

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

Vol. XXXIII

JULY, 1922

No. 4

THE CHARLESTON ASSEMBLY, 1922.

By the EDITOR.

How does this Assembly compare with other Assemblies that you have attended? This is a question which is frequently asked by the younger commissioners who have never attended an Assembly before. To be perfectly honest, all the Assemblies are very much alike, and act in very much the same way. The Charleston Assembly was no exception. It was a good Assembly, composed of a fine body of commissioners, but there was nothing unusual or remarkable about it.

THE PRE-ASSEMBLY EVANGELISTIC CONFERENCE.

For the past two years a pre-Assembly Conference has been held under the auspices of the General Assembly's Executive Committee of Home Missions. The Conference this year was of a very high order. A deep spiritual note ran through it from beginning to end. All of the speakers rose to the occasion. The Conference was a good preparation for the Assembly that was to follow and left one feeling that he wanted to do all of his work as a commissioner on a high spiritual plane.

There was one development that ought to be nipped in the bud. A few commissioners took advantage of this occasion to campaign for their favorite candidate for moderator. I heard them do this with my own ears and I heard others speak of it. It would be nothing short of high tragedy if a conference called for such high and holy purposes should develop into a happy hunting ground for those men who love to make moderators.

EVOLUTION AS A SCIENCE AND A PHILOSOPHY.*

By REV. NEAL L. ANDERSON, D. D.

The occasion for the subject I have chosen for this evening may be found in the interest in Evolution awakened by a recent volume from the pen of the Honorable William Jennings Bryan, and by certain lectures he has been delivering on this theme in various parts of the country.

The subject has aroused so much controversy, prejudice, and passion, that only a sense of duty has led me to speak of it, that I might call your attention to its bearing upon religion, and our faith in the Word of the Living God.

I shall speak directly to your minds, asking only that you follow me patiently and to the end, as otherwise you will be sure to miss the message.

SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY DISTINGUISHED.

It is of the utmost importance that we note what has strangely been overlooked in the controversy that has raged around this subject, the distinction between Evolution as a Science, and Evolution as a Philosophy.

Science deals with facts that may be verified, philosophy deals with the explanation of those facts, with causes and speculation upon facts real or supposed.

No one can adequately express our indebtedness to science. Men who sometimes speak sneeringly of science are yet dependent upon it for almost every active service of life—the food we eat, the clothes we wear, the vehicles in which we travel, the means of communication, the medicine that heals us, the sur-

*A sermon on Genesis 1:1, preached in The Independent Presbyterian Church, Savannah, Georgia, on Sunday evening, April 30th, 1922, and published in the UNION SEMINARY REVIEW, at the request of the Editor.

gery that carries down into the valley of twilight and brings us back to health and happiness—all are the results of the most painstaking, self-sacrificing, intelligent service ever rendered the world.

The world as we know it today, is for our knowledge of it so recent that many now living have seen the dawn and development of all that we call Science.

EVOLUTION AS A SCIENCE.

It will greatly help us in clarifying our thinking on the subject if we consider first of all Evolution as a Science.

Charles Darwin wrought a revolution in human thinking about the world, when he unfolded what as a scientist he believed to be the process by which God had evolved, or developed, life in the world. Evolution as a science is "simply a process, a description of the mode according to which changes take place, not a description of the power which produces the changes."

That there is such a process at work in nature has been demonstrated to such an extent that it is only a conservative statement that every scientific man in the world today, Christian, as well as unbeliever, geologist, astronomer, biologist, botanist, chemist has to this extent accepted evolution.

The disagreements among evolutionists, however, are as pronounced as their agreements. They all agree generally speaking as to the process, but when they come to explain the process there are almost as many theories of evolution as evolutionists.

DOGMATISM OF EVOLUTIONISTS.

Evolutionists are not free from the supposedly exclusive theological weakness of dogmatism and conceit of opinion. A recent author makes this remarkable statement, "It must be quite understood that every scientific authority in the world today believes that life was naturally evolved from elements in the early earth." McCabe, *A. B. C. of Ev.*, p. 29.

"No living naturalist, so far as I know, differs as to the im-

mutable truth of evolution in the sense of the continuous fitness of plants and animals for their environment, and the ascent of all the extinct and existing forms of life, including man, from an original and single cellular state." Dr. H. F. Osborn, quoted by Dr. Henry Fosdick in *Times*.

Yet, Dr. Etheridge, Fossilologist of the British Museum, says, "Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense not founded on observation, and wholly unsupported by facts. This museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of their views."

Prof. Beale, of King's College, London, says, "In support of all naturalistic conjectures concerning man's origin, there is not at this time a shadow of scientific evidence."

Prof. Fleishman, of Erlangen, says, "The Darwinian theory in the realm of nature has not a single fact to confirm it. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of the imagination."

Prof. William Bateson, until recently professor of Biology at Cambridge, England, says, "Science has faith in evolution, but doubts as to the origin of the species."

Benjamin Kidd, known over the world for his epoch-making book, *Social Evolution*, says in his recent volume on *The Science of Power*:

"The knowledge has come home to me that Darwinism, the sum and flower of the peculiar science of the West, is a compound of astonishing learning and incomparable ignorance." *Sc. of Power*, p. 82.

I have not made these quotations to give authority of great names to any anti-evolution theory, but merely to illustrate the folly of such dogmatic statements as to the unanimous agreement of scientists today.

FOSSIL REMAINS.

It is well to remember that in all the multitude of fossil remains, none has been found that show even the gradual transformation of the reptile into the bird, not to say into the mammal. Every one acquainted with recent discussion knows how

John Burroughs rejected Darwin's doctrine of transformation of species, and that the drift of scientific opinion is to discard the Darwinian doctrines of survival of the fittest, the struggle for existence, and sex selection as adequate explanations of the processes of evolution. The rival Mendelian theory of mutations has been described by a great American scientist, as "little, if anything short of creative activity."

I must pause to refer to the supposed fossil remains of primitive man, such as the Heidelberg race, the Piltdown race, and the Neanderthal race. If you visit the American Museum of Natural History in New York you will see most beautiful and artistic specimens of these races, all catalogued, labeled and photographed for you.

Branco, at the Fifth International Congress of Zoologists in 1901, said tersely this: "On the subject of the ancestors of man paleontology tells us nothing." Virchow, renowned pathologist, anthropologist and founder of cellular pathology, said at Weisbaden Congress of Naturalists, "Every positive advance we have made in the study of prehistoric anthropology has removed us further than before from the proof of evolution to be found there. Man has not descended from the ape nor has any ape man existed."

Of the Pithecanthropus, the so-called Java ape man, Virchow said, "The head is that of an ape, the femur, found fifty feet away, is that of a man, and neither of the two teeth belong to the skull."

Of the celebrated Heidelberg man, the "father of the Heidelberg race," 1 per cent. is original jawbone, 99 per cent. is restoration."

The Piltdown skull is a "scientific joke." Of the Neanderthal man, Dwight, of Harvard University, says, "It is not a specimen of a race arrested in its upward climb, but rather of a race thrown down from its high position. In no sense can it be regarded as the remains of a human being intermediate between man and the ape."

Blake, Vogt, Hoelder, Zittel says, "the skull belonged to a

human idiot," while other naturalists ascribe it to "an old Celt, or an old Hollander, an old Frieslander, and some as the remains of a Mongolian Cossak of 1814. Yet these remains are offered as conclusive proof of the evolution of man.

Now all these things which we have been considering belong to the domain of Science, and may be safely left to true scientists to settle as best they can.

MAN'S ORIGIN.

In a remarkable sermon, preached from this pulpit fifty years before Darwin wrote his epoch-making book, Doctor Henry Kollock* had this to say concerning man and the lower orders of being.

"Man stands at the head of the visible creation and serves to connect two widely different orders of beings. Compounded of body and soul, by his *body* he bears affinity to the beasts . . . and by his *soul* to those superior intelligences, who are not united to matter, nor encumbered with body. . . . We ascend, step by step, from dull, inert, unorganized matter, to the living plant, the perceptive brute, and the reasonable man."†

Here Doctor Kollock, knowing nothing of what we call Evolution, shows a remarkable insight into a question that has done so much to disturb Christian faith. He realized that there is a similarity of physical structure that links man with the lower orders of life, and states the fact of an ascending scale of life from lower to higher forms. For the naturalist, whether theist or materialist, there can be no question as to this likeness or as to the ascending scale from "inert, unorganized matter, to the living plant, the perceptive brute and the reasonable (reasoning) man."

It would have never occurred to this great Christian preacher

*One of the successors of Jonathan Edwards in the Chair of Divinity at Princeton College, and pastor of the Independent Presbyterian Church, Savannah, 1806-1819.

†Kollock's Sermons, Vol. 4, p. 402—a sermon on Hebrews 1:14.

to ask a question that we must, however, ask today, namely: Does this ascending scale merely record a historic sequence, or does it describe a process that is in itself causal?

"Similarity," says the advanced evolutionist, "argues oneness of original parentage," or as some one has quite recently put it, "Homology, or correspondence in internal structure and functional properties of organs, is accepted and asserted as explicit proof of common descent."

This is manifestly to substitute conjecture for proof at the most critical stage of the whole question.

Whether these admitted resemblances prove identity of origin is a question of fact only—a question not yet solved, and whose solution has been little advanced by merely multiplying the number of said resemblances.

For the theist, believing in God as the Creator of the Universe, inorganic, as well as organic, the question is purely a scientific one, and not a question of faith.

When all has been said, we may be very sure that the facts of God's world, will not contradict the facts of God's Word, and meanwhile, without claiming to be a scientist, the average man may yet insist that Science confine itself to its proper domain—the ascertaining of facts in the natural, physical world.

THE BIBLE DOES NOT TEACH SCIENCE.

I hold in my hands a volume of the Word of God, covering just one thousand pages printed in double columns, and containing upwards of twenty-five thousand verses. Of this volume only twenty-seven verses deal with matter that can in any sense be called "scientific," and these verses describe phenomena covering we know not how many ages, certainly when we consider the heavens as well as the earth (Genesis 1:1), many millions of years! The Book as a whole, and even in these twenty-seven verses, professedly teaches not Science but religion.

It is a very dangerous thing to attempt to make Scripture teach Science. The Church tried it when it declared that the Scriptures taught the earth was flat.

Copernicus was condemned by the Church of Rome for teaching that the earth was not the center of the universe, and that it moved upon its axis, as teaching doctrine formally heretical and contradictory of the Holy Writ. Luther called him a "fool," John Wesley said his doctrine "led to heresy."

Within the memory of some of us here tonight it was considered heresy, and a denial of Scripture, to believe that the world was not created in six literal days. Now Mr. Bryan proposes a declaration on Scriptural authority as to how God made man, and thinks his interpretation should be erected into a decree that would forbid all scientific men and others from teaching a different view, and almost persuaded the Kentucky Legislature to issue an edict on this scientific question.

WHAT DO SCRIPTURES TEACH?

Genesis 1:1, and following verses are the answer. "Not," as Henry Drummond long ago said, "how certain things were made, but that God made them." The Christian need not concern himself as believer in the Word of God with the problem whether God created His world at one time, as a finished product, or as a world "with properties, such that it would pass through successive changes until it reached the condition we see today."

We may still ask with one of God's most reverent servants more than a quarter of a century ago, "Is God less truly the Creator of the mighty oak, because He did not by a word bring it into its present condition?" Is He the less the Creator of your body and mine because we inherited our bodies from a long line of ancestors, or because it was as we know evolved by the mystic weaving of protoplasm?

The Scriptures teach with the utmost clearness that God created all things (in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth), and constantly rules over all. They do not teach in detail the methods according to which He proceeded in bringing the earth into its present condition, or in creating the successive series of species of plants and animals, and perhaps in forming the body of Adam."

The former president of Princeton Theological Seminary, Francis L. Patton, a man known throughout the Christian world as philosopher and theologian, well said, "What was the process by which man was made we do not know. But if it could be shown that man is related to the inferior animals so far as his body is concerned, it would none the less be true that God made him of the dust of the ground."

Whatever the method every additional fact of modern science contributes to the necessity of a living, present God. The heavens and the earth are full of His glory. As Dr. Henry Osborn, recognized as one of most advanced among modern evolutionists says, "Without this creed one may be an atheist or agnostic, with this creed one may humbly accept" God's Word and God's world. "Evolution by no means takes God out of His universe, but greatly increases the wonder, mystery and marvelous order which pervades all nature."

EVOLUTION AS A PHILOSOPHY.

When we come to consider evolution, not as a Science—the study of modes and processes of nature, but as philosophy dealing with sociological, economic, moral and religious problems, one can well sympathize without apology, with the protest of Mr. Bryan.

"It is this philosophy, dealing not with facts, but causes, explanations and speculation about facts, that has literally turned the world upside down, has blighted the faith of our youth, and poisoned the springs of moral and spiritual life in the world, and set it on fire with war.

It is true, as was said recently in the *Looking Glass*, though due to no fault of the noble man of Science, whose patient research has gained him imperishable honors, that "Darwinism has been made not only to justify the sensualist at the trough, and fashion at the glass, but Prussian at the cannon's mouth, and Bolshevism at the prison door."

“THE GREAT PAGAN RETROGRESSION.”

It produced what Benjamin Kidd has recently called “The Great Pagan Retrogression”—the return to savagery—and “the consequences have been felt through every fiber of civilization. * * * Within half a century the origin of species has become the Bible doctrine of the omnipotence of force.”

Evolution as a philosophy was applied ruthlessly to every problem of civilization, and the voice of the desert and jungle was heard again in the haunts of men. It was a deification of paganism, baptized and blessed by the high priests of a spurious science.

In England and America it found expression in the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, which “rejected the Christian duty of sacrifice of the individual for something higher, for there is nothing higher than the individual.”

In Germany it spoke with the voice of confidence and command that found an echo in every college and university where German philosophy had been accepted as the latest word of truth—it expressed itself in this wise, “The Christian duty of sacrifice for something higher does not exist, for there is nothing higher than the state.”

To lie for the state, to steal for the state, to ravage and murder and ravish for the state was not only not wrong, but a solemn duty of the citizen.

It was the return of primitive man to the stage, with spear dripping with blood, demanding that the law of the jungle be made the law of society.

“I impeach,” said Neitzsche, “that greatest blasphemy in all time—the law of love—which has enchained and softened us. It is good for cows, women and Englishmen. A new table, I set over you. O, my brethren, ‘become hard.’ For the best things belong to us, the best food, the purest sky, the fairest women, the strongest thoughts, and if men do not give us these things we take them.”

“Let us worship not Jehovah, but Wotan, the god of power.”

Thus was developed the German superman, the cave man

of the twentieth century—he was terribly real, however we may doubt the Neanderthal and Piltdown specimens; thus was the ethics of the jungle made the code of a whole nation.

It was the negation of morality, the negation of religion, and the negation of true Science. Science deals with facts, phenomena; the new philosophy dealt with speculation, inferences, deductions, proclaimed as true and causal in the name of Science. It was the hoax of the ages—this proposal to substitute a philosophy of causation for a science dealing with facts—to dethrone God by an exposition of the processes of geology, biology and chemistry.

A REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM.

Herbert Spencer, all unconsciously brought this philosophy to a *reductio ad absurdum* in an essay published shortly before his death, in which he said in substance, "If I am allowed to postulate Force only, I will explain the universe."

I summarize the clear, cold logic with which George Romanes, great scientist and Christian philosopher, replied:

"If we allow you to postulate 'force only,' you will explain nothing. Force alone produces not a cosmos, but chaos—undirected force can produce nothing. Now as soon as we introduce into the concept 'force,' the conception of 'direction,' we have introduced a concept that by the very constitution of our mental being we are compelled to associate with intelligence—personality."

This is the sanest, most terse and complete answer ever given to a philosophy that supposed it had explained causation, when it had unfolded processes—that sought to deck itself in the robes of Science and sit upon the throne of God.

Here it is that the Bible speaks with an authority that is insistent and imperious, "In the beginning God."

WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

What is the remedy for this false teaching that has done so much to wreck moral and spiritual life, even in America,

through the undermining of the faith of the youth in school, college, and university?

Certainly not the remedy proposed by the eloquent orator, who would have legislatures prohibit the teachings of Science of which they did not approve.

The remedy is in the returning sanity of men—the voice of reason is being heard again. Man made in the image of God, in the midst of a world of order, proportion and beauty is finding God not only in the long processes of nature's working, but in the mystery of the invisible world of atoms and electrons, far beyond the ken of microscope, all governed by law.

“God is law, say the wise, O soul,
 And let us rejoice,
 For if He thunder by law,
 The thunder is yet His voice.
 Then speak to Him thou, for He hears,
 And spirit with spirit may meet,
 Closer is He than breathing,
 And nearer than hands or feet.”

After all has been said God has been taking care of His truth. His outstretched hand of judgment has fallen upon the worshippers of force, the sensualism that has taken the beauty out of His world, and His love out of the souls of men.

Meanwhile the Christian may look with a new confidence on a wondrous world, never so wonderful as today, crying out in reverent awe, “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork.”

The believing soul watching the swift homing of the water-fowl may still humbly sing:

“He who, from zone to zone,
 Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
 Will lead my steps aright.”

DEVOLUTION NOT EVOLUTION.

By REV. B. C. PATTERSON, D. D.,

Tenghsien, China.

Evolution claims that religion has advanced from fetishism to animism, then to polytheism and finally to monotheism. In what follows we see that the reverse is clearly true in two cases that can be proved.

In China we have one of the rare instances, where continuous history has preserved the facts to show what really occurred in the so-called development of religion, when through long periods, it was out of touch with the revealed standards of God.

BLOODY SACRIFICE.

Beyond all controversy, the ancient world had a bloody sacrifice, which the Scriptures tell us was handed down from Noah. When Abraham, Melchizedek and Balaam were offering sacrifices to God in western Asia, Yao and Shun were offering their bloody sacrifices to "High Heaven," from the top of Mt. Tai in Shantung. So bloody sacrifices that have been regularly offered for four thousand years are still offered in every county in China today.

Now notice its evolution. It has not progressed in its idea of monotheism, but other gods are introduced as worthy of honors equal to those accorded heaven.

Thus chickens are offered to the River god and the blood is poured over the boat's prow, the place of the altar.

Pigs are offered with cattle and sheep to winds, rivers and gods of grain.

Confucius urged with all his might that the sacrifices of the "ancients" should be scrupulously observed, and no change whatsoever made. Yet, since 1200 A. D., the irony of evolu-

tion has brought it about, that he himself has been worshipped with these same bloody offerings.

Kwankong, a famous warrior of two thousand years ago, is now worshipped with animal sacrifices.

It is plain that the sacrifice that was first offered to "High Heaven" has through these centuries brought men no nearer the conception of one true God, but on the contrary has degenerated into a worship of a whole pantheon of coequal deities—polytheism.

A SECOND ENLIGHTENMENT AND DEGENERATION.

From A. D. 530 to 830 there was a large missionary body in China. The Nestorians established churches from East to West and from Peking to India. Men of rank became Christians, and emperors patrons. The Bible was brought to China and translated, and put in the imperial library, but not given to the people. So this church existed with a more and more degenerate worship, until a few remaining members that were left were absorbed into the Roman Catholic Church in the sixteenth century. Now with all this background to help, has there been any advance towards monotheism? Quite the contrary is true.

The story of Adam and Eve is preserved for us only because they are the ancestors of the race, and because they as ancestors, *are worthy of worship*. Here they stand in more than one temple in East China, clothed in leaves, called "Adam and Eve" or "The First Parents," Adam with a circle and a cross in his hand. Before him are the incense urns and tables.

As the Nestorian Church, like the Roman Catholic, exalted the Virgin above the Saviour, we should naturally expect to find traces of her worship today. We undoubtedly do. There are "holy wells" and "Virgin fountains," and "miraculous holy fountains."

Further it is held by those who have made a study of the subject, that the "great" Kwan Yin idol of China and India represents the Virgin Mary more than any other person or idea.

As, for instance, note the pictures of Kwan Yin that are sold all over China at New Year's time. She is represented as of "royal line," "as poor, became a goddess." "She is a *Virgin*" and yet "has her *son in her arms*." Near by are beings standing on clouds. Angels? On a table is a vase containing "water for purifying." In it is always a sprig of "willow" to "sprinkle with." On the other side is a bird called a "parrot," but resembling a dove, which carries a string of praying beads to the idol.

Now here is a case where we know that the truth was brought to China in a more or less pure form and exerted a very powerful influence on the whole social and religious structure of the nation, and through a length of time extending over more than a millenium; but not having the standard of the written Word, instead of developing into something purer and tending towards monotheism, exactly the reverse has occurred. Today this worship is wretchedly degraded. Mary and the Child, the god of war and the god of riches, occupy the same scroll on the wall. In the temples the worship of these female and infant images is so disgusting that it is not pleasant to allude even euphemistically to it.

Thus here in China one can really trace these steps of "evolution" down and not up.

Is there any real evidence that when religious thought is left undirected the progress is not always down?