwin set forth as capable of producing development are now discredited. What cause there can be which can enable one species to change into another, is now uncertain and disputed amongst evolutionists.

The difficulties in the way of Evolution have been vastly increased in recent years by the progress of science and archæological research. In regard to man, discoveries have emphasized the contrast between early men and the animals; because of their high natural intelligence and the rapid rise of civilization at the outset. The possible time for the development of man has also been greatly curtailed by further investigation.

A theory such as Evolution can be judged not only on the ground of evidence, and the need for adequate forces to cause it to operate, but it can also be tested by its outcome. If its tenets when followed out, are found to be subversive of known truth, in morals and religion, the verdict must be against it.

When compared with the foundational doctrines of Christianity, it is coming to be clearly recognized that the teachings of Evolution are antagonistic to them. Compromise is not possible unless the vital truths of Christianity are explained away and replaced by Modernist views. It is thus evident that a choice must be made between evolutionary teaching and the Scriptures as a revelation from God.

W. B. D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE MEANING AND BEGINNINGS OF EVOLUTION	- 5
LIMITATIONS OF EVOLUTION - - - - -	12
SUMMARY OF THE QUESTION - - - - -	23
THE TESTS OF EVOLUTION - - - - -	27
PHYSICAL MAN AND HIS INTELLIGENCE - - -	38
EVOLUTION AND MAN'S SPIRITUAL NATURE - -	46
ATTITUDE TOWARD EVOLUTION - - - - -	57

EVOLUTION CONTRASTED WITH SCRIPTURE TRUTH

Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

—1 Cor. 1:20, 21.

THE MEANING AND BEGINNINGS OF EVOLUTION

WHAT is the Meaning of Evolution?—In considering Evolution, it is more necessary than in almost any other subject, to make quite clear what we really mean by it. It has been well said that "Evolution" is the most over-worked word in the whole dictionary, because of the extraordinary variety of different things that it is made to signify. Some writers go so far as to include under Evolution every change or progression of every kind and description that takes place in nature. Every stage of development, in the heavens above or in the earth beneath, from the hatching of an egg to the life-history of a star, is comprised under the term "Evolution"; and we are called upon to accept Evolution or to deny that any change can ever occur. Not only so, but all progress in human invention, and even the advance of knowledge, is characterized as Evolution.

There are men of science who reply with indignation to any attack upon Evolution, that to deny it is to put a ban upon all research and to arrest all progress in knowledge; and to revert in the end to the dogmatic intolerance of the Dark Ages. If we examine just what they mean by Evolution in making so sweeping a statement, we find that they are giving it the wide inclusiveness above referred to. It is quite unscientific to include under one term a vast aggregation of diverse things which are the outcome of equally diverse causes; and this over-loading of the word Evolution only leads to confusion of thought. It is thus evidently necessary to have some rational definition of the meaning of Evolution.

It is pointed out by Sir William Dawson that Evolution, even with reference to organisms, is given four distinct meanings: (1) The development of structures, such as the development of seeds and eggs into perfect plants and animals. This process goes on in a circle; for the hen lays an egg and the egg becomes a hen, and no Evolution occurs at all, in the sense of some new creature of a different kind arising from the process. (2) Indirect development, or that which takes place under the power and guidance of an external will. In this way, varieties of animals and plants are produced by selection and other means; such as fancy pigeons and new varieties of apples. The question whether any new type that remains permanent can thus be developed, has been closely investigated for many years; and the relation of varieties to true species has been keenly discussed. (3) The supposed development of new kinds or species of animals and plants from others, by descent with modification; a process which is unknown except as a hypothesis. This is what the doctrine of Evolution was originally contrived to establish. (4) The supposed production of living

organisms from dead matter; also a process unknown to science. The most intensive study has been given to this problem, with entirely negative results.

As Dawson then remarks: "All these entirely distinct kinds of change are mixed up by evolutionists in treating of organic evolution; and they freely extend the same term to things so different as the physical changes by which the earth assumed its present form, the improvement of arts and social institutions, the growth of nations by human agency, and even the supposed development of the mind of man himself from the powers of lower animals. In these circumstances, if we are to understand anything of this confused and multi-form philosophy, we must perpetually question its advocates and exponents as to the kind of development of which they are speaking, and as to the causes to which such alleged developments may be attributed." (*Modern Ideas of Evolution*; p. 26.)

The only consistent meaning of Evolution, in the sense in which it is properly used, may be thus stated: It is a gradual process of development by which all the varied materials in the world were evolved from some primal substance of one kind; and the further development from these materials, of all the variety of plant and animal life that we see around us. In such an evolving process, it is evident that one kind of material must have been transformed into another of a totally different kind; as different as a piece of limestone and a block of iron; and also that one kind of animal must have developed into another which is entirely different. For example, not only must a lizard have become a bird, but in course of time a lion must have developed from some early creature as simple as a jelly-fish. Such changes as these must have occurred if Evolution is to hold good. We may therefore make the matter as clear

as may be, by giving the following explanatory definition: Evolution includes the development of all things from one primal substance, the change of one creature into another of a totally different kind, and finally the development of man from the animals.

This is what Evolution claims to accomplish; and it is quite evident if we are asked to believe this, two things must be established: First, some causes or influences have to be found, capable of producing these changes, or the theory is incredible; also, adequate evidence must be discovered, that such developments have actually taken place.

Darwinism.—Although Darwinism does not begin with the primary development of the universe, but plunges into the heart of the matter, it may be best to begin with it; because the modern discussion of Evolution may be dated from 1859, when Charles Darwin published his *Origin of Species*. What he meant by Evolution was the change of one species of creature into another, which corresponds with our present definition; and his book undertook to explain how this may have taken place. It is only fair to Darwin to point out, as has often been done, that he put forward Evolution as a hypothesis or theory; and also that he quite recognized that for any theory to hold good, some adequate causes or forces must be found, to enable it to operate. The causes which he considered adequate to change one species into another, were three: (1) The struggle for existence, (2) the survival of the fittest, and (3) natural selection, by which any creature would select as its mate the most improved individual; and the backward and inferior types would thus die out. In this development of new species, man himself was included; and it was maintained that he also had developed from the lower animals by the operation of these three forces or tendencies.