

## PART SIXTEEN

### EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

The following statements appeared recently in a local church publication: "The Fall runs straight across the path of the theory of evolution. If evolution is true, then the Biblical teaching concerning sin and salvation and the ultimate judgment upon man is *not*. Evolution teaches that man gradually evolves upward; the Bible teaches that man began perfect, sinned, and has devolved downward ever since. One has to take a choice: you can't have it both ways. To hold to an evolutionary concept of man's history one has to get rid of the Fall. This doesn't mean to interpret the book of Genesis as a book of 'myths with spiritual truths.' It means to get rid of Jesus and His teaching which supports the Fall. It means that the Old Testament prophets have to go, with their pronouncements on the subject. Then you have to throw out the New Testament letters which declare the Fall as a reality and explain how it is overcome through Christ," etc.

These are positive "either-or" affirmations. They precipitate certain very significant questions, such as the following: Is there any possible ground of reconciliation of the evolution hypothesis with the Genesis account of the Fall? Furthermore, is there any real necessity for demanding such a reconciliation as a factor in validating "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3)? That is, are the two subjects genuinely relevant to each other, and, if so, how far does this relevance extend? Is to try to find harmony with respect to every detail involved in both the Biblical and "scientific" accounts really necessary, or even justifiable? Finally, is it true that man "began perfect"? Or, did he "begin" innocent with the potentiality of attaining wholeness or perfection? One thing is sure, namely, that *man as we know him historically and experientially, is anything but the epitome of physical, mental, moral or spiritual perfection.* No one but a

## GENESIS

person blinded by his own conceits would even question this fact.

In sharp contrast to the view presented above, Dr. A. H. Strong, who can hardly be accused of heresy with respect to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, has written as follows (ST, 465, 466): "The Scriptures, on the one hand, negate the idea that man is the mere product of unreasoning natural forces. They refer his existence to a cause different from mere nature, namely, the creative act of God. . . . But, on the other hand, the Scriptures do not disclose the method of man's creation. Whether man's physical system is or is not derived, by natural descent from the lower animals, the record of creation does not inform us. As the command, 'Let the earth bring forth living creatures' (Gen. 1:24), does not exclude the idea of mediate creation, so the forming of man 'of the dust of the ground' (Gen. 2:7) does not in itself determine whether the creation of man's body was mediate or immediate. . . . Evolution does not make the idea of a Creator superfluous, because evolution is only the method of God. It is perfectly consistent with a Scriptural doctrine of Creation that man should emerge at the proper time, governed by different laws from the brute creation, yet growing out of the brute, just as the foundation of a house built of stone is perfectly consistent with the wooden structure built upon it. All depends upon the plan. An atheistic and undesigning evolution cannot include man without excluding what Christianity regards as essential to man. . . . But a theistic evolution can recognize the whole process of man's creation equally the work of nature and the work of God. . . . Psychology comes to our help in the interpretation of Scripture. The radical differences between man's soul and the principle of intelligence in the lower animals, especially man's possession of self-consciousness, general ideas, the moral sense, and the power of self-determination, show that that which chiefly constitutes

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

him man, could not have been derived, by any natural process of development, from the inferior creatures. We are compelled, then, to believe that God's 'breathing into man's nostrils the breath of life' (Gen. 2:7), though it was a mediate creation as presupposing existing material in the shape of animal forms, was yet an immediate creation in the sense that only a divine reinforcement of the process of life turned the animal into man. In other words, man came not *from* the brute, but *through* the brute, and the same immanent God who had previously created the brute created also the man." Again (466): "Drummond, in his *Ascent of Man*, concedes that man passed through a period when he resembled the ape more than any known animal, but at the same time declares that no anthropoid ape could develop into a man. The brute can be defined in terms of man, but man cannot be defined in terms of the brute. It is significant that in insanity the higher endowments of man disappear in an order precisely the reverse of that in which, according to the development theory, they have been acquired. The highest part of man totters first. The last added is first to suffer." Again, quoting J. M. Bronson (466): "The theist must accept evolution if he would keep his argument for the existence of God from the unity of design in nature. Unless man is an *end*, he is an *anomaly*. The greatest argument for God is the fact that all animate nature is one vast and connected unity. Man has developed not *from* the ape, but *away from* the ape. He was never anything but potential man. He did not, as man, come into being until he became a conscious moral agent." To this Strong adds: "This conscious moral nature, which we call personality, requires a divine Author, because it surpasses all the powers which can be found in the animal creation." But, is the "breathing into man's nostrils" of "the breath of life" to be explained (as in Strong's statement) as a "reinforcement of the process of life" that "turned the animal into a man"?

## GENESIS

What kind of "reinforcement"? Or, just what did this "reinforcement" consist of? The word "reinforcement," as used here, strikes me as being exceedingly vague. Surely the texts of Gen. 1:27 and 2:7 leave us with only one valid interpretation, namely, that the "breath of God" carried with it a direct impartation from God Himself of *those powers which specify man as man*—his intellectual, moral and spiritual endowments, in fact the essence of his interior life. Gen. 1:28, if it means anything, surely means that God breathed into him, not just the life principle, but the rational principle as well which is that which constitutes him a conscious moral creature. (Cf. Gen. 6:17; Eccl. 12:7; Job 33:4, 32:8; Psa. 139:14; Eccl. 12:7; Acts 17:25). It will be recalled that Lotze, the German philosopher, held that at certain stages of development, God, by direct action, inserted into the creative process new increments of power, namely, the phenomena of energy-matter, life, consciousness, and self-consciousness, respectively, thus accounting for the gaps that still obtain in scientific thought between successively higher levels of being. It will also be recalled, in this connection, that Trueblood (PR, 98-102) contends that what he calls "the fact of evolution" is a positive proof of our theistic God. He quotes Archbishop Temple as saying, "The more completely we include Mind within Nature, the more inexplicable must Nature become except by reference to Mind." Trueblood himself then adds, that if man's life is included in the evolution theory, "we cannot escape the conclusion that mind and nature are akin," that "mind is not accidental in nature," but "a revelation of the nature of nature." The thesis of his argument is that such a unity is a unity of design, one that "arises only from effective operation of purpose." (Cf. Isa. 44:6-8, 46:8-11; Psa. 33:6-9, 148:1-6; Acts 17:23-31).

Let us now examine the facts, as briefly as possible, which have to do with the problem of evolutionism and its bearing on the Genesis narrative of the Fall. (I suggest

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

that the student read again my *Genesis*, Vol. 1, pp. 559-601). In pursuing this study, we must call attention again to the difference in meaning of the terms, "evolution" and "evolutionism." The former designates only the process itself, the process of "continuous progressive change." The latter term designates how the process "proceeds," that is, the methodology of it, the factors which are said to have actualized it. *Evolutionism* is also properly designated the *theory of evolution*.

So much by way of introduction. We shall now summarize those various aspects of the material to be presented here, as follows:

1. *Concerning the evolutionists themselves.* (1) Generally speaking, evolutionists are persons who summarily reject any kind of evidence that cannot be supported by empirical observation and measurement: in their own "universe of discourse," they are known as Positivists. (2) In the main they are men who are either non-religious or positively anti-religious in attitude. Hence, they reject *a priori* any notion of what might be called the "supernatural." In this respect they belong in the same school as the "analytical critics" and "demythologizers" who approach history from the *a priori* assumption that any event described as a "miracle" cannot be material for genuine history, no matter how strong the evidence of eyewitnesses in support of it, and hence must be explained (rather, "explained away") on a naturalistic basis or rejected outright. David F. Strauss, whose *Life of Jesus* attained such great popularity in Germany about a century ago, set the fashion in this area of criticism: accepting the historicity of Jesus, he made a vain effort, however, to explain away His miracles in naturalistic terms. The French writer, Renan, fell into the same error: as someone has said, his *Life of Jesus* "rests on the soft pillow of doubt." (3) Of course, evolutionists generally, like scientists of all persuasions, are influenced by the arbitrary

## GENESIS

assumption that lies at the root of all scientific inquiry, namely, that events which cannot be established empirically (that is, by sense-perception, or by sense-perception implemented by proper mechanical devices such as the microscope and the telescope) cannot be accepted as belonging to true science. Notably, in this connection, many scientists scoff at all research in the field of extrasensory perception and psychokinesis, largely because they regard this kind of research as lying beyond the area of scientific investigation in the true sense of that term. Indeed, many of them manifest completely closed minds to all the conclusions reached by the investigators of the phenomena of the subconscious. Again quoting Dr. Jauncey (SRG, 57): "All we can say at the moment is that evolution is generally accepted, possibly because of the lack of any scientific alternative, but with serious misgivings on the adequacy of some aspects of it."

(4) Many evolutionists—indeed, I should say, the great majority of them—are fundamentally ignorant of the teaching of the Bible, in particular of its internal unity, and hence of its basic content and design. It is doubtful that they have even a passing acquaintance with the Holy Spirit, or indeed even know that the Holy Spirit is (cf. Acts 19:2). Over-specialization has much to do with this tragic lacuna in the knowledge of men high in secular academic circles. One of our humorists—Will Rogers, if my memory serves me right—has aptly remarked that "the most ignorant man in the world is the fellow who is highly specialized in one particular field when he ventures outside the field he is specialized in." Years ago, when the first Henry Ford was in his prime, I would have believed almost anything he had to say about the manufacture and marketing of automobiles. But when he ventured into print on matters of religion and politics, as all such gentlemen are prone to do, I could hardly accept anything he said: his statements demonstrated his colossal ignorance of

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

both subjects. The same is true of the fulminations of Edison, Burbank, Clarence Darrow, John Dewey, and all their kind: yet the authority of a great name often leads thousands of gullible persons into egregious fallacies. I recall, in my days in college, certain professors who went out of their way to poke fun at some of the Bible narratives, but their very statements proved that they knew little or nothing about the subjects they ventured to discuss with all the pontifical solemnity of a self-appointed pundit.

(5) It is notoriously true that evolutionists have been addicted to the use of pompous language and to extravagant, if not actually ridiculous, claims in support of their hypothesis. Recall here, for example, Herbert Spencer's grandiose definition of evolution as "continuous change from indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to definite, coherent heterogeneity of structure and function, through successive differentiations and integrations." One is reminded, too, of Haeckel's "Tree of Life" in which he presented the course of evolution under the likeness of a great spreading tree, Haeckel himself supplying the multifarious "missing links" out of his own fantastically fertile imagination. In similar vein, we recall the tendency among historians of our time, as, e.g., the late H. G. Wells in his *Outline of History*, to introduce actual history with chapters on what is obviously prehistory and hence generally conjectural. I can see no justification for this method, especially in view of the fact that the obvious distinction between the character of prehistory and that of history proper is never clearly defined for the reader. One is reminded here also of claims that have been made recently for the antiquity of man, stretching his existence on earth theoretically as far back as 500,000 years. One wonders, if *homo sapiens* has been around that long, *what on earth* has he been doing throughout all these millenia. Surely, there is no evidence from archaeology, or from any other source, that he made much progress, either materially or spiritually, apparently begin-

## GENESIS

ning to do so only some 10,000 years ago, in what is called the Neolithic Age. As a matter of fact, history proper had its beginning no farther back than about 5,000 B.C.—and indubitably *history is made by men*.

The late William Jennings Bryan who, from the role he played in the notorious "monkey trial" (a silly term of journalistic coinage, and one that exudes scorn, no doubt designedly) in Tennessee, has been caricatured in scientific publications, in so-called religious periodicals, and even in the daily press, as a kind of nit-wit, *was anything but that*. (Bryan, unfortunately, allowed himself to be put on the defensive in the Scopes trial, and this is something that one must never do in facing an atheist or an agnostic: the believer has nothing to fear by taking the offensive in such situations. Bryan was, of course, a bit naive in some of his statements, but Darrow was downright *ignorant* of the teaching of the Bible and displayed his ignorance in the arguments he presented.) This writer personally heard Bryan speak, on several occasions, including his famed public lecture, "In the Image of God." In the printed version of this speech, he pointed up some of the extravagant claims of the evolutionists in support of their hypothetical brainchild. Because so few persons in our day and age have any real understanding of Bryan's efforts and of the real circumstances of the Scopes trial, I present here a few paragraphs from this lecture, as follows (IHM, 90-106): "Before commenting on the Darwinian hypothesis let me refer you to the language of its author as it applies to man. On page 180 of *Descent of Man* (Hurst and Company, Edition 1874), Darwin says: 'Our most ancient progenitors in the kingdom of the Vertebrata, at which we are able to obtain an obscure glance, apparently consisted of a group of marine animals, resembling the larvae of the existing Ascidians.' Then he suggests a line of descent leading to the monkey. And he does not even permit us to indulge in a patriotic pride of ancestry; instead of letting us

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

descend from American monkeys, he connects us with the European branch of the monkey family. It will be noted, first, that he begins the summary with the word 'apparently,' which the Standard Dictionary defines: 'as judged by appearances, without passing upon its reality.' His second sentence (following the sentence quoted) turns upon the word 'probably,' which is defined: 'as far as the evidence shows, presumably, likely.' His works are full of words indicating uncertainty. The phrase, 'we may well suppose,' occurs over eight hundred times in his two principal works. (See *Herald and Presbyterian*, November 22, 1914). The eminent scientist is guessing. . . . If we could divide the human race into two distinct groups we might allow evolutionists to worship brutes as ancestors but they insist on connecting all mankind with the jungle. We have a right to protect our family tree. . . . Darwin is absurd as well as groundless. He announces two laws, which, in his judgment, explain the development of man from the lowest form of animal life, namely, natural selection and sexual selection. The latter has been abandoned by the modern believers in evolution, but two illustrations from Darwin's *Descent of Man*, will show his unreliability as a guide to the young. On page 587 of the 1874 edition, he tries to explain man's superior mental strength (a proposition more difficult to defend today than in Darwin's time). His theory is that, 'the struggle between the males for the possession of the females' helped to develop the male mind and that this superior strength was transmitted by males to their male offspring. After having shown, to his own satisfaction, how sexual selection would account for the (supposed) greater strength of the male mind, he turns his attention to another question, namely, how did man become a hairless animal? This he accounts for also by sexual selection—the females preferred the males with the least hair (page 624). . . . A comment and a question: First, unless the brute females were very different from

## GENESIS

females as we know them, they would not have agreed in taste. Some would 'probably' have preferred males with less hair, others, 'we may well suppose,' would have preferred males with more hair. Those with more hair would naturally be the stronger because better able to resist the weather. But, second, how could the males have strengthened their minds by fighting for the females, if, at the same time, the females were breeding the hair off by selecting the males? Or, did the males select for three years and then allow the females to do the selecting during leap year? . . ."

Again: "But how does the evolutionist explain the eye when he leaves God out? Here is the only guess that I have seen—if you find any others I shall be glad to know of them, as I am collecting the guesses of the evolutionists. The evolutionist guesses that there was a time when eyes were unknown—this is a necessary part of the hypothesis. And since eye is a universal possession among living things the evolutionist guesses that it came into being—not by design or by act of God—but just happened, and how did it happen? I will give you the guess—a piece of pigment, or, as some say, a freckle appeared upon the skin of an animal that had no eyes. This piece of pigment or freckle converged the rays of the sun upon that spot and when the animal felt the heat on that spot it turned the spot to the sun to get more heat. The increased heat irritated the skin—so the evolutionists guess, and a nerve came there, and out of the nerve came the eye! Can you beat it? But this only accounts for one eye: there must have been another piece of pigment or freckle soon afterward and just in the right place in order to give the animal two eyes. And, according to evolutionists, there was a time when animals had no legs, and so the leg came by accident. How? Well, the guess is that a little animal without legs was wiggling along on its belly one day when it discovered a wart—it just happened so—and it was in the right place

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

to be used to aid it in locomotion; so, it came to depend upon the wart, and use finally developed it into a leg. And then another wart and another leg, at the proper time—by accident—and accidentally in the proper place. Is it not astonishing that any person intelligent enough to teach school would talk such tommyrot to students and look serious while doing so? And yet I read only a few weeks ago, on page 124 of a little book recently issued by a prominent New York minister, the following: 'Man has grown up in this universe gradually developing his powers and functions as responses to his environment. If he has eyes, so the *biologists* assure us, it is because *light waves played upon the skin* and eyes came out in answer; if he has ears it is because the *air waves* were there first and the ears came out to hear. Man never yet, *according to the evolutionist*, developed any power save as a reality called it into being. There would be no fins if there were no water, no wings if there were no air, no legs if there were no land.' You see I called your attention to only forty per cent of the absurdities; he speaks of eyes, ears, fins, wings and legs—five. I called attention only to eyes and legs—two. The evolutionist guesses himself away from God, but he only makes matters worse. How long did the 'light waves' have to play on the skin before the eyes came out? The evolutionist is very deliberate; he is long on time. He would certainly give the eye thousands of years, if not millions, in which to develop; but how could he be sure that the light waves played all the time in one place or played in the same place generation after generation until the development was complete? And why did the light waves quit playing when two eyes were perfected? Why did they not keep on playing until there were eyes all over the body? Why do they not play today, so that we may see eyes in the process of development? And if the light waves created the eyes, why did they not create them strong enough to bear the light? Why did the light

## GENESIS

waves make eyes and then make eyelids to keep the light out of the eyes? And so with the ears. They must have gone *in* 'to hear' instead of *out*, and wasn't it lucky that they happened to go in on opposite sides of the head instead of cater-cornered or at random? . . ."

Again: "Last November I was passing through Philadelphia and read in an afternoon paper a report of an address delivered in that city by a college professor employed in extension work. Here is an extract from the paper's account of the speech: 'Evidence that early men climbed trees with their feet lies in the way we wear the heels of our shoes—more at the outside. A baby can wiggle its big toe without wiggling its other toes—an indication that it once used its big toe in climbing trees.' What a consolation it must be to mothers to know that the baby is not to be blamed for wiggling the big toe without wiggling the other toes. It cannot help it, poor little thing; it is an inheritance from 'the tree man,' so the evolutionists tell us. And here is another extract: 'We often dream of falling. Those who fell out of the trees some fifty thousand years ago and were killed, of course, had no descendants. So those who fell and were *not* hurt, of course, lived, and so we are never hurt in our dreams of falling.' Of course, if we were actually descended from the inhabitants of trees, it would seem quite likely that we descended from those who were *not* killed in falling. But they must have been badly frightened if the impression made upon their feeble minds could have lasted for fifty thousand years and still be vivid enough to scare us. If the Bible said anything so idiotic as these guessers put forth in the name of science, scientists would have a great time ridiculing the sacred pages, but men who scoff at the recorded interpretation of dreams of Joseph and Daniel seem to be able to swallow the amusing interpretations offered by the Pennsylvania professor."

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

Finally: "A few months ago the *Sunday School Times* quoted a professor in an Illinois University as saying that the great day in history was the day when a water puppy crawled up on the land and, deciding to be a land animal, became man's progenitor. If these scientific speculators can agree upon the day they will probably insist on our abandoning Washington's Birthday, the Fourth of July, and even Christmas, in order to join with the whole world in celebrating 'Water Puppy Day.'" "Within the last few weeks the papers published a dispatch from Paris to the effect that an 'eminent scientist' announced that he had communicated with the spirit of a dog and learned from the dog that it was happy. Must we believe this, too?" We might go on here with excerpts from Mr. Bryan's lecture couched in similar vein; we feel, however, that the foregoing are sufficient to demonstrate the speculative extravagances to which the rabid evolutionists resort in support of their hypothesis—for *evolution is, even down to our day, still a hypothesis.*

(6) Evolutionists reject all attempts that are, or could be, made to show correspondence between the Genesis account of the Creation and their own theory. All the prominent originators of the theory of evolution—Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, Haeckel, Wallace, and the rest—were firm opponents of the Biblical view of the world and of man. Generally speaking, the same is equally true of our present-day crop as well. To be sure, there are men—eminent scholars—who have sought to point up a possible correspondence in broad outlines, under the caption of *theistic evolution*, between the theory and the teaching of Genesis; still, the foremost advocates of the evolutionary view in our day look with considerable disdain—and even contempt—on all such efforts and those who would even suggest that such harmony exists or is possible. For example, Goldschmidt, the geneticist writes (art., "Evolution, as Viewed by One Geneticist," *American Scientist*, Vol. 40,

## GENESIS

January 1952, p. 85): "Another type of evolutionary theory hardly deserves to be mentioned in a scientific paper. This is the mystical approach, which hides its insufficient understanding of the facts behind such empty words as creative evolution, emergent evolution, holism, and psycho-Lamarckism. . . . The biologist does not receive any constructive help from such ideas and is forced to ignore them." (I might interpolate here that the insufficient understanding, of these gentlemen, of Biblical teaching is pitiful; it would be laughable, if it were not so tragic.) G. G. Simpson, the bellwether of the present-day materialistic school, has "delivered himself" on the subject of theistic views of evolution as follows ("Evolutionary Determinism and the Fossil Record," *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 71, October 1950, p. 264): "The fossil record definitely does not accord with . . . the concept of orthogenesis or more broadly with overtly or covertly non-materialistic theories like those of Driesch, Bergson, Osborne, Cuenot, du Nuoy, or Vandel." In an important address recently at the Darwinian Centennial Convention and the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at the University of Chicago, Simpson spoke just as positively. Among other things, said he, "Evolution is a fully natural process, inherent in the physical properties of the universe, by which life arose in the first place and by which all living things, past or present, have since developed, divergently and progressively. . . . Life may conceivably be happier for some people in the other worlds of superstition. It is possible that some children are made happy by a belief in Santa Claus, but adults should prefer to live in a world of reality and reason" (cf. Simpson, "The World Into Which Darwin Led Us," *Science*, Vol. 131, April 1, 1960, pp. 969, 973-974). Julian Huxley was quoted in an Associated Press dispatch, November 27, 1959, as saying this, at the same Convocation: "In the evolutionary pattern of thought there is no

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

longer need or room for the supernatural. The earth was not created: it evolved. So did all the animals and plants that inhabit it, including our human selves, mind and soul, as well as brain and body. So did religion." And C. D. Darlington, Professor of Botany at Oxford, sums up the issue from his point of view in this terse statement ("The Origin of Darwinism," *Scientific American*, Vol. 200, May 1959, p. 66): "We owe to the *Origin of Species* the overthrow of the myth of Creation." The paens that have been sung to Darwin in the past century have been fantastic, to say the least. We would humbly suggest that they be assembled, and together with those offered up in the worship of Marx and Freud, presented to the world in a volume that would aptly be entitled, "The Hymnody of Scientism." In the statements quoted above the fact stands out as *prima facie* evidence that in each case the wish is father to the thought.

2. *Concerning evolutionism.* (1) The antireligious prejudice of the evolutionists, particularly of those who champion the strictly materialistic version of the theory, prompts them to proclaim vociferously *that evolution is a fact*. They make no bones about asserting dogmatically that their case is proved—*again a case in which the wish is father to the thought*. Whether they choose to be known as "naturalists," "humanists," "positivists," "materialists," or what not, they are all *anti-theistic*: in short, they are *anti-God*, that is, in any sense of the term "God" that is congenial and helpful to mankind. Obviously, then, in their thinking man is not the image of God, for the simple reason that there is no Deity of which he can be the image; hence, as Chesterton has put it, we must conclude that he is "a disease of the dust." In strict truth, however, *evolutionism is not a fact—it is a faith*. No one ever witnessed the emergence of a new species. No one on earth knows how such an emergence takes place (if it does). Moreover, the time element claimed by devotees

## GENESIS

of the hypothesis is so vast as to put it forever beyond all possibility of empirical (eye-witness) verification. *The various arguments in support of the theory are matters of inference.* Hence the questions arise, is all this *necessary* inference? Or, how much of it is just *conjectural*? We are reminded here of Mark Twain's comment: "There is something so fascinating about science; one gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such trifling investments of fact." Chesterton's statements about the word "evolution" are certainly apropos (EM, 23): "As a matter of fact it is not a very practical word or a very profitable idea. Nobody can imagine how nothing could turn into something. Nobody can get an inch nearer to it by explaining how something could turn into something else. It is really far more logical to start by saying, 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth,' even if you only mean, 'In the beginning some unthinkable power began some unthinkable process.' For God is by its nature a name of mystery, and nobody ever supposed that man could imagine how a world was created any more than he could create one. But evolution really is mistaken for explanation. It has the fatal quality of leaving on many minds the impression that they do understand it and everything else; just as many of them live under a sort of illusion that they have read the *Origin of Species*." In the attitude of the evolutionists that their theory must be accepted *as fact* chiefly because there is no alternative but creation, they commit the fallacy of begging the question: that is, they assume as fact what actually needs to be proved, when it might turn out after all that evolution is God's *method* of creation. If decided *a priori* that the totality of being must be explained "naturally," obviously one would be under the necessity of accepting evolutionism whether or not it is validated by the available evidence. Again, Chesterton (EM, 13): "An iconoclast may be indignant; an iconoclast may be justly indignant; but an

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

iconoclast is not impartial. And it is stark hypocrisy to pretend that nine-tenths of the higher critics and scientific evolutionists and professors of comparative religion are in the least impartial. Why should they be impartial, what is being impartial, when the whole world is at war about whether one thing is a devouring superstition or a divine hope. . . . They are not impartial; they never by any chance hold the historical scales even; and above all they are never impartial upon this point of evolution and transition. They suggest everywhere the grey gradations of twilight, because they believe it is the twilight of the gods. I propose to maintain that whether or no it is the twilight of the gods, it is not the daylight of men."

(2) It is most interesting to note here two Scripture affirmations, Heb. 11:3 and 2 Pet. 3:1-7, which have significant bearing on the subject before us. In the former passage, the inspired author tells us that the things we see with the natural eye ("ages," as in Heb. 1:2; cf. *time* as the Einsteinian fourth dimension) have not been made out of these things which appear to our physical vision (cf. 2 Cor. 4:16-18). Robertson (WPNT, V, 419): "The author denies the eternity of matter, a common theory then and now, and places God before the visible universe as many modern scientists now gladly do" (the physicists in particular). Is it not significant that what the inspired writer states here is now generally accepted as fact by the nuclear physicists, namely, that the forms of matter which are amenable to sense-perception are actually constituted of ultimate forms of energy which are totally inaccessible to man's physical senses. Thus far no man has ever seen an atom, much less any of the growing number of elementary particles or forces which go to make up the constituency of the atom. Today, matter in its ultimate form is apprehensible, not by physical sense-perception, but by mathematical calculation; hence, it is to be regarded truly as *metaphysical* rather than as strictly physical. As Lincoln

## GENESIS

Barnett writes (UDE, 114): "Man's inescapable impasse is that he himself is part of the world he seeks to explore; his body and proud brain are mosaics of the same elemental particles that compose the dark, drifting clouds of interstellar space; he is, in the final analysis, merely an ephemeral conformation of the primordial space-time field. Standing midway between macrocosm and microcosm he finds barriers on every side and can perhaps but marvel, as St. Paul did nineteen hundred years ago, that 'the world was created by the word of God so that what is seen was made out of things which do not appear.'" (I must dissent from the view stated above that man is "merely an ephemeral conformation of the primordial space-time field." As a matter of fact, man is the one entity in creation who is *not* an ephemeral conformation of any kind: even in the total scheme of relativity envisioned today by the physicists, he is the only "framework of reference" to whom anything else has meaning, and this is by virtue of the fact that he is essentially imperishable spirit, the image of God.)

(3) As for the second Scripture cited above, 2 Pet. 3:1-7, the significance is even more startling. Here we are told that "in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for, from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." We go on to read that these mockers "wilfully forget, that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and amidst water, by the word of God, by which means the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished," etc. Is not all this precisely what the majority of evolutionists of our time are saying and doing? How could the picture have been drawn more realistically? And thus do these mockers, our antitheistic evolutionists, fulfill Bible prophecy, although, I am sure, they are blissfully

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

unaware of their prophetic identification. True it is today, as always, that "not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God chose the foolish things of the world, that he might put to shame them that are wise," etc. (cf. 1 Cor. 1:20-29).

(4) The excessive devotion of the evolutionists to their brainchild leads them to try to apply the "progressive development" yardstick to every phase of the cosmic process. They would trace chronologically every physical, astronomical, geological, biological, sociological, even theological, development in the totality of being. Hence we now have books with such titles as *Stellar Evolution, From Atoms to Stars, Biography of the Earth, From Molecules to Man*, etc., and innumerable published articles of the same general trend of thinking. We have Herbert Spencer's "cultural evolution" theory, namely, that all cultures have moved "forward" from savagery through barbarism to civilization. This concept has long been abandoned by anthropologists and sociologists alike. The evolution yardstick was, for a long time, applied to the history of religion: it was held that *animism* (the belief that everything is "ensouled") was the first form of "religion"; that in time animism gave way generally to *polytheism*; that polytheism was succeeded by *henotheism* (a pantheon with a single sovereign deity); and that henotheism developed into *monotheism* (belief in one true God to the exclusion of all other deities). It is held further that monotheism will ultimately give way to *pantheism*, a sophisticated "religion" in which God is identified with nature or with some impersonal creative process in nature, the only system, we are told, which is acceptable to the intelligentsia. It is doubtful that this theory is seriously entertained in our day: there is too much evidence that monotheism has existed along with these other views, somewhere and in some form, from earliest times. Of course, at the outset evolutionism had reference only to biological development,

## GENESIS

to *the origin of species*. Implicit in all these theories is the view that *all change takes place from the simple to the more and more complex*: in logic textbooks this is now designated "the genetic fallacy." As stated in one such textbook (ILSM, 389): "It is an inexcusable error to identify the temporal order in which events have actually occurred, with the logical order in which elements may be put together to constitute existing institutions. Actual recorded history shows growth in simplicity as in complexity." The fact is that in some areas change is not from the simple to the complex, but just the reverse—from complexity to greater simplicity. This is true, for example, in the field of linguistics especially: the history of language is the story of a continuous process of simplification. The same is true in the area of social organization: all one has to do to realize this fact is to contrast the long tortuous genealogical tables of the most primitive peoples with the tendency today to minimize, even to disregard, genealogical tables altogether (cf. 1 Tim. 1:4, Tit. 3:9). Again (ILSM, 390): "Science, as well as art and certain social organizations, is sometimes deliberately changed according to some idea or pattern to which previous existence is not relevant."

(5) It has been charged, and that rightly, that evolutionism has, unfortunately, tended to vitiate intellectual integrity throughout the scientific world. Some very interesting statements to this effect appear in the Preface, by W. R. Thompson, F.R.S., Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Ottawa, Canada, to the most recent Everyman's Library edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species*. "A long-enduring and regrettable effect of the *Origin*," writes Thompson, "was the addiction of biologists to unverifiable speculation," the net result of which was that "the success of Darwinism was accompanied by a decline in scientific integrity." "This," he adds, "is already evident in the reckless statements of

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

Haeckel, and in the shifting, devious and histrionic argumentation of T. H. Huxley." Finally, his conclusion: "It may be said, and the most orthodox theologians indeed hold, that God controls and guides even the events due to chance; but this proposition the Darwinians emphatically reject, and it is clear that in the *Origin* evolution is presented as an essentially undirected process. For the majority of readers, therefore, the *Origin* effectively dissipated the evidence of providential control. It might be said that this was their own fault. Nevertheless, the failure of Darwin and his successors to attempt an equitable assessment of the religious issues at stake indicate a regrettable obtuseness and lack of responsibility. Furthermore, on the purely philosophical plane, the Darwinian doctrine of evolution involves some difficulties which Darwin and Huxley were unable to appreciate." (I might well add that their devoted disciples in our day seem to have closed minds on the same matters). "Between the organism that simply lives, the organism that lives and feels, and the organism that lives, feels, and reasons, there are, in the opinion of respectable philosophers, abrupt transitions corresponding to an ascent in the scale of being, and they hold that the agencies of the material world cannot produce transitions of this kind." Again, "Biologists still agree on the separation of plants and animals, but the idea that man and animals differ only in degree is now so general among them, that even psychologists no longer attempt to use words like 'reason' or 'intelligence' in an exact sense. This general tendency to eliminate, by means of unverifiable speculations, the limits of the categories Nature presents to us, is an inheritance of biology from the *Origin of Species*." We are reminded here of the attitude of many scientists toward the conclusions of those men who have been delving into the study of the phenomena of the Subconscious in man. Dr. J. B. Rhine, head of the Department of Parapsychology at Duke University, has some pertinent

## GENESIS

remarks to make on this subject. "Fear," comments Rhine, "more than anything else, blocks scientific acceptance. First, there is fear of having to accept as real something that does not harmonize with a physicalistic philosophy. The acceptance of nonphysical action would admit two kinds of reality, and divide the universe. Such a step looks like a throwback to supernaturalism." (The author—of *The Reach of the Mind*—then goes on to show that it is an error to think that ESP and PK lead to dualism. "The very act in which the two systems of mind and body operate upon each other necessarily unifies them to some degree into a single process. No one can conceive of the interaction of two systems, except by supposing that there are properties common to both. Indeed, we can conclude in all safety that the facts do not require one to be a dualist—they do not *allow* one to be.") Rhine continues: "The other fear that retards the scientific acceptance of ESP-PK is a social one: fear of losing caste in one's profession. Many scientists have experimented with ESP and PK in secret. Occasionally we learn of successful and valuable experiments, only to be told that 'for professional reasons' no report will be published. 'My family has to eat,' said one of these experimenters. 'My institution would object,' said another. 'Every member of my department would criticize me, and I am in line for the chairmanship.'" Truly scientists can be very "human" at times! (From condensation of Rhine's book, *The Reach of the Mind*, in *The Reader's Digest*, February, 1948).

3. *Concerning the Inadequacies of Evolutionism* (that is, to explain what it is supposed to explain). *Evolutionism*, let us remember, is the *theory of evolution*, frequently designated the *evolution hypothesis*. In the terminology of science a *hypothesis* ranks below a *theory* in validity, and both hypothesis and theory attain the stature of a *law* only when after a long period of testing their validity is established by apparently incontrovertible evidence. The

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

theory of evolution fails to account adequately for many of the facts of human observation, experience, and general knowledge. Among these are the following: (1) *The origin of life*: spontaneous generation may be considered a possibility *theoretically*, but as yet no direct evidence has been brought to light to prove that it ever actually happened. As Spallanzani (1729-1799) explained, "Even microbes must have parents," and all the thanks he got for his discovery was ostracism by the medical society of Europe. (2) *The life movement itself*: the underlying force, or whatever one may call it, that brings about cell segmentation (and growth) plus differentiation as to structure and specialization as to function. "Protoplasmic irritability" is a grandiose term which reminds us of John Locke's definition of matter as "something-I-know-not-what." (3) *The transmission of modifications*: the process by which a variation in a parent organism becomes embodied in the reproductive cells, the only media (the genes) by which it can be passed on to offspring. Genes are defined as the determiners of heredity; still and all, they are hypothetical in the sense of eluding sense perception. (4) *The vast gap between the intelligence potential of man and that of any known animal species extant or extinct*. This gap has led many scientists to take the position that man's appearance on the scene must have been a mutation. Man is not just animal: he is animal *plus*, and it is the plus that specifies him as man. Hence the folly of trying to explain the person as a biological creature exclusively; as Chesterton says (EM, 17): "It is exactly when we regard man as an animal that we know he is not an animal." (5) *The cause of mutations*: the appearance of new forms as wholes as a result of sudden jumps in the process, forms which continue to "breed true" from the time of their "emergence." As a matter of fact, mutations have all the appearance of special creations, what some have called the insertion of new increments of power into

## GENESIS

the Creative Process. (Cosmic rays have been found to produce mutations in fruit flies). Evolutionism simply could not be validated in any form without mutations. And is it not fortunate that these alleged mutations occurred in a sequence which supports the concept of progressive development of species? And does not this fact in itself presuppose direction of the whole process—if it actually occurred—by an intelligent Designer? (cf. Isa. 46:8-11). (6) *The origin of sex differences*. Evolutionism is unable to give us a satisfactory account of this fact on which the preservation and continuance of all living species is based. (It is interesting to note here that the Genesis Narrative of the Creation is silent regarding the origin of females among subhuman orders, with the sole exception of the implication in Gen. 1:22; it is the human female, Woman, to whom our attention is especially directed in Scripture). (7) *The Mendelian laws of heredity*. These "laws," like all the laws of the sciences, are descriptive. They are not in any sense explanatory of the *why* of the inter-relationships of the factors involved.

(8) *The amazing variety of highly developed special organs* which serve the needs of the respective species in which they function, e.g., wings, feathers, fur; eyes, ears and other physical sense organs; tusks, antennae, hooves; fins and gills and electric organs of fishes, poison glands and fangs of snakes; the "radar" mechanism of bats; migratory sense of birds, etc. These are too numerous and too multifarious even to try to list them all here. They are "explained" by evolutionists in terms of adaptation to environment: thus the term "adaptation" has become a kind of linguistic factotum brought in to "explain" the unexplainable. Think of the innumerable possibilities of variations which may take place *retrogressively* as well as *progressively*. So many imponderables (immeasurable factors) are said to be involved, such as so-called natural selection, sexual selection, artificial selection, variable prolificity of

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

species, hereditary processes, mutations, the role of the germ plasm, etc. Regardless of the time element which may be assumed, no one knows the precise *how*, much less the *why*, of these mysteries (not even how the phychical takes hold of the physical and moves it, as happens every time a man takes a walk). The fact is that evolutionists embalm all these mysteries in a crust of academic jargon that explains little or nothing in the concrete, arriving at their pontifical pronouncements by inferences that are unverifiable in fact. (After all, the term "hypothesis" is just a sophisticated term for a fairly respectable guess).

(9) *The fact of instinct*, of the almost inconceivable manifoldness of instinctive responses, in subhuman orders. E.g., the lifetime journey of salmon, the wonderland of ants, the mating dance of the scorpion, cicadian rhythms ("biological clocks"), bird migrations, migratory sense of "homing" pigeons, etc. Some of these are so fantastic as to be almost inconceivable. Indeed instinct has rightly been called "the Great Sphinx of Nature." If complexity of instinct were to be made the criterion of the classification of living forms in an ascending order, it is obvious that the lowly Insecta would stand at the head of the list, and that man, poor man, would be somewhere near the bottom.

I recommend especially a book entitled *Marvels and Mysteries of Our Animal World* (a book put on the market recently by The Reader's Digest Association), also the following statements, which appear in a sketch of the content of the book prepared for advertising purposes, to emphasize the subject under consideration here (the specialized organs and instincts of subhuman species): "The wonderful zoo of our planet is unique. In all of space there is no other giraffe than ours, no aardvark, and no gliding sea-horse, for nature does not repeat her experiments with life. These wonderful creatures are ours. They belong to the earth and we belong to them. Man moves through this parade of life, specialized in brain and

## GENESIS

dexterity—but still primitive in many ways. We cannot gnaw down trees or run on one toe. But we can make sense out of seeming chaos. And we can use our eyes to see the beautiful spotted fawn in the glade, the oriole swinging in its basket nest, a thousand spangled butterflies trembling on a tree limb. And, seeing these, we know the miracle of the animals we live with. Here, in this exciting Reader's Digest volume, the miracle comes alive! We learn the methods of the insect magician who invented a baffling trick—light without heat. We get a close-up of that engineering genius, the busy beaver—a good family man and a peaceful chap; we follow the monarch butterfly on an incredible 2000-mile journey, get an intimate view of "the boulder with the built-in pocket," learn why elephants are *almost human* (and why they're not!), look twice at an ostrich (look once, then look out!), and thrill to the story of the friendly sea otter's comeback!" Truly, instinct *is* the Great Sphinx of Nature! Through its magic powers the Divine Intelligence secures the preservation of all species in relation to their respective needs and to human needs in particular.

(10) *The role of the artificial in relation to the "natural."* Simpson (ME, 139, 140): "It is still false to conclude that man is *nothing but* the highest animal, or the most progressive product of organic evolution. He is also a fundamentally new sort of animal, and one in which, although organic evolution continues on its way, a fundamentally new sort of evolution has also appeared. The basis of this new sort of evolution is a new sort of heredity, the inheritance of learning. This sort of heredity appears modestly in other mammals and even lower in the animal kingdom, but in man it has incomparably fuller development and it combines with man's other characteristics unique in degree with a result that cannot be considered unique only in degree but must also be considered unique in kind. . . . This new evolution peculiar to man operates

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

directly by the inheritance of acquired characters, of knowledge and learned activities which arise in and are continually a part of an organismic-environmental system, that of social organization." We must admit our amazement at this concession by the writer of the most recently produced "Bible of the evolutionists." That is to say, generally speaking, artificial selection *plus* societal selection has taken over the future development of the evolutionary process. Yes, *man is unique in kind*—no doubt of it! If he were not, Simpson would never have written his book entitled *The Meaning of Evolution*. Moreover, this uniqueness *in kind* proves our point, namely, that artificial selection is of a different and higher order, and cannot rightly be included in what is generally called "natural" selection. *This certainly leaves the gap between the two kinds to be accounted for, and so destroys the notion of unbroken continuity of the alleged progressive development!* But even though mind and its activities are now considered as elements of what is called "nature," the fact remains that the artificial, and the so-called societal alleged to be resulting from it, is *not* the *per se* natural. Moreover, by definition, and by facts of human experience as well, artificial selection certainly proceeds according to the purposes of directing minds. Indeed, the concept of purposes, designs, ends, is implicit in the very word "selection," in whatever form that "selection" may be hypothesized. Thus mutations (of which man is now frequently said to have been one), resulting in progressively higher (more complex) forms, point unmistakably (as Trueblood, quoted above, insists) to a directing Divine Intelligence.

(11) *The general non-fertility of hybrids.* This fact, it seems, would militate against the evolution hypothesis. Moreover, subhuman nature, when left to its own resources, seems to deteriorate rather than to advance. Any gardener knows that tomatoes produced by properly cultivated plants are always superior to those which are pro-

## GENESIS

duced by seed or plant in what is called "volunteer" fashion. (12) *The modus operandi of emergence. The simple truth is that no one knows how a new species emerges or could emerge.* As Alfred Russel Wallace once remarked to Darwin: Your theory will account for the *survival* of an existing species, but it does not account for the *arrival* of a new species. This statement is as true today as it was when spoken almost one hundred years ago. As a matter of fact, all the theories of the *method* of evolution taken together still do not bring us any nearer to the solution of the basic problem of emergence. Vociferous and dogmatic affirmations are never substitutes for facts. *Moreover, evolution is largely variation, and variation may occur regressively as well as progressively. Evolution may "roll out" downward as well as upward.*

4. *Concerning Materialistic Evolutionism.* (1) This is the doctrine that all things have evolved by accident or chance (that is, *purposelessness*). Devotees of this cult simply refuse to acknowledge Efficient Causality of any kind in the origin and preservation of the cosmos, with the possible exception of some form or forms of primal physical energy: they rest their case on the eternity of matter-in-motion. (Obviously this primal impersonal energy is their "god.") With disarming simplicity they proceed to describe all phenomena of the cosmos, including those of the life processes and the thought processes, in terms of a "fortuitous concourse of atoms" (or sub-atomic forces). Materialistic evolution is usually described as "mechanistic." The word "mechanism," however, has a question-begging aspect. Machines are contrivances, but as far as human experience goes, they are contrivances invented by some intelligent agent to serve some function, to gain some specific end. Moreover, anyone who insists that the cosmos is just a great machine, is simply reading into his understanding of it the properties and powers *that he himself sees in a machine.* Evolutionists, as a rule, dislike to be called

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

materialists: they prefer to be known as *naturalists*, that is, essentially, deniers of the supernatural. However, it is obvious from the point of view of human experience itself that the totality of being was never brought into existence by human agency: as a matter of fact, man was the last species to put in appearance. Therefore, "nature," whether supernatural or not, is certainly *superhuman*. Materialistic evolutionists reject theism, the doctrine of a God who is Spirit (personal, John 4:24): the only God who could be responsive to human inclination and need. (2) The Christian cannot, of course, accept materialistic evolutionism, because it directly contradicts the Biblical doctrine of the sovereignty and eternal purpose of God (Isa. 46:9-11; Acts 15:18, 17:30-31; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Eph. 3:8-12). Nor is there any special reason why any Christian, or any other intelligent person, should accept it. In the first place, any unbiased person can readily see that the phenomena of personality (perception, consciousness, and especially *meaning*) are not entirely reducible, if reducible at all, to matter-in-motion. In the second place, materialistic evolutionism cannot be harmonized with the fact of *cosmic order*. This order is clearly evident (a) from the mathematical relations characteristic of the processes of the physical world and the mathematical formulae by which they are amenable to precise description; (b) from the manifold interrelationships of ends and means, as empirically discerned, prevailing throughout the totality of being; (c) from the over-all adaptation of nature to human life and its needs. As stated heretofore, the word *cosmos* means *order*; lacking this order, human science would be forever impossible, for the simple reason that science is man's discovery and description of the order which he finds to prevail in the various segments of the natural world. Surely this architectonic order presupposes a Supreme Orderer, a directing Mind and Will. *It is inconceivable that sheer chance could have produced the order we see all*

## GENESIS

*around us. To adopt this view requires infinitely more faith than is required to accept the Eternal Purpose of the sovereign God.*

5. *Concerning Theistic Evolutionism.* This is the view, stated in simplest terms, that evolution is God's method of creation. Under this view, the important question for us is this: Can theistic evolutionism be harmonized with Biblical teaching, in particular with the Genesis Narratives of the Creation and the Fall? There are many well-informed and sincerely religious persons who hold that theistic evolutionism "properly stated" (that is, within certain limitations) is not necessarily in conflict with the teaching of Genesis, if the latter is also "constructively interpreted." In the exposition of this general view, the student is advised to consider the following matters of importance:

(1) There is a clear correspondence between the Genesis Cosmogony and present-day scientific thought on many points. (See my *Genesis*, Volume I, Part X, for a list of these harmonies).

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

(3) There is nothing in the Genesis text that constrains us to accept the ultra-literal view that God spoke all living species into existence at one and the same time. On the contrary, according to the narrative itself, the activity of Creation was extended over six "days" and a fraction of the seventh. This is true, however we may see fit to interpret the word "day."

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

(4) In the Genesis narrative itself, the teaching is implicit—if not actually explicit—that in creating the cosmos and all things in it, God operated through “secondary causes” (“laws of nature”) as well as through primary causation (direct action). This is evident from such statements as these: “Let the earth put forth grass,” etc. (v. 11), “Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures,” etc. (v. 20), “Let the earth bring forth living creatures,” etc. (v. 24), and even from the earlier decrees with reference to non-living forms of being, “Let there be light” (v. 3), “Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters” (v. 6), “Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear” (v. 9). In Scripture, God is pictured as exercising His power *directly* in some cases and with immediate results (e.g., Exo. 17:5-7; Lev. 10:1-2; Num. 16:31 ff.; 2 Ki. 4:2-7; 2 Chron. 26:16-21; Matt. 8:24-27, 9:18-26, 12-13; Mark 8:1-10; Luke 17:11-19, 22:50-51; John 2:1-11, 11:38-44; Acts 3:1-10, 8:6-8, 9:32-42, 13:11, 16:16-18, 19:11-12, 20:9-12; 1 Cor. 15:51-52; 1Thess. 4:13-17), and in other instances as achieving His ends gradually or by what is called “progressive development” (Gal. 3:8, Heb. 1:1-3, 1 Pet. 1:10-12, Isa. 28:9-10, Mark 4:26-29, Psa. 90:4, 2 Pet. 3:8). Divine action *by fiat* simply means that God decrees a thing to be done and it is done, but does not necessarily indicate *how* it is done or *how long a time* is involved in the doing of it (Psa. 148:1-6). We must never forget that time means nothing to God, that His realm (eternity) is that of *timelessness*. We always get into difficulties when we drag our concepts of mathematical time into the area of God’s timeless activity (2 Cor. 4:18). We see no reason for rejecting the view that God, whose Will is the constitution of the cosmos and its processes, should operate through the majesty and the sovereign power of His own established decrees. All

## GENESIS

law presupposes a lawgiver; therefore what we call "laws of nature" presuppose the Mind and Will of the Divine Lawgiver.

(5) Certainly the weight of all the evidence available, as explained in Volume One of this textbook series, is in support of the view that the "days" of the Genesis account were not solar days, but *aeonic* days; that is, indefinite periods of time. Thus it may be conceded that the Genesis narrative of the Creation can be thought of as allowing for all the time the evolutionists may see fit to muster up theoretically in support of their theory.

(6) Evidently Infinity in God has no reference to any kind of magnitude because God is a Spirit (John 4:24); rather, the term designates the inexhaustible Source of Power by which the cosmos was created and is sustained in its processes (Psa. 148:5-6, 33:6, 9). Hence the problem before us is not one of *power*, but one of *method*. What method, then, did the Creator employ? Was Creation a long-drawn-out process of progressive development, or was it a process of actualization in a very brief time-span? But, after all, what significant difference does it make, whether it was the one or the other? Whether the Creation extended over six or seven solar days, or over six or seven aeonic days, *the same measure of Creative Power would have been necessary in either case*. (See again our conclusion in Volume I, p. 595).

### 6. Concerning Evolutionism and the Narrative of the Fall.

(1) The first question that comes to our attention here is that of *relevance*. With respect to the Genesis narratives any human theory of origins, I should say, is to a large extent irrelevant, for various reasons: (a) because Genesis is pre-scientific chronologically, that is, it came into existence before human science had reached any significant stage of development, (b) because the book was composed for moral and spiritual ends only, (c) because

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

the subject-matter is presented in bold outlines only, designed to give us a panoramic picture of the order of the Creation without regard to details, and (d) hence, is not entirely irreconcilable with evolutionism of a kind which allows for the continuous and directed operation of Divine Power by the Divine Mind and Will. The religious truths emphasized in the book are not affected to any great extent by the scientific theory characteristic of any age. Hence, whether the Genesis account of the Creation, or that of the Fall, is scientific or not, is a false issue. The accounts were not designed to be such; as a matter of fact, no account of origins could be written that would always be in harmony with shifting scientific thought. To attack Genesis from the point of view that it must be in harmony with every detail of present-day scientific theory is to manifest either profound ignorance of the whole subject, and of Scripture especially, or probably a perverted will that raises false issues solely to discount the Biblical record. The astonishing fact is that the correspondence between Bible teaching and present-day scientific theory is greater than at any other time in the entire history of human thought. (This affirmation I am willing to defend at any time anywhere.) It would almost seem that the Holy Spirit looked down through the ages and gave us the facts regarding origins that would ultimately come to be in close harmony with direct human experience and with the most advanced secular science. (See again my *Genesis*, Volume I, Part X.)

(2) No scientific theory, evolutionism included, has ever cast any valid doubt on the facts presented in Genesis *in re* man, his origin, nature, and destiny, as known by means of human experience itself, such as the following: (a) that as to nature, he is a spirit-body (psychosomatic) unity, a corporeal frame vitalized by the Breath of God (Gen. 2:7); (b) that he has advanced far beyond the brute stage; (c) that he had a beginning as the handiwork

## GENESIS

of a Creative Process (Intelligence and Will) which antedated him and which had already prepared the natural world and its orders, both non-living and living, for his entrance into it and his sojourn in it (otherwise their existence would have no meaning whatsoever); (d) that, as to his moral state, he is endowed with the power of choice, and hence is inherently capable of both good and evil; (e) that by virtue of this choice, his state is one of moral responsibility; and (f) that he is prone to do evil, to rebel against authority, even to try to play God; (g) that somewhere along the line, and somehow, he acquired a conscience.

(3) Certainly conscience came into being *potentially* when reason was actualized in the first *homo sapiens*. (Is not this power of thought the factor that validates the use of the term *homo sapiens* by the scientists?) Evidently, conscience became *actualized* when that which is designated the *natural moral law*—the law which is promulgated in human nature and in human natural relationships—was first violated by *homo sapiens*. (Cf. Psa. 8:3-9, Gen. 2:18-25, Rom. 2:14-16). And certainly in the third chapter of Genesis, we have the account of the birth of conscience in man, whatever else may be implicit in this Narrative of the Fall. It will be recalled that Alexander Campbell describes this tragedy as a fall from man's original *natural* state into his present *unnatural* state. (Evil was never intended to be a part of man's natural state). Strong (ST, 658): "The translation of Enoch and Elijah, and of the saints that remain at Christ's second coming, seems intended to teach that death is not a necessary law of organized being, and to show what would have happened to Adam if he had been obedient. He was created a 'natural,' 'earthly' body, but might have attained a higher being, the 'spiritual,' heavenly, body without the intervention of death. Sin, however, has turned the normal condition of things into the rare exception (cf. 1

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

Cor. 15:42-50). Since Christ endured death as the penalty of sin, death to the Christian becomes the gateway through which he enters into full communion with his Lord." That is to say, in Adam the 'natural,' had he continued upright (in unbroken obedience to God), might without death—by the process of transfiguration—have attained the 'spiritual' (cf. Gen. 5:24, 2 Ki. 2:11, Dan. 12:3, Matt. 17:1-3, Acts 26:12-15, 1 Thess. 4:13-17, 1 Cor. 15:50-55, Rom. 2:7, 1 Tim. 6:14-16).

(3) At this point let us heed words of caution from the pen of one of our pioneers, D. R. Dugan (*Herm.*, 47) as follows: "Before any man is ready to say that the Bible and science are not agreed, he should know two things: first, he should know all about the Bible; and second, he should know all about science. In the meantime, the best thing he can do will be to learn all he can of either one or both. It is not to be denied that we may know some things, at least approximately, and that so far as facts have been really introduced and tested, we may be governed by them, just to the extent of our absolute knowledge. But no interpreter should trouble himself to make exegesis keep up with scientific hypotheses. Science has no more right to lord it over religion than religion has to lord it over science. He who made the universe made the Bible, and when we come to understand them both, we will be delighted with their beautiful harmony. And it is, therefore, the privilege and duty of every man to push his investigations as far and as fast as he can." Truth (John 8:31-32, 17:17) may be said to exist in three forms, namely, (a) that which is, by its very nature, forever hidden from man (Deut. 29:29), (b) that which is neither hidden nor revealed, but is embodied in the very structure of the universe, both physical and moral, for man by study and research (science) slowly to spell out through the centuries (Gen. 1:28); and (c) that which is revealed for man's acceptance and ultimate redemption in spirit and

## GENESIS

soul and body (Eph. 1:3-14, 3:1-12; 1 Cor. 2:6-16; 1 Thess. 2:13; Heb. 1:1-4; 1 Pet. 1:10-12). *The Bible has no antagonism toward, no fear of, truth in any form.*

(4) *With special reference now to the evolution hypothesis in relation to the Narrative of the Fall,* (a) I must say, in the first place, that I cannot agree with one statement which occurs above (in the excerpt appearing at the beginning of this Part of our text), namely, that "man began perfect." True it is that, as to *nature*, *i.e.*, as a psychosomatic unity, he (Adam) was perfect, in the strict sense of the term as meaning "whole" or "complete" *as a person* (Gen. 1:27, 2:7; cf. what is said of Jesus in Heb. 1:3); as to *character*, however, that is, *morally* speaking, he was created *innocent*, but with the potentiality of achieving perfection (holiness) by his own voluntary steadfastness in obedience to the Will of God. Indeed, this is the *only* way of attaining holiness that is possible to any intelligent being (Matt. 5:8, 5:48, 7:13-14, 7:24-27; Rom. 2:4-11, 14:17; Heb. 10:10, 12:14; 2 Pet. 3:18, etc.). As a consequence of the fall into sin, Adam and his entire posterity (Rom. 3:23) must achieve holiness in the same way, but in what may properly be designated "the hard way" (Eph. 6:12-18, 2 Pet. 2:9-10). (b) It is surely true that the author of this Narrative of the Fall was not concerned with science or with any such problem as that of the correspondence of Biblical teaching and scientific theory. However, the Holy Spirit, as the ultimate Author, could surely have embodied the account in such general terms, such bold outlines, as to make it harmonious with scientific thought, and especially with the science of our own times. This appears to be the case in fact: the sole purpose of the account is religious; hence we have in this Narrative the record of what happens to every human being as he passes from a state of innocence into that of the actual experience of sin in his own life; and this indeed may be all that the Spirit intended to teach us by it.

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

Perhaps He left the *how* of the matter for human science to spell out as best it can. But the fact remains that the Fall, as pictured in Genesis, was indeed a fall from an original state of innocence into that of the actual experience of sin and the *guilt* that accompanies that experience. This is about all we can say about it: and in this sense the Fall was *real*, both in itself and in its tragic consequences. Moreover, the very fact, born of universal experience, that man is in sin, prone to evil of all kinds, simply cannot be denied by any intelligently honest person. It is tragically—and often gruesomely—apparent in daily newspaper accounts of rape, incest, sex perversions, devil-worship, thrill murders, deceit, treachery, fraud, lawlessness of all kinds, not to mention genocide, strife, war, and violence that fill the earth in our age as in Noah's time (Gen. 6:5, 11, 12; Matt. 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-27). To deny this, and to deny that this is sin, is to be stupid with the worst kind of stupidity—that of a closed mind. This condition must be accounted for, and the most satisfactory account is that which is given us in the Genesis Narrative of the Fall.

(d) This writer's conviction is that the difference between man and the brute is *not one of degree*, but *one of kind*. However Strong's theory of Gen. 2:7 as indicating a "divine reinforcement of the process of life" which "turned the animal into man," is to be explained, whether anthropomorphically (which certainly is not to be ruled out) or by mutation (in some manner biologically), it certainly was of the character of a special creation. Moreover, should Strong's view be the correct one, *homo sapiens* (for obvious reasons I am using the scientific designation here) is no less *homo sapiens*, regardless of how he may have arrived on this terrestrial scene. Moreover, he has no known existing ancestors: those humanoid forms which are supposed to have existed prehistorically are now extinct, hence hypothetically identifiable only by isolated sparse

## GENESIS

skeletal remains which have been found in different parts of the world. These remains of alleged prehistoric man are too fragmentary to allow for any reliable reconstruction of man's ancestry from the so-called *hominidae*. Nor do these widely scattered skeletal remains necessarily indicate that there were different "centers" of the origin of *homo sapiens*. Again, evolutionists must accept the fact that there had to be a space-time locus at which the transition from *hominidae* to *homo sapiens* actually occurred; and that with the appearance of the latter, as stated above, reason also appeared, and along with reason, conscience, which is the voice of practical reason. This means that all humanoidal forms existing prior to this transition were not forms of *homo sapiens*. The tendency of so many scientists to pontificate about these humanoidal finds makes it necessary for us to put their significance in proper perspective in order that we may not be led astray by exaggerations.

(e) When man actually first became man, regardless of what his ancestry may have been, hypothetically or actually, if there was any such ancestry of course, there was a change of some kind that could be regarded, I suppose, as a transition from innocence to awareness of moral law and the sense of guilt occasioned by violation of that law, and hence could be designated a "Fall." Again, it is evident that what is pictured as having occurred in Adam's case is precisely what occurs in the life of every human being on reaching the age of discretion: and perhaps this is the most important lesson which the Divine Author would have us learn from this Narrative, in which He is concerned chiefly, it would seem, with accounting for the observed fact of man's rebelliousness and lawlessness. I have no desire to stretch Scripture out of context, or to indulge fantastic interpretations, to force it into conformity with the science of any age, especially in view of this paramount fact that the design of the Narrative is religious

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

and not scientific. I cannot convince myself that man's depravity is simply a hang-over of his so-called "animal heritage": there is too much evidence from human experience that his own self-perverted will has much to do with his fallen state. To summarize: the essence of the Fall was *de facto* the birth of conscience: had Adam continued in unbroken obedience to God he would never have experienced the chiding of conscience and accompanying sense of guilt. This is about as far as anyone can go, or should go, in attempting to get at the heart of the Genesis Narrative: whether this can be harmonized with evolutionism certainly remains a moot question. *But the essential truth is unaffected in any case: that truth is that man is infected with the disease of lawlessness, however he may have caught this infection in the first place.* I shall be content, therefore, to accept by faith what the Bible teaches regarding this tragic state which has befallen the whole human race. *Human depravity is a fact of experience: how it originated may remain an inscrutable mystery to man in his present state. Hence, in view of the fact that science has no adequate explanation of the mystery, and certainly no adequate remedy to offer to alleviate the condition, let us be content to walk by faith and so to accept the Biblical account and with it the redemption which our Lord has provided for all who will meet the terms of covenant relationship by which, and by which alone, we can appropriate to ourselves the eternal verities of this Unspeakable Gift (John 3:16, 2 Cor. 9:15, Eph. 2:8, 2 Pet. 1:4).*

(f) Perhaps we should consider another possibility at this point, one which would seem at first glance to be far-fetched, but which "grows on one," so to speak, as one mulls it over in thought. I put it in the form of a question as follows: Could it be that we have in the story of Adam and Eve the account of a special creation of a Man and a Woman as distinct from the evolutionary origin of

## GENESIS

the race as hypothesized by present-day biologists? Could Adam and Eve have been created to head up the physical creation, in a separate strain that was designed to produce the Messianic Line and its fulfilment in the Head of the spiritual creation (Rom. 5:12-15, 1 Cor. 15:45-49)? Could this be intimated in the statements occurring in Gen. 6:1-4, with respect to the intermingling of the "sons of God" with the "daughters of men"? The idea is intriguing, to say the least.

(g) Finally, science arbitrarily rejects the "supernatural" and hence has only evolutionism to resort to as a "naturalistic" explanation of Creation. However, even though the complex of causes-and-effects which go to make up "nature" may be said to be "naturalistic," what would the Efficient Cause of this entire complex be designated? Certainly man did not set the cosmos into operation. Shall we not say, then, that the First Cause, the Cause of all causes-and-effects, even though conceived as operating within the framework of what is called "nature," is properly designated *supernatural*? Or shall we be content with the term *superhuman*? It is inconceivable that the Efficient Cause of the Totality of Being could be properly designated "natural" or "naturalistic."

In dealing with impressionable high school and college students who have been brainwashed into uncritical devotion to evolutionism, I try to impress upon them, first of all, that in studying this subject *we are not dealing with fact, but with theory*. I try to impress upon their minds the motivation, the antibiblical, even antireligious, bias which inspires the misplaced zeal manifested by devotees of the theory, pointing up the *a priori* assumptions, the verbose and extravagant, and even dogmatic, statements, and the play on words, all of which characterizes their methodology of promulgation. I try most of all to show them that the arguments which are marshaled to support the theory are basically *inferential*, and that grave doubts

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

exist that the inference is logically or empirically *necessary* inference. I try to show them that my objections to evolutionism, however, are based largely on the unscientific methodology that is used to promote it, and, as a matter of fact, its lack of genuine *scientific* corroboration; that I object to it even more on this score than on the supposition that it is in conflict with Biblical teaching. I emphasize the fact that the Bible, after all, was written in pre-scientific times, and solely for the purpose of presenting to man the *religious* truth with respect to his nature, origin and destiny; and the most amazing fact of all, namely, that its teaching, including especially that of the book of Genesis, corresponds in so many particulars to present-day scientific thinking. I urge them to study the pros and cons of the theory critically, and, even though accepting it provisionally, to await further developments in the area of the life sciences, holding to a sharp distinction especially between *fact* and *inference*, and under no circumstances to allow it to disturb, much less destroy, their confidence in the Bible or their Christian faith. (See my *Genesis*, Volume One, for my own general conclusions (pp. 595, 600, 601), for Dr. James Jauncey's comments on the theory of evolution (pp. 473, 573), and for discussions of the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge (pp. 509ff., and pp. 514ff.), respectively.)

\* \* \* \* \*

### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART SIXTEEN

1. State the problem of the relation of evolutionism and the Genesis account of the Fall.
2. Distinguish between *materialistic* evolution and *theistic* evolution.
3. Summarize the material presented in the first paragraph of this Part on the alleged conflict between evolutionism and the Genesis account of the Fall.
4. Summarize Strong's defense of theistic evolution.

## GENESIS

5. State Trueblood's theory of the significance of evolutionism in relation to the doctrine of God.
6. Summarize the general attitude of confirmed evolutionists toward the Bible and toward religion in general.
7. What do we mean when we say that in this attitude "the wish is father to the thought"?
8. What is the arbitrary assumption which underlies all scientific research?
9. How is this problem of the Bible and science affected by "over-specialization" in the various fields of knowledge?
10. Show how excessive zeal leads to extravagant assertions in support of evolutionism, as illustrated in the excerpts from Bryan's lecture.
11. Are confirmed evolutionists willing to accept the views of those who find harmony between evolutionism and the Genesis Narratives?
12. Why do we affirm that evolutionism is a faith rather than a fact?
13. Show how the arguments presented to support evolutionism are *inferential* rather than factual.
14. How is the teaching of Heb. 11:3, and that of 2 Pet. 3:1-7, related to evolutionism?
15. Explain what is meant by the genetic fallacy, and show how it is erroneous.
16. State Thompson's view about the effect of evolutionism on the intellectual integrity of scientists.
17. What does Dr. Rhine have to say on this point?
18. List and explain what we call the "inadequacies" of evolutionism.
19. Discuss the problems of sex difference, mutations, specialized organs, heredity, instinct, artificial selection, and non-fertility of hybrids, in relation to evolutionism.
20. Would you say that anyone can explain *how* a new species can emerge? Explain your answer.

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

21. Why do we reject materialistic evolution?
22. State the facts by which this rejection is substantiated.
23. List the grounds on which theistic evolutionists defend their view.
24. Explain what is meant by *relevance* in dealing with the problem of evolutionism and the Fall.
25. List the facts presented in Genesis about man which are generally accepted by scientists.
26. Explain the relation between the appearance of the first *homo sapiens* and the birth of conscience.
27. What does the term *homo sapiens* mean?
28. Review Campbell's theory of the *natural*, *unnatural*, and *preternatural* states of man.
29. Show how Strong's view coincides with that of Mr. Campbell.
30. State Dungan's word of caution about attempting to make Biblical teaching conform to the scientific theories of any age?
31. Would you say that man could have attained immortality without falling into sin?
32. If your answer is in the affirmative, how—would you say—could he have done this?
33. In what sense was man created perfect?
34. Was he created morally perfect, or only with the potentiality of attaining moral perfection (holiness)? Give reasons for your answer.
35. What do we mean when we say that he was created innocent?
36. Would you say that the change from innocence to one of the activity of conscience could be regarded as the Fall? Explain your answer.
37. State our general conclusions about the relation between the evolution theory and the Genesis Narrative of the Fall.
38. To what extent, would you say, can they (1) be

## GENESIS

- harmonized, (2) not be harmonized. Explain your answers.
39. What basic truths about man's moral state does the Author of the Genesis Narrative seek to impress upon us?
  40. Why do we take the position that the difference between man and the brute is not one of *degree*, but one of *kind*?
  41. What essential change took place when man truly became *homo sapiens*?
  42. Is it possible to fully explain man's depravity as the hang-over of his so-called "animal heritage"? If not, why not?
  43. Can it be said unequivocally that the Cause of all causes-and-effects which go to make up the Totality of Being simply cannot be designated "natural" or "naturalistic"?
  44. In view of the fact that science has no adequate explanation of man's rebelliousness, what attitude should the sensible person take with regard to it?
  45. What does it mean to *walk by faith* in this present world?

\* \* \* \* \*

The following summarization of evolutionism and its status in scientific thinking today appeared in an issue of the El Paso *Times* not so long ago. It was written (in answer to a reportorial questionnaire) by Dr. Thomas G. Barnes, Director of the Schellenger Research Laboratory, El Paso. With Dr. Barnes' permission I reproduce it here because I consider it an excellent presentation of the subject.

"1. What is the theory of evolution? It is the theory that all plants, animals, and man have descended from very simple types: roses from algae, peacocks from amoeba, etc.

"2. Has science shown evolution to be a fact? No. It is only theory. No real scientist can honestly classify it as a fact.

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

"3. Do all scientists subscribe to the theory? No. Many scientists do, but thousands of reputable scientists do not. Over a hundred research scientists, representing various fields of successful scientific accomplishment, have recently joined together to re-evaluate science from the viewpoint of creation as opposed to evolution.

"4. Natural selection (survival of the fittest, etc.) is supposed to be the means by which evolution works. Is there any evidence that natural selection has produced evolutionary change in the lifetime of any observer? No.

"5. Can the selection process be speeded up artificially? Yes.

"6. Can artificial selection produce changes? Yes. Variations are observed, but no true evolution has been observed.

"7. What is the difference between variation and evolution? Variation is change within restricted limits. It may include change in size, color, texture, etc. This type of change is common. Evolution, in principle, could cause change without limit. For true evolution to take place, a simple organism would have to change to a more complex organism: fish to land vertebrate, etc. This has never been proved.

"8. Have any experiments with artificial selection been carried to their limits. Yes. There have been many such experiments.

"9. Give an illustration of such experiments. The process of artificial selection in sugar beets was pursued to its limit in an experiment which began in 1800. Only the seeds from the sweetest beets in each crop were planted for the next crop. By 1878 by this selective process the beets had increased in sugar content from 6% to 17%, but this was the ultimate. No further increase in sugar content was attained even though the experiment was continued 40 years more. Variation had been produced, but no evolution.

## GENESIS

"10. Does this ultimate limit of variation indicate that there are barriers to true evolution? Yes.

"11. Does the fossil record confirm the limits to the variation on each type of plant or animal? The fossil record indicates barriers, not continuous evolution.

"12. Can evolution be classified as a law? No. We have already mentioned that it is only theory. Laws have to be consistent with all the evidence. Evolution is not supported by satisfactory evidence.

"13. Is evolution consistent with the most accepted physical laws? No. The laws of thermodynamics contradict the theory of evolution. Attempts by evolutionists to show that living matter is not governed by the laws of thermodynamics have not been successful.

"14. Is evolution based on the probable or the improbable? On the improbable. The knowledgeable evolutionist admits that it is based on the improbable, but he says that if it is given enough time the improbable will happen. He uses the time element as an excuse for the failure of all experiments to verify without qualification any phase of evolution (as distinguished from variation)."

\* \* \* \* \*

It will be recalled that Spinoza, the Jewish philosopher (1632-1677), set out in his *Ethica* to deal with the problems of how an immaterial Being (God) could create a material universe, only to "explain away" the problem at the end, simply by identifying God with the world, nature, the universe, etc. (the totality of being). His system was a rigid pantheism which "explained" little or nothing *in re* the basic problem with which he was trying to deal. In like manner, in recent years, the late French priest-scientist-philosopher, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, in his principal works, *The Divine Milieu* and *The Phenomenon of Man*, created a stir of some proportions in the academic world by undertaking to explain the *modus operandi* of evolution (as did Bergson earlier in his work entitled

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

*Creative Evolution*). Teilhard envisions evolution through a gradation of forms, from atomic particles up to human beings, in ever increasing complexity of structure, and along with it, the development of consciousness (Bergson uses the term "Spirit"). The result is a kind of *pan-psychism*. Man is the focal point in whom all facets of the evolutionary process converge, and in man reflective thought finally emerges. The unique feature of Teilhard's system is his concept that the ultimate reality of this cosmic development is the Incarnate Christ (not the "Superman" of Nietzsche, nor that of Samuel Butler, nor that of Shaw's *Man and Superman* or his *Back to Methuselah*), but the God-Man, who ultimately gathers all things up into Himself and truly becomes *all in all*. "The only universe," says Teilhard, "capable of containing the human person is an irrevocably 'personalizing' universe." Again: "In one manner or the other, it still remains true that, even in the view of the mere biologist, the human epic resembles nothing so much as a way of the Cross" (PM, 290, 311). Like that of Bergson, Teilhard's system was an honest effort to describe the *modus operandi* of the evolutionary process. However, we are safe in saying that both Bergson and Teilhard have failed to explain how a new species emerges—indeed how novelty of any kind enters into the process—just as Spinoza failed to explain how an immaterial God could have created this material world. *Obviously, these are mysteries which lie beyond the scope of human comprehension* (Job 11:7, Isa. 55:8-9). Nevertheless Teilhard's presentation is sufficiently intriguing to merit an analysis of it, in its main outlines, for whatever it may be worth to the student. One thing can be said in its favor: it has received little but scorn, and even sneers, from the materialistic evolutionists. The following diagram and explanatory matter will suffice, perhaps, to place the Teilhardian view before readers of the present text.

## GENESIS

---

OMEGA: Creation and Creator Become One  
Through Christ  
Plerome  
Socialization  
*Homo sapiens*  
N O O G E N E S I S  
(from *nous*, "reason," "mind")

---

Hominisation  
Threshold of Reflection  
Primates  
A N T H R O P O G E N E S I S  
(from *anthropos*, "man.")

---

Mammals, etc.  
Animals (Consciousness)  
Plants Cellular Processes  
Monocellulars Bacteria  
B I O G E N E S I S  
(from *bios*, "life")

---

Threshold of Life  
Minerals  
Molecules Crystals  
Atoms  
Granules of Energy  
C O S M O G E N E S I S  
(from *cosmos*, "order"—of the non-living world)

---

A L P H A  
(Read upward, according to what Teilhard  
calls the Axis of Ascending Complexity and  
Consciousness)

---

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

EXPLANATORY: Evolution, according to Teilhard, moves along a kind of vertical line which he calls "the axis of ascending complexity and consciousness," each cosmic particle (monad) being composed of a "within" (of psychic or radial energy, also called psychism, which is not amenable to physical sense), and a "without" (physical or "tangential" which is measurable): both form an indivisible "spirit-matter" entity. (Hence this must not be thought of as a dualism.) 1. *Period of "Cosmogensis."* The more complex the matter becomes, the more consciousness (psyche) it gains. Evolution is simply the continuous intensification of the psychical or radial energy. Cosmogensis is the process of *becoming*, on an evolutionary line between a past and a future. The point of departure from the axis is designated ALPHA, or the Alpha Point. Through "granulation" of energy the first elementary particles took form, and over an unimaginable stretch of time assumed the status of what present-day science calls atomic nuclei, atoms, or molecules (these are simply tools of explanation in physics). The birth of our planet probably occurred about five million years ago. 2. *Period of "Biogenesis."* When the "corpuscular number" in a particle reached a certain level matter "came alive." This "vitalisation" occurred when matter crossed the threshold of life and marked the beginning of the age of biogenesis. As physical matter became more and more complex, the psychism of the individual monad increased proportionately. 3. *Period of "Anthropogenesis."* At the point when the brain reaches the necessary degree of complexity, the threshold of reflection was crossed and man was born. This power of thought made man a being distinct from all other species. This was "not a matter of change of degree, but of a change of nature, resulting from a change of state" (PM, 166). The hominisation of the species introduced the age of anthropogenesis. This occurred probably at some point within the last million years. Concerning *instinct* in animals, Teilhard writes: "We realise better in our minds the fact and the reason for the *diversity* of animal behavior. From the moment we regard evolution as primarily psychical transformation, we see there is not *one* instinct in nature, but a multitude of forms of instincts each corresponding to a particular solution of the problem of life. The 'psychical' make-up of an insect is not and cannot be that of a vertebrate; nor can the instinct of a squirrel be that of a cat or an elephant: this is in virtue of the position of each on the tree of life" (PM, 167). "The individual and instantaneous leap from instinct to thought" marked the beginning of "hominisation," which then advanced by means of "the progressive phyletic spiritualisation in human civilisation of all the forces contained in the animal world" (PM, 180). As Julian Huxley puts it, in his Introduction: "The intensification of mind, the raising of mental potential" is regarded "as being the necessary consequence of complexification" (PM, 11-16). 4. *The Period of Noogenesis.* (From the Greek *noesis*, from *noein*, "to perceive," from *nous*, "mind": hence, *noesis* in English, which, in philosophy, means purely intellectual apprehension.) This phase began as a result of the gradual evolution of mental powers, with the appearance of the first *homo sapiens*. (There are different races, Teilhard emphasizes, but only *one homo sapiens*.) Evolution has now reached the stage at which major physical development has lost significance. Science holds that man is unique in nature because of his brain processes, not because his brain is the biggest in capacity but because it is more complex. According to Teilhard, "the noosphere (and more generally the world) represents a whole that is not only closed but also *centred*. Because it contains and engenders consciousness, space-time is necessarily of a *convergent nature*. Accordingly, its enormous layers, followed in the right direction, must

## GENESIS

somewhere ahead become involuted to a point which we might call *Omega*, which fuses and consumes them integrally in itself" (PM, 259). At the present time we are in the period of socialisation in which, according to Teilhard, mankind becomes more and more united and integrated. This will come about as a consensus of mankind will gradually replace the growing capacity of the individual intellect because the human brain will cease to grow. This common consciousness will lift humanity to a higher level. Man inevitably continues to socialize: it is his nature to do so; hence all things will converge at one center, *Omega*, the point where humanity and the universe is bound to converge in the cosmic Christ.

What roles are played by God and Christ in the Teilhardian system? He puts the totality of being in the hands of the omnipresent God. He places man in the Divine Milieu, yet in such a way that man is not depersonalized in spite of ever increasing socialization. On the contrary, it is this personal link which connects each of us to God, who is the center, and the motor, so to speak, of the evolutionary process. We become God's partner in leading the world forward to the *Omega* point. For some persons, man is the center, the only point of adoration in the totality of being; for others, man is little or nothing in this grandiose universe—he is lost in it. Neither position is right. Referring to Paul's sermon on the Areopagus, Teilhard writes (DM, 25): "God who has made man in order that he may find him—God whom we try to grasp through the experiment of our lives—this God is as tangible and present as the atmosphere in which we are submerged. He surrounds us from all sides like the world itself." Man cannot escape the Divine Milieu. Each right action brings him into closer communion with Christ. "Whatsoever ye do," writes the Apostle, "do all in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Col. 3:17). This means we should always act in close fellowship with our Lord. The totality of man's life, even in its most "natural" aspects, is sanctifiable. From this point of beginning, the Christian life receives its content and direction, how and where to go. How does man enter upon this path? By purifying his intentions and acting according to the Will of God. As man adheres to the creative power of God, he becomes its instrument, or even more, its living extension. Man is thus united with God and in God on this earth in a common love to create. And in spite of the individual's failures and sins the world as a whole will achieve victory over evil, because God is on man's side. Mankind is assured that the universe, all creation, will rejoin the One when all evolution shall have converged in the point *Omega*. This will be the mysterious Plerome, where Creator and Creation will be one totality, without, however, adding anything essential to God. The active center of the Plerome in which everything is united, the creative Soul in whom everything is consummated, is Jesus Christ. "Religion and science are the two conjugated faces or phases of one and the same act of complete knowledge—the only one which can embrace the past and the future of evolution so as to contemplate, measure, and fulfill them (DM, 284, 285). Note well the following concluding statements (PM, 293, 294): "Is the Kingdom of God a big family? Yes, in a sense it is. But in another sense it is a prodigious biological operation—that of the Redeeming Incarnation. As early as in St. Paul and St. John, we read that to create, to fulfill and to purify the world is, for God, to unify it by uniting it organically with himself. How does He unify it? By partially immersing himself in things, by becoming 'element,' and then, from this point of vantage in the heart of the matter, assuming the control and leadership of what we now call evolution. Christ, principle of universal vitality because sprung up as man among men, put himself in the

## EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

position (maintained ever since) to subdue under himself, to purify, to direct, and superanimate the general ascent of consciousness into which he inserted himself. By a perennial act of communion and sublimation, he aggregates to himself the total psychism of the earth. And when he has gathered everything together and transformed everything, he will close in upon himself and his conquests, thereby rejoining, in a final gesture, the divine focus he has never left. Then, as St. Paul tells us, *God shall be all in all*. . . . The universe fulfilling itself in a synthesis of centres in perfect conformity with the laws of union. God, the Centre of centres. In that final vision the Christian dogma culminates." (Cf. Eph. 1:5-12, I Cor. 15:20-28, Col. 1:9-23, Rev. 1:8, 1:17-18).

It will thus be seen that Teilhard's God is essentially *theistic* rather than pantheistic: He is presented as the Eternal Being, in Himself separate from the creation, and as immersing Himself into all created being as the "center" and "motor" of the evolutionary process. His portrayal of the Omega Point as the ultimate fusion of Creation and Redemption in the Beatific Vision (Union with God) is hardly a variation from the Apostle Peter's description of the "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:13; cf. Matt. 5:8, 1 Cor. 13:12, 1 John 3:2, Rev. 21:1-8, 22:1-5). It strikes this writer that the most obvious weakness in the Teilhardian exposition is his failure to recognize the juridical aspect of the totality of being, and his consequent failure to deal adequately with the fact of evil and its consequences, including the Scripture doctrines of judgment, rewards, and punishments. (See Psa. 89:14, John 5:28-29, Matt. 25:31-46, Rom. 2:1-16, 2 Thess. 1:7-10, Acts 17:30-31, Rev. 20:11-15, etc.) This, of course, is a tragic lacuna in all the branches of human knowledge in our day.