

gations. A careful use of the daily Collect and other helps to prayer provided by our M.S.C.C. will make our petitions intelligent, definite, and helpful to ourselves and to others. Prayer is power.

The Church in England

Some very depressing and disappointing figures appear in the new volume of "The Church of England Year Book." It is, of course, unwise to lay too much emphasis upon the returns of one year, and yet it is scarcely possible to avoid noticing the seriousness of the diminution in the number of communicants and the corresponding decreases in finance. Unfortunately, too, it coincides with a similar depression among the Nonconformist Churches, showing that everything is not quite right with religion in England. At the recent Free Church Congress it was stated that only about one-sixth of the sittings in the Methodist Church are occupied at morning services, and the same is true of other denominations as well. Churches are built in response to supposed needs, and while the locality grows the Church remains only half full. Even earnest, true-hearted men in the ministry find themselves overwhelmed with the power of indifference. Not for a moment would we gauge prosperity by numbers, and yet "the assembling of ourselves together" is ordinarily a fair test of our appreciation of the Gospel of Christ. It behoves us in Canada to heed these facts and to see that nothing is permitted to interfere with the spiritual life and work of our congregations.

Genesis and Evolution

From time to time statements are heard to the effect that it is impossible to reconcile Genesis with the modern view of Evolution. We have already seen that Evolution is by no means definitely proved and settled beyond question, so that a good deal depends upon interpretations, both of Genesis and Evolution, before we can say that they are beyond reconciliation. Perhaps a little more knowledge of what Genesis actually contains and a little more information about the facts of science might lead to another conclusion. But in any case the question is worth facing.

On one hypothesis there is no doubt that Genesis and Evolution are irreconcilable, namely, the belief that Evolution is causal, thereby ruling out a belief in a great First Cause. If we admit that the solar system has always existed it would, of course, be necessary to believe in the eternity of matter, but nothing in the universe more clearly points to a beginning than the solar system, and great scientists, like Lord Kelvin and Sir Oliver Lodge, are quite definite in their conviction that only by means of a First Cause can we account for things as they are. Whatever may be the precise method by which present arrangements have come to be, orderly succession suggests cause and effect, and this, in turn, implies and demands an intelligent and infinite First Cause. But we may dismiss this idea of Evolution as causal because it is plainly anti-theistic.

The other view regards Evolution as modal, as the method employed by God to produce the world and all that is in it. On this assumption Evolution cannot get further back than the condition of things mentioned or implied in the second verse of Genesis, the well-known nebular hypothesis, which assumes a mass of nebulous matter revolving with velocity and throwing off rings which formed the planetary system. This must obviously stop short with verse 2, because it presupposes sun, atmosphere and the power of rotation. This is all

that science can say, but it does not in the slightest degree explain how these things came to be. For this we must go further back still and concentrate attention on verse 1, which teaches that the universe was not self-originate, but was due to a First Cause. Once this is granted it can be seen that there is no contradiction between Genesis and science. No scientific error has yet been proved to exist in it, and the language is sufficiently flexible to allow of agreement with modern discoveries. If Genesis had been written in strict scientific language it would have been unintelligible for centuries. Thus there is only one word for the act of creation as distinct from that of making or moulding from materials, and it is significant that this word occurs three times only in connection with the three spheres of matter (ver. 1); life (ver. 21); and man (ver. 27). When it is remembered that Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace maintains that there must have been three interpositions of a Divine and supernatural power to account for things as they are, the agreement of science with Genesis is surely very striking. There is a gulf between matter and nothing; one between life and the non-living; and a third between man and the lower creation, and science cannot bridge any of them. Then again, the chapter has the same order of events as may be seen in scientific records to-day. Comparative anatomy tells us that types of life go up from the lowest to the highest, and are determined by the proportion of the amount of the brain to the spinal cord, the order being fish, reptiles, birds, mammals, man. This is exactly the order of Genesis, and it would be interesting to know how the author of that chapter came to be familiar with facts which were only discovered by science just over two centuries ago. Further, the chapter is clearly marked by indications of development, progress, and change in harmony with much modern teaching on Evolution, and there are also points of contact with biological and anthropological teaching about man's nature. Man is seen to be at once united with nature and yet separate from it. This unity of animate and inanimate nature is exactly in accordance with scientific thought. Even a materialistic scientist like Haeckel bears his testimony to this remarkable fact, and the late Professor Romanes and others speak in the warmest terms of the way in which Genesis has anticipated the order of events as recorded by science. It is, therefore, marvellous that, although not allowed to set down scientific truths in scientific phraseology, the writer of Genesis was prevented from setting down anything inconsistent with scientific results. The oldest book in the possession of man has wonderfully anticipated some of the latest discoveries of science. Of course, it is necessary to distinguish carefully between Geology and Genesis, the one being for students and the other for all men; the one being concerned with science, the other with religion. And yet there are striking analogies between them, as, for example, the fact that the material universe had a beginning and is not eternal; that light was in existence before the appearance of the sun and moon; that the earth was once covered with water; that vegetation preceded animal life; and that man only came when the earth was ready. And it is striking that many leading geologists, like Buckland, Miller, Dana, Dawson, Hitchcock, and others have expressed the opinion that geology is in harmony with the account of creation in Genesis.

In particular the question of man is important, as showing that there is no contradiction between Genesis and science. Anthropology, like Genesis, bears witness to man's complex nature, implying a complex origin. Physiology is not adequate to account for him; psychology must be predicated as well. The memory alone is a proof that both elements are required, physical and mental. Then, too, as

pointed out in our earlier article, the origin of species by favourable variations is not the entire explanation, for, as Sir Oliver Lodge rightly asks, "How is the appearance of these same favourable variations to be accounted for?" He goes on to say that it can only be by artificial selection. Given their appearance, their development can be explained, but that they arose spontaneously is an assumption which cannot be made. Here are the exact words of the great scientist: "Does anyone think that the skill of the beaver, the instinct of the bee, the genius of a man, arose by chance, and that its presence is accounted for by anything done and by survival? What struggle for existence will explain the advent of Beethoven? What doubtful instinct for earning a living as a dramatist will educe for us a Shakespeare? These things are beyond science of the orthodox type. Then let us be silent, and let it deny nothing in the universe until it has at least made an honest attempt to grasp the whole." These words are worthy of attention by those who are ready to set aside Genesis in favour of science. Then, too, how are we to account by evolution for three things in man: (a) The fact of mind; (b) the fact of language; (c) the fact of conscience? Evolutionists may be safely challenged to explain any of these by the process of development. It is simply impossible to express personality in terms of Evolution, for there are facts outside it and several gaps which prevent it from being regarded as an inductive science.

It is, therefore, high time that the truth were told in order that those who fear that the authority of Genesis is destroyed may be reassured. Evolution is a magnificent conception, but it is not an explanation, for it does not say anything as to how the primal impulse arose from which the whole movement proceeds. It does not explain the upward tendency of things. It does not explain the particular forms and laws in the universe, and it cannot bridge the gulf between mind and matter. All these have to be taken for granted at the start, and from the standpoint of Evolution Agnosticism is the only position, for they are unknown and apparently unknowable. They may be described but cannot be accounted for. So Evolution may describe, but only Theism can explain. It is well known that if any single cell of life, in plant, insect, or animal cannot take in from without the issue is death. There is no such thing as development merely from within, for development is also dependent on appropriation of force from without. If nothing is taken in from without there is no development from within, and it is this that Genesis specifically teaches. Thus, in spite of all the brilliant discoveries of science, the plain fact abides that we must come back to the Old Book for an explanation of the origin of life. Many people seem to think that Evolution is synonymous with Darwinism, and herein lies the whole difficulty, for the position has shifted so considerably since Darwin's day that it is unjust to imagine that every Evolutionist is a Darwinian. Even if we grant to the full the evolutionary method, it gives us no explanation of the origin. Evolution may explain processes, but it cannot say anything about the source. We would, therefore, beg those who may have been perturbed by any utterance on this subject to possess their souls in patience, and to remember that not every statement found in the papers is necessarily true, especially when it has to do with religion. There is no need to apologize for the first chapter of Genesis, and no need to be disconcerted when anyone declaims against it. Both Genesis and science come from God, and until science can give us a better explanation of how things have come to be than that which is found in the first two chapters of Genesis we shall be well advised in maintaining our position.