

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

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

783RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 14TH, 1935.
AT 4.30 P.M.

DOUGLAS DEWAR ESQ., B.A., F.Z.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of June 11th, 1934, were read, confirmed and signed. The following have been elected since the last Meeting. As Members : Sidney J. Arkwright, Esq., M.A. (from Associate), Douglas Dewar, Esq., F.Z.S. (from Associate), R. Duncan, Esq., M.B.E., I.S.O. (from Associate), Miss A. Budgen, Charles E. Arundel, Esq., and Capt. A. Acworth, D.S.O., R.N. As Associates : Rev. C. E. Stocks, M.A., B.D., Rev. J. Wesley Smith, Brig.-General W. Baker Brown, C.B., R. G. Lundy, Esq., I.S.O., James McGavin, Esq., M.Eng., A. E. Everatt, Esq., Miss Grace M. Kerr, Admiral Sir George King-Hall, K.C.B., Rear-Admiral Sir Harry H. Stileman, K.B.E., J. Campbell Beattie, Esq., John McKellar, Esq., Samuel Nevin, Esq., M.D., B.Sc., F. S. Harris, Esq., B.S., Ph.D. Hugh Dolby, Esq., James Duncan Bunyan, Rev. H. J. Barker, M.P.S., H. W. Bryning, Esq., Brig.-General F. D. Frost, C.B.E., V.C.

Before proceeding with the ordinary business of the Meeting, the CHAIRMAN submitted a motion of appreciation of the services of the late Dr. James W. Thirtle, in the following words : "That this meeting of Members and Associates of the Victoria Institute, at their first meeting in 1935, desire to record their deep appreciation of the great value of the services to it of the late Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.A., F.R.A.S., Vice-President and Chairman of Council, and their sense of loss by his decease. They also wish to convey their sympathy and condolences to the members of his family and his friends."

The Motion, being seconded by the President, Sir Ambrose Fleming, was then put to the meeting and carried unanimously, the audience standing in silence in token of their sympathy and approval.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the President, Sir Ambrose Fleming, to read his paper on "Modern Anthropology *versus* Biblical Statements on Human Origin."

MODERN ANTHROPOLOGY *versus* BIBLICAL STATEMENTS ON HUMAN ORIGIN.

By Sir AMBROSE FLEMING, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (*President*).

I. THE STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE.

NO one can deny that in a period covered by one long life, say, in the last seventy years, which is the "Life" of the Victoria Institute, there has been a very marked change in the ideas of the general intelligent public, and in those

of their instructors in scientific matters, as regards the important question of the origin of the human race.

Before the beginning of that period, apart from those so ignorant or careless as to be indifferent to all serious questions, the great mass of people, who thought about it at all, held in a general way that the human race was a special creation as stated in the early chapters of the Book of Genesis. Although the French naturalists, Buffon in 1749, and Lamarck in 1809, had boldly announced their belief in the close bodily relation of man to the anthropoid apes their speculations then seemed destitute of any support in fact and had little influence on popular opinion.

In 1859, Charles Darwin published the first edition of his epoch-making book on *The Origin of Species* and followed it in 1871 with another book on *The Descent of Man*. In the first he applied his theory of natural selection to account for the origin of the vast multitude of animal species, and in the latter the same hypothesis was used to explain the derivation or evolution of the human race from the same animal stock, which also gave rise to the anthropoid or manlike apes, such as the Chimpanzee and Gorilla.

Just before the appearance of Darwin's book the discovery was made near Düsseldorf of a skull cap and fragments which experts declared were those of an extinct primitive race of men of low cerebral development and great bodily strength which are now called the Neanderthal race. In 1863 the English Geologist, Sir Charles Lyell, published a book on *The Geological Evidence for the Antiquity of Man*, and made reference to the ape-like characters of the Neanderthal skull.

Darwin's theory was hailed with delight by those to whom the idea of special creation was unacceptable or impossible. It secured powerful advocacy from skilled controversialists, such as T. H. Huxley, and although it met with strong opposition, its opponents had not, in general, the biological knowledge necessary to offer any effective protest against it. The issue was, however, fairly joined at the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. On the one side the evolutionists asserted that the human species arose by natural selection from the same mammalian stock from which were derived the anthropoid apes and that the differences between man and ape were differences of degree and not of kind. Man, so they

said, had *acquired* a larger brain, power of upright walking on his legs independent of the arms, a special adaptation of foot and hand, and powers of intercommunication by speech. On the other hand, the opponents pointed out that no sufficient evidence then existed of intermediary forms and that there was an unbridged gap not only in important details of bodily structure, but an enormous gulf in psychical powers for which no sufficient reason had been given. Those concerned with questions of religious belief asserted emphatically that this evolutionary theory was totally at variance with the Scriptural teaching as to man's original perfection, his fall, moral responsibility, and with all its teaching as to the necessity for an atonement for the remission of sin. Since the vigorous controversies of the last century have come to notice in the form of fragments of more or less complete skeletons, especially skulls, which Darwinians declare establish the necessary links of connection between man and ape. The widest publicity has been given to these discoveries and so confident are the Darwinian anthropologists of their importance and truth that any doubt or opposition is treated as the result of ignorance or bigotry. The daily newspapers give large space to these theories and the wildest assumptions as to the supposed age of the specimens are made without any critical discussion.

All this has markedly affected popular thought and even that of some religious teachers in the direction of the belief that the earlier chapters of the Bible must be taken as parabolic and not literal truth, but chiefly represent the ignorance of an unscientific age.

Hence some modernists proclaim confidently that the theological teaching of the New Testament also must be modified in accordance with this modern anthropology. But this attempt to make a scientific hypothesis take precedence of the teaching of that literature which millions of people for centuries have been convinced is a revelation from the Author of the Universe to mankind, involves consequences of a very serious nature. The archæological and literary researches of recent times are continually confirming the truth of early Biblical history in many ways.

Hence it is necessary to subject these biological hypotheses to renewed careful scrutiny at the present time, more especially since, at the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences which met last year in London, they were given fresh support and the widest publicity.

2. WHAT ARE THE FACTS ?

Let us then, in the first place, state very briefly the facts about these so-called discoveries, apart from any hypotheses which have been built upon them. We will take them in the order of their significance rather than historical succession.

In 1891, a Dutch army surgeon, Eugen Dubois, excavating for fossils in Java, near Trinil, found an upper molar tooth he thought was that of an ape. About a yard away he found the top of a skull and a second tooth, and about fifty feet away a left thigh bone which had human characteristics. These few scattered fragments were given the pretentious name of *Pithecanthropus erectus*, or the "Upright ape-man." It was declared to be an ancestor of modern man.

The strata in which these bones were found was stated to be of late tertiary or Pliocene formation. The especial characteristic of this skull top was the slight evidence of a bony ridge over the front, which brow-ridge is a feature of the anthropoid ape skull, and also its small frontal angle and brain capacity. Some, however, doubted whether these fragments belonged to the same individual and other naturalists regarded the skull-cap as part of the skull of a giant gibbon. The evolutionists, however, have not been content to limit themselves to the actual facts. They have drawn pictures and modelled in clay busts representing their ideas of the complete head of this ape-man.* Forty years' search has, however, revealed no second similar skull specimen in the same locality. The whole theory that this "Erect Ape-man" is a progenitor of modern humanity is built on these isolated few fragments of bone and all the additions are pure imagination.

It is, in fact, a mere supposition that these four pieces of bone so found were part of the skeleton of one and the same animal. Suppose anyone found in a field a bone button and a yard away another similar button and the top of an old bowler cap, and then fifty feet away part of one leg of a pair of trousers, would it be legitimate to assert that all these fragments were part of

* Such drawings are given in the book *Men of the Stone Age*, by H. F. Osborn (G. Bell & Sons, London), and models of them are placed in the Natural History Museum, South Kensington, London, in the Gallery on the First Floor, West Wing.

a single costume and to proceed to make a drawing of what the complete dress was like when it left the outfitter's shop, and declare that long ago many people were arrayed in this fashion? Most persons, we think, would hesitate before making such a gratuitous assumption.

Apart, however, from any possible inferences which may be drawn from the few discovered fragments as to the bodily appearance of this supposed "man," we have not the smallest means of knowing the true nature of its appearance or its mental faculties. Was its body covered with hair like an ape? Had it a prehensile great toe of an ape or the hand with an opposable thumb of a human being? Had it any powers of speech? Did it make any clothing or covering for its body? Was it, in short, a single step in advance of any of the brute creation in any way? Had it any possibility of educational progress, or were its faculties rigidly limited like those of other animal species? To these and all such questions there is no reply and hence no justification at all for the name "man" bestowed upon it. Can we regard these three or four fragments of some skeleton or skeletons as a truly scientific proof establishing the conclusion that many intermediate vertebrate beings once existed in form and powers between modern man and ancient ape of an antiquity guessed at half a million years?*

Then next in 1907 was found, in the Mauern Sands, near Heidelberg, at a depth of 79 feet, part of a jaw bone with teeth in it of human type, but with a rounded front or an absence of projecting chin bone, which defect is characteristic of the anthropoid ape jaw. The conclusion drawn from this single fragment was that it belonged to a man-like being, who

* To anyone accustomed to or trained in the exact reasoning and strict definitions required in mathematics or physics, it is a matter for surprise to notice the loose, inconclusive arguments and ill-defined terms employed by some Darwinian anthropologists. For example, there is not a shadow of proof that the four fragments of bone comprising the so-called *Pithecanthropus erectus* belonged to one individual or were deposited in the ground at the same time. But all difficulties are covered up by the adoption of this grand name, which takes for granted the very thing required to be proved. If any similar shaky argument was put forward in a Court of Law, say in a criminal trial, it would be dismissed as inadequate without any hesitation by judge and jury. Nevertheless, the anthropologists venture boldly on this thin ice and find no difficulty in making it the basis of an argument for the evolutionary origin of Man.

was called *Homo Heidelbergensis*. Here again, evolutionary imagination proceeded to make drawings of the head of this Heidelberg "man" declared to be a stage in advance of the Java man. The fallacy of this nomenclature consists in assuming the very thing which has to be proved. The Darwinians desire to have these fragments regarded as stages in the evolution of modern man from an animal ancestor, but until the proof is obtained it is a pure assumption to call them by the name *Homo* or *Man*.

Then, again, in 1911 or 1912, Mr. C. Dawson found in a gravel bed near Piltdown, in Sussex, England, a small fragment of a skull, and shortly after other fragments were found and pieced together by Dawson and Smith Woodward and Father P. Teilhard. As far as the fragments allowed any true reconstruction to be made, it appeared that the brow-ridges characteristic of apes were absent in this case, and the skull capacity was estimated variously at from 1,070 to 1,500 cubic centimetres. It may be here noted that in true modern human beings the volume of the skull may vary between about 950 to 1,600 or 1,700 cubic centimetres. The largest true ape skull has a volume of about 600 cubic centimetres, and that of the Java man has been estimated at about 900 cubic centimetres, which is half as large again as the ape brain. This Piltdown skull, with its smooth forehead, but ape-like jaw, was in accordance with evolutionary ideas christened by the name *Eoanthropus*, or the *Dawn-man*, and asserted to be a sample of a new stage of modern man in process of making. Drawings and busts have accordingly been made illustrating the supposed appearance of the head of the Piltdown man in real life. Nevertheless, learned opinions differ, and the eminent German anatomist, Schwalbe, has asserted that this Piltdown skull is not essentially different from a good-sized skull of modern man (*Homo Sapiens*), and only distinguished by the greater thickness of its bone. Also, the supposed jaw has been stated by more than one expert to be that of a fully adult chimpanzee.

H. F. Osborn gives it as his opinion that the Piltdown man was not ancestral to either the Heidelberg or the Neanderthal man. It would occupy too much space to describe in detail the various "finds" that have taken place in the last few years, all of which are proclaimed as fresh links in the evidence of man's evolutionary development from the animal races.

Thus, in December, 1929, in a cave at Chou Kou Tien, near Peking, were found a skull and jaw remains embedded in rock which were given the name of *Sinanthropus*. It was declared that this Peking "man" was roughly comparable in age with the Java and Piltdown "man," and was acquainted with fire and made implements of stone and bone, and in age these fragments were said to carry us back even up to half a million years. Then, in addition, there was the Rhodesian "man" and the eleven skeletons found in a cave on Mount Carmel and the Mount Carmel child skull, all of which are pronounced to be of immense age, the last about 30,000 to 50,000 years old, on little or no scientific evidence. These lightly-made guesses at age receive, however, a shock sometimes.

About 1930, Professor F. C. C. Hansen, of Copenhagen, received some human bones recovered from a twelfth-century graveyard in Gardar, Greenland. Amongst them was a lower human jaw and a large part of a skull showing characters more primitive or ape-like than the so-called Rhodesian skull, and having close affinities with the Java and Peking skull. True to custom, this Gardar skull was christened *Homo gardarensis*. But buried as it was with the remains of twelfth-century Norsemen, it had to be pronounced as a case of atavism, or the reproduction of a type of man long since extinct. These guesses or assumptions cannot, however, be regarded as scientific knowledge or any real proof of human evolution. That occasional cases of atavism, or "throw-back," or deterioration, are not impossible seems indicated by an account that appeared in 1930 in the *Morning Post* of January 27th (repeated in *Whitaker's Almanack* for 1931) concerning the skull and skeleton of a criminal named Deeming, executed in Melbourne Gaol in 1892 for the murder of his wife. When his skeleton, 38 years later, was exhumed and examined by Sir Colin Mackenzie, it was stated to have very remarkable anthropoid-ape characters. The foramen magnum in the skull was further back than in human skulls and the mastoid processes and skull capacity were similar to those in the Java "man" skull, and it also had similar brow-ridges. The arms were longer than in normal humans, and the thigh bones ape-like in character. The author of this address wrote twice to Sir Colin Mackenzie, the Director of the Australian Institute of Anthropology, to ask if the report concerning Deeming's skull was correct, but did not succeed in

obtaining a reply. If, however, the facts are as stated, it shows that such retrogression is possible.

We must pass on next to notice the more extensive discoveries with regard to a race called Neanderthal "man," the first discovery concerning which was the skull-cap and fragments of a skeleton discovered at Düsseldorf in 1856 to which reference has already been made. Near by bones of a cave bear and rhinoceros were found. In 1887 two skulls and nearly complete skeletons were found near Spy, in Belgium, with flint implements of so-called Mousterian age, from the name of the place, Le Moustier, in France, the caves at which were amongst the earliest inhabited by so-called man. In these caves were found also the remnants of bones of extinct mammals such as the woolly mammoth, woolly rhinoceros, cave bear and cave hyæna.

These Neanderthal skulls had brow-ridges rather less marked than anthropoid apes, a receding forehead, and cranial profile inferior to that of the lowest Australian races and thigh and shinbones of ape-like proportion, indicating a short, massively built body, yet one not able to stand quite upright. In succeeding years up to 1914, a considerable number of fragments of skeletons and skulls were found in various places such as Krapina in Croatia and in the South of France, which had similar characteristics with those of Spy, and were declared to belong to the same Neanderthal race which was once said to be distributed widely over Europe. The distinctive features of these skull and skeleton remains were the marked brow-ridges and retreating foreheads, and large size of nasal opening said to represent a lower type than any of the existing Australian races. Anthropologists such as Schwalbe, in 1901, asserted that the Neanderthal skull occupies a position half-way between the anthropoid apes and modern man called *Homo Sapiens*. Professor H. F. Osborn, in his book *Men of the Old Stone Age*, gives a list (p. 219) of the Neanderthal remains so far found. The fragments or complete skeletons found at these places are asserted to be the remains of a race of low order of intelligence, but it is questionable whether it had advanced so far as to discover fire, though some form of ceremonial burial seemed to have been used. Whether, however, they were stages on the way up in human development, or stages on the way down, remains to be proved.

3. THE ADVENT OF HOMO SAPIENS.

There is evidence, however, to show that the aforesaid Neanderthal race of human-like beings, or as we may perhaps best call them *hominoids*, disappeared from Europe and were replaced or destroyed by the advancing groups of a superior race called the *Cro-magnons*, who were in all bodily respects identical with or superior to modern races of men. These Cro-magnons were a tall and highly intelligent looking people. Their skull and limb characteristics were equal or superior to that of many present-day men. Some were over six feet high. The first complete Cro-magnon skeleton was found in a cave in Western Wales. In 1852 seventeen others were found in a cave at Aurignac in the Pyrenees, and others at Dordogne in France. The skulls are marked by large cranial capacity, 1,500 to 1,600 cubic centimetres, entire absence of brow-ridges as completely as in modern man, and a skull volume exceeding that of many savages of to-day. This race had great ingenuity and handicraft skill and were able to make bone and flint instruments such as knives, scrapers, spearheads, arrow-heads and needles. They probably made clothes of animal skins and had in some degree burial ceremonial customs and the knowledge of how to produce fire. The most interesting and remarkable fact about this Cro-magnon race is their artistic ability and power of making outline drawings or even painted pictures of contemporary, but now extinct, animals, such as the mammoth, cave bear, woolly rhinoceros and others. These are found in caves in considerable numbers and exhibit in some cases great artistic ability.

According to H. F. Osborn, the Cro-magnon race appeared first in Asia and was not evolved from the preceding Neanderthal race. No trace of artistic ability has been found in the latter, but the Cro-magnons must have had great intelligence and also personal beauty. They were, no doubt, capable of self-education and had strongly developed artistic and some religious sense. They appeared first in South-Western Europe and gradually made their way over the Continent, obliterating or destroying the remnants of the Neanderthal race. These Cro-magnons were an outdoor race of hunters, but had probably also reached the stage of constructing log huts in places favourable for hunting or fishing.

4. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.

In reviewing all the above-mentioned facts concerning discoveries of remains of supposed ancestors of "man" it is evident that the Darwinian anthropologists, urged by their fundamental postulate that evolution *must* be true, are tempted to give quite undue weight to isolated specimens. I submit that we cannot consider we have any serious proof of the evolution of modern man from an animal stock, from which also are derived the anthropoid apes, in the few scattered fragments of skeletons which have been named the Java, Heidelberg and Piltdown "men," especially as the real nature of these fragments is still questioned by competent naturalists.

The evolutionists are here in the same difficulty in which they are placed with regard to the evolution of other animal species. The palæontological or fossil evidence is painfully small. Whatever may be the truth with regard to the Neanderthal "man," the Cro-magnon man certainly belonged to the same species as the human beings of the present day. They are included therefore amongst the species of our race called in scientific language *Homo sapiens*, or intelligent man. The Neanderthal "men" cannot be placed on quite the same level of intelligence. We have no means, however, of knowing their actual mental state or how far they could have advanced by their own efforts if they had not been entirely obliterated.

Let us turn, however, in the next place to consider the account given of the origin of the human race in that literature which so large a number consider is inspired. We have to discuss in the first place the meaning to be attached to the word "Man" as used in the early chapters of the Book of Genesis.

5. MEANING OF THE WORD "MAN" AS USED IN THE BIBLE.

It is freely acknowledged that in all scientific literature the exact definition of the terms used is a fundamental necessity. If there is any vagueness or uncertainty it is fatal to true scientific thought. Hence, if such words as "Man," "Evolution," "Adapted" or "Acquired" are used in anthropology without exact definition we are no longer concerned with anything which has a right to be called scientific knowledge.

In the creational narrative as given to us in the Book of Genesis i, 26, we meet first with the Divine resolution, "Let us make *man* in our image after our likeness" (Gen. i, 26). This man so made in the Divine image was appointed to have dominion over the animal races. He was therefore to be their superior and not their equal or merely one of them. In the valuable book of Dr. D. E. Hart-Davies, *The Genesis of Genesis* (James Clarke & Co., London), attention is drawn to the fact (p. 64) that in the original writings the Hebrew word *bara* (= create) is only used three times, viz., with reference to the first appearance of Matter, of Animal Life, and of Man as indicating then some very special acts of Divine Power.

We can analyse Matter or material substance into molecules, atoms and electrons and protons, but we have not the very smallest knowledge of how empty space first became occupied with the most rudimentary form of Matter. Neither have we any conception of how Life originated. We cannot in any way bring it into existence apart from previous life. Here, then, are two great gaps which no evolutionary theory has been able to bridge.

Then the use of the same word *bara* with regard to "man" seems to mark another uncrossed gulf which is emphasized by the Divine resolution to create him in the likeness of God. In what sense could man be said to be created in the image of God? God is a Spirit (John iv, 24), and we are told "No man hath seen God at any time" (John i, 18). But we are also taught that the Agent of Creation was The Logos or "Word of God," Who became incarnate as the Christ, and that "by Him were all things created" (Col. i, 16), and that He is the "image of the invisible God" (Col. i, 15). Hence, to create a being in the image of God was to create one in the image of His Son. Could this, however, refer merely to bodily form? Must it not much rather have primary reference to a similarity or congruence in mental and spiritual nature? If so, we cannot properly apply the word "man" to any organism not involving these latter elements. We have no right to limit it to the mere form of the material body or its skeleton of bone, when we are entirely ignorant of the nature of the psychical and spiritual faculties, if any, associated with that body. There is, however, on this point a strong divergence of opinion. Materialistic biologists would not admit any independent existence of something called *mind* or *spirit* apart from the operation of brain. They would

say the brain in action *is* the mind, and nothing exists when the brain is destroyed. There are, however, many strong indications that the mind is something more than brain, although the brain may be the instrument of the mind. The remarkable powers of some very young children in mental arithmetic, music, or artistic gifts which sometimes decrease with age, and the fact that great mental powers are not at all proportional to brain bulk are very significant facts. Some would appeal to certain results of psychical research to prove the survival of some element of the human personality after the death of the body, and others rely on the statements in Scripture proved in many indirect ways to be a production not entirely due to the human mind. Broadly and generally we may say that the widespread, almost universal, conviction of humanity, as shown by burial customs as well as in the phenomena of conscience, is that bodily death does not terminate personal existence in human beings. Then from almost the earliest appearance of man he gave evidence of a religious sense which even in the form of mere animism or polytheism affords evidence of a feeling that there are unseen immaterial powers which control the life of man and to whom he must bow down or worship and submit himself. At a later stage his most elaborate buildings were constructed for the purpose of religious ceremonies. No other animal exhibits the very smallest trace of this faculty or feeling. It is absolutely limited to the race we call human beings. Furthermore, the marvellous intellectual, artistic, ethical and social achievements of this creature called "man" cannot be the result merely of the motions or positions of atoms of matter constituting the brain. Hence, whatever the pure materialist may assert, the verdict of the bulk of mankind is that the body is not everything.

But then we may bring forward other arguments to show that the human mind has faculties of which not the least traces are found in the true animal races. No animal makes for itself any dress or article for personal adornment, or has any sense of beauty, or makes any drawings or representations of other objects or animals. None buries its dead with any signs of expectation of revival, and none contrives or makes any tools or weapons. But all, or nearly all, of these things were done by the earliest true races of men. The animal may possess remarkable powers in some respects, but it has no self-educative ability, and never goes a step beyond its natural instincts. Man

is enormously progressive, and in his very earliest appearance gave evidence of it by constructive powers in numerous ways. If, then, there is such a sharply marked difference between the animal mind and the human mind, the problem the evolutionist has to face is to explain how it comes to pass that if man and the anthropoid apes have a common ancestor all the above astonishing powers and faculties should be present in ever-advancing degree in man, and totally absent in the collateral animal the ape. There is another difference between the animal and "man" to which Darwinians do not seem to have attached sufficient importance, and that is the very different value of the individual life. We consider it not wrong to kill certain animals, provided it is done without unnecessary cruelty, for food or to prevent them becoming too numerous or in self-defence, but we think that the killing of a man is only justified as an equitable punishment for wilful murder or other great crime against the community. If, then, man is merely a transformed and more perfect animal, we may ask at what stage in the evolution, and why, did this peculiar attribute of sacredness in the individual life begin? If, on the other hand, he was a special creation, and not wholly a material body, the reason for this difference is not hard to see. We have not merely to account for the bodily form, we have to explain the appearance of these immensely progressive psychical and spiritual powers as well. Modern anthropology furnishes no sufficient answer to this question. It makes enormous and unjustified demands on time for the evolutionary production of the material body, and ignores completely any source or origin for the invisible agency which uses that body as a musician uses his musical instrument, which is the seat of all thought, sensation, perception and emotion, and without which he could not possibly be described as being made in the "image of God."

Seeing, then, that there are these tremendous differences of opinion, it is necessary to consider a little more in detail the validity of some assumptions which modern anthropology makes.

6. SOME UNPROVED ASSUMPTIONS OF MODERN ANTHROPOLOGY.

The first is, that it takes for granted the entire sufficiency of Darwin's theory of natural selection to account for the production of those different non-interbreeding groups of animal forms we call species.

It is not possible to recapitulate all the arguments against the Darwinian theory of organic evolution in a few sentences. The reader may be referred to the author's book, *Evolution or Creation* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London), for an attempt to give a fair summary of these arguments.* Since Darwin's day, great progress has been made in our knowledge of genetics or animal reproduction. In particular, the rediscovery of the important law of Mendel has shown many naturalists that Darwin's theory of accidental variations in the ova or eggs, combined with a struggle for existence, is not sufficient to account for the production of those permanent specialized non-interbreeding groups of animal forms we call different species.

It is certain that large variations are possible within the species by natural or artificial selection, but there are definite limits to this which are never overpassed.

If, then, Darwinian natural selection will not sufficiently account for the production of animal species, it will not account for the production of the human species. Moreover, the possession of a similarity in structure at any point is no proof of a close common ancestry. Thus the claw of the scorpion is similar to the claw of a lobster in form, and the eye of a cuttlefish or octopus to the eye of a mammal. But this does not prove any close relation of scorpion and lobster or octopus and sheep. Thus the brow-ridges of the anthropoid apes and those of Neanderthal men cannot be taken as proof of any close origin or close common ancestry of ape and man. The overhanging brow of the monkey assists vision at a distance, because the ape wears no hat with a peak or brim. The same for man before the invention of hats.

In this connection, however, it seems to me that the great error that the Darwinian anthropologists make is to assume

* The following papers read to the Victoria Institute and published in their Transactions are of great value in this connection :—

Dr. Albert Fleischmann, Professor of Zoology in the University of Erlangen, Germany. *The Doctrine of Organic Evolution in the Light of Modern Research*. Trans. V, I., Vol. 65, p. 194. 1933.

Douglas Dewar, Esq. *The Limitations of Organic Evolution*. Trans. V, I., Vol. 64, p. 120. 1932.

Dr. A. Rendle Short, M.D. *Some Recent Literature Concerning the Origin of Species*. Trans. V, I., Vol. 61, p. 141. 1929.

Henry R. Kindersley, Esq. *The Bible and Evolution*. Trans. V, I., Vol. 64, p. 191. 1932.

that organic evolution by natural selection, as Darwin postulated, can take place under conditions which are quite different from those prescribed by Darwin.

The core and essence of Darwin's theory is that there must be a struggle for existence. He assumes that the germs, eggs or ova of any individual vary accidentally in all possible directions. Then next, that those possessing variations which give any advantage to the offspring to continue to exist by obtaining food or escaping from enemies are preserved. Those individuals best adapted to their surroundings live, and those that are not die off or are killed. If, then, conditions are such that there is no great struggle to live, and no great procreation, the source of organic evolution is, so to speak, removed.

Darwinian anthropologists would probably offer the following explanation for the mode in which an ape-like man could have been produced from the same stock which yielded a man-like ape.

If there was some common ancestor of ape and man, which we will call for shortness the C.A. (= Common Ancestor), then, by Darwinian principles, there must have been a great procreation or large numbers of this C.A. Some of these C.A. may have found themselves in forest regions in which they could best survive by dwelling in trees, to be safe from carnivorous enemies and able to subsist on fruits and nuts.

Hence they "acquired," to use the evolutionary term, paws adapted for tree-climbing with prehensile great toe, jaws and teeth adapted for vegetable food and hairy covering to protect them from cold. As no great call was made on intelligence, the brain remained small and skull capacity likewise.

But this great procreation of the C.A. must have forced other members of it out into non-arboreal districts and these had to take refuge in caves and other sheltered places and move much about. Their hind paws then became "adapted" for walking on the ground. As nuts and fruits were not easily obtained, they had to take to a flesh diet and catch fish and birds. This required the manufacture of weapons, and the front paws developed into hands "adapted" for making stone axes, barbs and spears, also for defence against carnivorous animals.

Hence, whilst one branch of this C.A. evolved into man-like apes, another branch developed into ape-like "men." This theory is consistent with itself provided the premises are sound. But when we ask for the facts which support it, we find no ade-

quate proof in fossil remains to demonstrate the existence of the required large number of any common ancestor (C.A.) of ape and man which must be hypothecated if the results supposed are to follow. The Darwinian theory may be valid provided the assumed conditions hold good. But if they cannot be shown to have existed, then the theory falls to the ground.

Even if the Darwinian theory of natural selection could or can be shown to be inadequate for the production of animal species and therefore of the human species, some naturalists are content to postulate a vague undefined, impersonal cause for development which is covered by the word Evolution, and they assume that evolution in the sense of gradual development *must* be true.

If this term is used merely as the name for a *process*, it is not entirely objectionable, but if it is used as a name for an *effective cause* it is quite unscientific and illegitimate. The objector might say that the word Creation is equally vague and indefinable and that we have no knowledge of the exact process.

The reason, however, for resting more content with the term creation than evolution is as follows :—

No agency can bestow any quality or power which it does not itself possess. Thus life can only proceed from already living matter. It cannot be imparted from non-living matter. We can only obtain energy from some source already possessing it. The same for other things.

Now the essential quality of man is that he is conscious of his own existence. He can think and will. He is therefore possessed of personality. Hence, the only true source of human self-consciousness and thinking power must be a Being which also possesses self-consciousness, thought, and will, and therefore personality.

We can, therefore, quite appropriately assert that the origin of man is to be looked for in the creative power of a self-conscious Creator and Supreme Intelligence and Will. We cannot, however, assume that a mere abstract term such as evolution, which merely connotes gradual change, is a *vera causa* in a scientific sense.

Accordingly, it is no explanation at all to assert that man has been evolved from an animal form. We can say certainly that there is evidence of Thought in the Universe from countless metrical facts which are not the product of our own minds, and hence that there must be a Supreme Intelligence as its

Source and therefore Creative Power and Will as the origin of it. But there is no adequate proof of the extensive distribution or large existence of any skeleton remains to justify the assumption that there did exist in past time many intermediate types of organic beings or common ancestors of man and the ape in such numbers and gradually varying types as to justify the assumption of Darwinian evolution. The few scattered remains represented by the Java, Heidelberg, Piltown, and Peking "man" as far as they are not truly animal may rather be regarded as biological abnormalities or cases of decadence rather than stages in an upward development. There are, then, no sufficient reasons for declaring the evolutionary origin of the human race a definitely certain fact. Certainly none for assuring a general congregation in Westminster Abbey, as did Bishop Barnes, on Sunday, September 25, 1927, that "To-day there is among competent men of science unanimous agreement that man has been evolved from an ape-like stock. He arose probably a million years ago from a tangle of apes which began to vary in different directions."

A second unjustified assumption of the evolutionists is the vast space of time demanded for this evolution of man. Many geologists hold the opinion that in the past there have been one or more periods of intensely cold winters on our earth in which the polar ice caps came down to much lower latitudes than at present. These periods, called glacial, were sandwiched between mild and warm periods of climate called interglacial. The cause of these glacial periods has been much under discussion. Some arguments can be given for an astronomical cause depending on secular variations in the eccentricity of the earth's orbit and the position of its axis of rotation.

In a very interesting book called *The Cause of an Ice Age*, Sir Robert Ball has proved mathematically that under certain conditions of the earth's orbit as regards its eccentricity and combined with a certain position of the earth's axis of rotation periods must come when the winters are of extraordinary rigor and polar ice caps come down well into Europe. He shows that these occur at each hemisphere at intervals of about 21,000 years and that when this glacial epoch is at its maximum, the short warm summers are unable to neutralize the long intensely rigorous winters and consequent cumulative effect of the low temperature. The astronomical theory shows that the Ice Ages alternate in the two terrestrial hemispheres as regards time of maximum.

There is evidence not altogether negligible that a last glacial epoch may have ended not much more than seven to ten thousand years ago.*

The question then arises, Could any gradually evolving intermediate type, or true human being of present type, have lived through a glacial epoch or epochs assuming such did occur? Even if these periods of intense polar cold did happen, it is possible that a central or equatorial district of the earth may have kept a sufficiently mild climate to permit such human life to continue.

The question then cannot be decided by dogmatic statements either way. There is certainly room for difference of opinion. But the fact remains that the evolutionists have not given any unanswerable proof of the pre-glacial period existence of true man. Many of the assumptions as to the great age of certain stalagmite deposits or fossil-bearing strata in the earth have subsequently been shown to be greatly over-estimated. At a meeting of the British Association in 1925 the eminent geologist, Sir Boyd Dawkins, expressly stated his opinion of the impossibility of any certain reckoning of ages in years from any geological data at present available.

In his book *Evolution*, Professor J. Graham Kerr says (p. 212), "Palæontological knowledge regarding man's past history is still of the most fragmentary kind. Each additional scrap becomes the subject of a voluminous literature and the basis of an edifice of speculation out of all proportion to the foundation upon which it rests and not infrequently constructed in complete defiance of the accepted canons of morphological argument." Also on p. 213: "Still less is it justifiable to suggest a probable date for man's appearance on the earth. Statements of this kind involving periods of time reckoned in hundreds of thousands or millions of years are frequently made, but, like other attempts at the numerical expression of evolutionary time, they are not to be regarded as of scientific value."

The evolutionist then makes in the third place a large assumption in his demand that the process by which this being "man" came into existence must be one which is entirely intelligible to his modern descendant. We can give irrefutable proof from

* See Dr. W. Bell Dawson. *The Bible and the Antiquity of Man*, p. 17 et seq.

the law of dissipation of energy and from the radio-active transformation of matter that the physical universe cannot have existed for an infinite past time. The universal presence of numerical relations and evidences of design or adaptation or means to an end in the physical universe and its intelligibility by our minds affords the strongest proof that it is not a mere chaos of casual events, but an ordered cosmos, originating in a Supreme Intelligence. Hence, it had a beginning. It does not follow, however, that the nature of that beginning or Creation must be intelligible to our human minds. If it were so, it would show that this Supreme Intelligence is not infinitely beyond but nearly on a level with our own. In rejecting the idea of Creation by Divine Will and Power, the evolutionist then claims that the only kind of beginning which can be accepted as true is one which appeals to his own finite intelligence. He is prepared to accept the Darwinian hypothesis because it is intelligible to him. He dismisses creation by Divine fiat as impossible because he cannot form any clear idea of how it took place. He rejects as untrue any statements about Nature which lie outside the limits of present human understanding and experience. Nevertheless, the evolutionist accepts the theory of evolution, which assumes change without adequate cause, although he admits he cannot see any reason for it. Yet at the same time he dismisses the idea of Divine Creation because he cannot comprehend how it took place. Thus said an eminent naturalist to the British Association a few years ago: "the theory of evolution was a theory universally accepted, not because it could be proved to be true but because the only alternative, special creation was clearly incredible" (Professor D. M. S. Watson). Another equally eminent zoologist declared, "We are more at a loss than ever before to understand the causes of evolution" (Professor H. F. Osborn).

In view of the argument above mentioned, based on the dissipation of energy and on radio-activity, and the additional argument which may be drawn from the fact that we cannot account for the long-enduring radiation from sun and stars without assuming some transformation of matter into radiant energy, many of our most eminent physicists have declared that creation in the inorganic world is an absolute necessity; in other words, it is not a matter of religious faith but of scientific demonstration that the physical universe must have had a

beginning. We men are conscious of our own existence and thinking power, and thus we ourselves can begin, initiate, or create certain things. There should therefore be nothing "incredible" in the idea that the Supreme Intelligence and Will of Deity which is evidenced to us in the phenomena of the inorganic world should be able to create not merely atomic matter and energy but also living matter in organic forms. Moreover, we have the proof of this in all the documentary, historical and circumstantial evidence for the creative work of the Founder of the Christian Church.

We cannot reasonably dismiss as simple legend and myth the accounts of the power of the historical Jesus Christ to create instantly shoals of fish in a lake where no fish were found just before, or to create bread and fish instantly to feed large multitudes, or to create wine out of water at a word, or raise dead human beings to life, seeing that the evidence is overwhelming that He himself was raised to life again, as He had predicted, three days after He had most assuredly suffered physical death of the body by crucifixion.

We have no right to assert that these statements are fictitious unless we have most carefully examined the evidence and found it certainly invalid. Those who have done so are agreed that the bodily resurrection of Christ is one of the most certainly attested facts in human history. But, if so, it certifies all previous Biblical miracles and it was unquestionably predicted in prophesy which is a continual miracle. But there are yet other considerations which show that the evolutionary theory of the origin of mankind by Darwinian natural selection from the animal races cannot be a true account of the matter, for whereas the Biblical or creational account agrees very closely with all the subsequent history and tendencies of mankind, the evolutionary hypothesis fails to explain certain of the most patent facts with regard to human nature at the present time.

7. THE EVOLUTIONARY AND CREATIONAL ORIGIN OF MANKIND TESTED BY SUBSEQUENT HISTORY.

It is agreed that a scientific theory which explains some effects but fails to give any explanation of others cannot be a true or full account of the phenomena. It is clear that the

motive power which brings about changes in animal form according to Darwinian theory is an urge experienced by the living individual to continue to exist. But when we come to apply this theory to help us to understand how some form of animal was transformed, on the one hand, into an ape and, on the other, into a man, we find a very remarkable difference between the two transformations. If man and the ape had a common ancestor from which by natural selection they were both developed, we have to explain how it came to pass that whilst the man-like apes owed their survival to great bodily strength, agility and hardiness ; on the other hand, the ape-like man owed his survival less to bodily powers and more to mental faculties and development of brain. He triumphed over his animal enemies because able to invent weapons, snares, traps, and especially by the production of fire and means to cook flesh food. His arms and legs were relatively feeble compared with those of the man-like apes, but his brain and mental powers were larger.

But then beyond a certain point this mental development rendered him no service in continuing to live. He developed early a sense of causation and began to be curious about the motions in the sky of the sun, moon and stars. He speculated about the phenomenon of bodily death and arrived at the conclusion that such an event was not the end of personal existence. He developed a religious sense and assumed that there were unseen intelligences which could control the life of man and must be propitiated or worshipped. He acquired a sense of beauty and began to adorn his person and appreciated it in others. All this went far beyond the acquirement of powers necessary for bodily life. There was not a trace of their beginnings in the collateral man-like ape. How, then, did these philosophic, æsthetic, ethical and social qualities arise by evolution ? T. H. Huxley, ardent Darwinian though he was, admitted that difficulty at the end of his life. Alfred Russell Wallace, co-enunciator with Darwin of the theory of natural selection, drew the conclusion that whilst man's body might be the outcome of that process, his mind and soul must have been a special creation.

But the theory of evolution not only fails to explain the origin of man's excellence and mental superiority, it also fails to explain his degradation and evil use of his powers. No animal behaves

to members of its own species with the cruelty, deception and violence of man. All human history is the long story of the inhumanity of man to man. The evolutionists try to explain sin as the remains of the brute in man. But that is quite unjust to the true animals. They all set man a very good example and are highly respectable themselves. If, then, evolution will not explain man's rise neither will it explain his fall and hence cannot be a full account of his origin and special powers.

The Biblical account of man's origin may not be altogether free from difficulties, but it is much more in touch with facts than an unproved assumption of a gradual stage-by-stage spontaneous automatic advance from a wholly animal form of life.

8. SOME QUESTIONS REMAINING TO BE DISCUSSED.

Those of us who accept the special creation of man and the Biblical derivation of the present existing human race from a single pair have, nevertheless, to bring our views into accord with the facts which are well ascertained as to prehistoric "man" and his activities.

As already stated, the evidence as regards the true nature of the Java, Heidelberg and Piltdown fossils is far too uncertain and sparse to build upon it any true scientific knowledge of human origin. The so-called Neanderthal specimens are on a somewhat different footing and have to be fitted in to any theory of the human race. The Cro-magnon man and his successors may, with little doubt, be reckoned as of the species *homo sapiens*.

Many modern anthropologists in their zeal for evolution seem to assume that various species of "man" with progressive improvements, succeeded each other on our globe as evolution operated. But, as a matter of fact, there have always been a large number of groups widely different in development present at the same time on earth. Thus, about a century ago, when in Europe and America we had the most highly cultured, intellectual, inventive and educated populations, there were in Australia, Africa and North America at the same time races using stone axes, dwelling in rude huts, scarcely able to count their fingers and not much more advanced than the Neanderthal "man." Hence, if we go back to the earliest historic times, when there were, as we know, high civilisations in Egypt, Mesopotamia

and Palestine, there is nothing impossible in the view that on the fringe of humanity and at a distance from the centres of civilisation there may have been some members of the race as rudimentary as the Neanderthals. The structure of human nature is such that in isolation the mental and spiritual powers decay, and as the mind becomes inactive and brutalised the facial type becomes animalised also.

These few skull specimens with their brow-ridges, retreating foreheads and heavy jaws may not, therefore, be stages on the way up from ape to man but stages on the way down from man to brute. In other words, instances of deterioration and not stages of upward evolution.

There is another view which may be put forward very tentatively, and that is that between the anthropoid apes and true man with his psychical and spiritual as well as bodily structure, there *may* have been some species of hominoids created with more than ape intelligence, but not "man" in the sense of the word used in the Bible, not ancestors or descendants of the man into whom was breathed the breath of life, destined not for extinction but to inherit eternal life. Biblical commentators have also paid attention to the mysterious verses at the beginning of the 6th chapter of the book of Genesis, in which it is asserted that the "Sons of God" intermarried with the "daughters of men" and that this union was responsible for a great increase in crime, violence and irreligion. We read that ultimately this moral disaster involved the physical disaster of the Flood to "take them all away" and enable a fresh beginning to be made with a better race and higher type of man. Neither time nor space will permit any discussion here of the various views held about these verses, nor of the probably inaccurate statements as to the true dates of the Creation or the Flood, due to the adoption of the Usher chronology, based on the later Hebrew texts of Genesis. That time scale is considerably extended if we take the Septuagint figures for the genealogies in the 5th and 11th chapters of Genesis and, moreover, there is some evidence that the word "son" in the Old Testament does not always mean immediate offspring but is equivalent to descendant. Taking the chronological system of Dr. William Hales, rather than of Usher, it is then possible to put the origin of the true human race consistently back to about the middle of the 6th millennium B.C., or 5411 B.C., and that of the Flood date to the end of the

4th millennium (3155 B.C.), and thus gain all required time for the growth of population from the Creation to the Flood and from the Flood to the time of Abraham.*

The vast ages which modern anthropology postulates for some fossil human remains are based on estimates, often little more than personal guesses, of the age of certain terrestrial strata or stalactitic layers, and there are no indisputable data for these ages and no unquestioned agreement between geologists as to the actual age of certain layers of the earth's crust, or even whether the same class of rocks at different localities have the same age. If we adopt the above suggested chronology, we can regard the Cro-magnon and subsequent races as the antediluvian men of the Biblical narrative, and there is then quite sufficient time for the re-population of the world from three pairs after the Flood. The Neanderthal race can then be explained as standing to the Cro-magnon in much the same relation as Australian bushmen or pigmies of Central Africa stood to the European men of the last century. It may be noted that the population of the world in 1914 was estimated at 1,900 millions, and had apparently nearly doubled in the preceding seventy years. Owing to wars, pestilences and other causes the average rate of increase since the beginning of the Christian era must have been much slower. If we take it at a rate which doubles about every 300 years, that would make the population at about 20 millions at A.D. 1. Before population crowded into large cities or contended for the possession of convenient dwelling lands on the earth, the rate of increase may have been again rather larger. It can be shown that the re-population of the earth from three couples after the Flood, as described in Genesis, could have furnished the earth with the above 20 millions in 3,155 years, if the rate of increase was such that the population doubled every 145 years.

If, then, we take the slowest of these rates of increase, say doubling in 300 years, it is possible to show that in 9,000 years a single pair of human beings could multiply into 1,000 million pairs of human beings. If prehistoric man had anything like

* Those who wish to find a justification for these dates are referred to an excellent little pamphlet by Dr. W. Bell Dawson, M.A., called *The Bible and the Antiquity of Man*, published by The Bible League, 40, Great James Street, Bedford Row, London, W.C.1, price 6d., which is in every way worthy of careful perusal.

the above rate of procreation, namely, doubling in 300 years, and had been living on the earth for any period like ten millenniums, he would have multiplied to an extent to fill up nearly the whole known world.

Yet where are the remains of such a vast population? All that have been found are a few dozen skulls and skeletons, mostly in very isolated and widely separated places, such as Java, Peking, Piltdown, Palestine, and South France. Surely this fact alone is sufficient to rule out these great ages thus assumed for these few human or semi-human remains. All the facts are much more consistent with the Biblical account and a post-glacial date for the Creation of mankind.

We may note in passing that if the above law of population increase holds good, viz., that the population of the world is now doubling every 70 to 100 years, there would then be about 4,000 million human beings on this earth in the year A.D. 2000, and it is a question whether the earth would support so many. Hence, all talk of the future of mankind a million years hence is futile.

9. CONCLUSION.

If, then, we give fair consideration to the above objections, it will become evident that this sedulously propagated hypothesis of man's age-long evolution by Darwinian natural selection from a stock which has also produced the anthropoid apes, and that all man's superiority is due to a spontaneous "acquirement" of a larger brain, upright position, improved foot or hand and powers of speech "acquired" over vast periods of time is the product rather of the imagination than based on indisputable evidence. Modern anthropology has to some large degree abandoned the true scientific method of letting the facts suggest the explanations. It endeavours to fit the facts into a preconceived hypothesis of spontaneous evolution. The cardinal error is that it substitutes as the ultimate source of all things an impersonal self-acting or automatic process of improvement, in place of the Will and Power of a Personal, Self-conscious Creator and Father of Mankind. Adherence to the doctrine of evolution is entirely inconsistent with belief in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity and New Testament teaching as regards human sin, redemption and future life, which alone have power to explain and remedy the past, inspire the present and dissipate the deep

shadows that otherwise surround the termination of human life.

It is a matter greatly to be deplored, then, that some ministers of religion should accept as demonstrated truth the unconfirmed speculations of a materialistic anthropology, deny the possibility of miracle or exceptional action on the part of Deity, and assume that no events have ever happened or can happen which are outside of or different from those of our present limited experience of Nature.

In so doing, they are building on the sands of an uncertain ever-changing science instead of resting on the rock of the increasingly verified inspired Scriptures which do not comprise the guesses of fallible minds but the utterances of holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. D. E. HART-DAVIES said : I have travelled from Edinburgh to-day in order to hear the paper which has been read by Sir Ambrose Fleming, and I am not disappointed. On the contrary, I am sure that I voice the mind of many when I express a feeling of gratitude for the candour and the courage of the protest to which we have been listening. There is a distinct bias in the scientific, journalistic, and even the ecclesiastical realm against anyone who presumes to question or reject the evolutionary theory of origins. We are all more or less the slaves of fashion. There are fashions in philosophy as there are in dress and custom. Sir Ambrose, fortunately, has reached such a height in the scientific realm that he can afford to utter his convictions without fear of consequences.

Sir Ambrose has rightly stressed the utter paucity of the evidence for the proposition, so loudly trumpeted, that man has emerged from a brute-like ancestry. Ten years ago there appeared in the pages of the *Illustrated London News* two full-paged reconstructions of a creature called *Hesperopithecus*—the male and female of the species being represented ; and the only foundation for this fanciful reconstruction was a single molar tooth discovered in Nebraska, U.S.A.—which Professor Smith Woodward pronounced to be the tooth of a Pliocene bear ! One instance out of many to justify Sir Ambrose's description of the theory as largely a product of the

imagination. Unfortunately, the public can be easily misled by high-sounding names. If the average person who reads in his newspaper about these pseudo-scientific claims could only realise that *Pithecanthropus Erectus*, simply translated, means "A standing-up Monkey-Man"; that *Eoanthropus* means "Man at his dawn"; and that *Hesperopithecus* signifies "The Ape at Eventide," he would begin to appreciate the contention of Sir Ambrose concerning the scantiness of the evidence adduced in support of the theory that man has emerged from the brute, from whom, it is affirmed, he differs not in kind but only in degree.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said: The doctrine of the evolution of Man has been sedulously and persistently proclaimed from pulpit, platform and press. Attempts have been made to bludgeon the public into believing the doctrine. A few years ago a distinguished Bishop wrote that "no educated person could believe in the early chapters of Genesis." Over against this arrogant opinion may be set the fact that many highly educated and intelligent people still accept the simple, plain, and natural interpretation which the record conveys to an ordinary reader, and believe in its historicity. It is most unfortunate that many of the pulpit advocates of the theory of evolution have not perceived that there is far more involved than in setting aside the Genesis account of Creation. They have proceeded to attack, as a consequence of their beliefs, some fundamental doctrines of the New Testament, and even go the length of an assault upon the authority of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

Sir Ambrose Fleming has given a most valuable paper. The cumulative effect of his argument goes to show the reasonableness of the Scriptural account of Creation, and the Darwinian theory as not being so reasonable. The lecture will do much to restore to many the assurance that the Bible gives a perfectly trustworthy, true and entirely satisfactory account of the origin of man. And more than that, it will give pause to many persons who read it, and will deter them from proclaiming as true what has never been proved. The argument which Sir Ambrose has so ably developed and brings to an issue (which calls for an answer, but which has not been given) is, "how it comes to pass that if man and the anthropoid apes have a common ancestor . . . astonishing powers and faculties should be

present in ever-advancing degree in man, and totally absent in the collateral animal the ape ? ”

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I do not think I need add anything by way of reply to the discussion on my Paper, except to thank those members who have spoken in kind approval of the opinions in it. I may say that since the reading of the paper I have amplified the arguments and somewhat extended the scope of it in a book just published called *The Origin of Mankind* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London). The difficulty in discussions with the advocates of Evolutionary theory is that they do not give reasoned replies to the objections raised, but for the most part content themselves with asserting ignorance on the part of the objectors or else the uniform acceptance of the theory which is not entirely correct.