

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

801ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 4TH, 1936,
AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. J. BURNETT RAE IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN, paying tribute to the late Dr. Morton, presented the Schofield award to his son, Mr. J. Hendy Morton, who made suitable reply.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the late Dr. Schofield, in whose memory the award had been made, called upon Colonel Molony to read Dr. Morton's paper on "The Supposed Evolutionary Origin of the Soul," and afterwards commented thereon.

THE SUPPOSED EVOLUTIONARY ORIGIN OF THE SOUL.

By the late Revd. Dr. H. C. MORTON, B.A., Ph.D.

Being the Dr. Alfred T. Schofield Memorial Paper.

EVOLUTION has to account for everything, and it is one of the many puzzles offered to us by the advocates of that popular theory that the supreme feature of Man, viz., his spiritual nature, generally called his "soul," has absorbed so very small a portion of their writings. The common sayings about Man, e.g., that he is a soul and has a body, or that the soul of all improvement is the, etc., make the almost universal concentration on the body very remarkable. The reason, however, is not far to seek, and it is one of the main objects of this paper to make the reason plain.

What do we mean by "the soul"? I use the word to indicate the non-corporeal nature of man in general. I am not distinguishing "soul" as the moral and emotional part of our nature from the intellect. The essential meaning is personality. The *Century Dictionary* says: "A substantial entity, believed to be

that in each person which lives, feels, thinks, and wills." What Evolution has to trace is the emergence and development of that self-conscious, self-determining reasonable personality which we call "the soul."

We are not dealing to-day with any subtleties or theological and moral distinctions, but with that simple element of human nature called Personality. Our greatest need is to see it clearly, to display what is involved in it, and to note how quickly we come to the end of all possibility of analysis.

The Evolutionist has for the most part entirely shirked the supreme question of the origin of the soul. He deals with Man as a body and thinks his work is done when he has to his own satisfaction traced the progress of life and form from the unitary cell by endless transformism up to Man. He comparatively seldom deals with morals, and hardly ever deals with "psycho-genesis" or the origin of personality. To avoid this question is to admit the failure of Evolution.

There are three things which I desire in this paper to maintain. First, that such evolutionists as do not entirely shirk the question of the origin of the soul, merely beg the question by thrusting in at the beginning without explanation what they intend to draw out at the end. Second, that all attempts to trace personality upwards out of the lower forms of life into the human, beg the question because the only personality we know anything at all about is our own personality; it is this which we reflect downwards upon the lower animals, etc., and we must not first explain lower forms of mentality by our own consciousness and then explain our own consciousness by derivation from these same lower forms. Third, that our only *knowledge* is knowledge of our own self; everything else is at best inference and usually mere assumption: that the proper study of mankind is Man, and that a close study of our own self-consciousness reveals personality as an element, incapable of analysis into simpler parts, and therefore incapable of derivation, containing the essential quality of freedom, which again no sort of process is able to evolve.

It has often been pointed out that Evolution has jumped a number of deep gulfs which it has been quite incapable of bridging. It has always the wings of the wind to carry it, and bloweth just where it listeth, and over the deep unfathomable gulf of the origin of mind it has merely flown. It has never

even attempted to grapple with the problem. Sir Ambrose Fleming says: "Consciousness . . . cannot possibly be the result of the arrangements or motions of atoms of matter forming his (Man's) brain"; and all except one man in a million would agree that this is an indisputable statement of fact. But the evolutionist makes far more impossible claims than that consciousness is the result of the arrangement of atoms. He claims that consciousness and life are interchangeable terms, that life is never absent where there is matter, and that consciousness inheres in the atoms of which even every mineral is composed. He assumes the existence of what he calls "mind-stuff" which, being taken for granted, he proceeds to affirm that when the "mind-stuff" takes form the form is accompanied by consciousness. I will give quotations in a moment.

Now it is important for us to get clearly before our thought what is involved in all this daring evolutionary verbiage. "Mind-stuff," if it means anything, means "mind." Likewise when the evolutionist speaks of "consciousness," he is assuming the existence of mind. Mind and consciousness are impossible without personality. There is no such thing as thought by itself; all thought is the activity of a thinker. There is no "mind" existing in the air, neither is mind to be thought of as matter and called "mind-stuff." Mind is the essence of spiritual being; it is the substance of personality. That is the only meaning which the terms "mind," "thought," "consciousness" bear; and the assumption of the evolutionists is that there is personality in the atoms of a mineral. This ludicrous assumption displays the desperate straits to which Evolution is reduced by its inability to trace the origin of the soul.

Inasmuch as very few seem to realise the real question-begging character of the whole evolutionary speculation, it is necessary to give a number of quotations which reveal that they thrust in at the beginning what they draw out triumphantly at the end. May I take three writers as my illustrations? First Professor A. Meek of Durham, in his *Progress of Life: a study in Psycho-Genetic Evolution*; Messrs. J. E. Marcault and I. A. Hawliczek in their *Evolution of Man*; and Mr. J. H. Whittaker in his *Metaphysics of Evolution*.

Professor Meek professes to give us a study in "psycho-genesis" which means "the origin of the soul." It is exceedingly able and, as a piece of "sleight of hand," it would be difficult to

excel it. As you read his pages you pass from the bodily into the spiritual without any warning and without the vast change being marked by the quiver of a solitary stroke of his pen. Up to a certain point the page deals with the material side of things ; one line more and you are launched upon the infinite seas of intellect and personality. He says (pp. 93 and 94) : " The substance of the living body being dynamic, a progressive centre of change, becoming more and more complex, it could be argued that a morphology was already based on molecular structures, a physiology on molecular interaction, and a pathology due to errors and changes in environment." And up to this point one follows with an unmoved mind. It certainly can be argued. But the next words pull one up sharp : for he goes on " And a simple but effective *psychology* (my italics) of reflexes." Thus psychology is just postulated and assumed instead of derived. Psyche is brought on the scene, not obtrusively or noisily, but very quietly. Still, she was not there when the sentence began ; and she is there when it ends. There are just bodies at the beginning of the rather complicated paragraph, but the bodies are endowed with souls as the paragraph closes.

This is the only sort of psycho-genesis with which Professor Meek's book provides us. If he asks us what other sort he *could* provide, the answer is a most cordial " None at all." This is not psycho-genesis, and no psycho-genesis is in any sense possible except by creation. But we object to the pretence of evolving the soul when all that is done is to assume the soul's existence and to begin suddenly to talk about psychology. This is all that Professor Meek does. May I trace his course through twenty or thirty pages which profess to be dealing with the origin of mind ? On page 106 he tells us that : " It has been found that the oxidation of linseed oil with respect to light displays a property which may be compared to memory " (p. 106). Memory is one of the factors of self-conscious personality ; and, if the words quoted have any meaning, they are merely a simile. The gradual lighting up of the morning sky may be compared with the gradual illumination of the mind ; but this does not mean that the morning sky may be henceforward credited with mentality : neither does Professor Meek's simile mean that he is justified in his assumption that memory has dawned in oxidated linseed oil. But he then proceeds from oil to infusoria. *Vorticella* is a very lowly form of life, a genus of

vegetable infusoria, a bell-shaped body with a circle of vibratory cilia around the oral disc, supported on a slender contractile stem. He says: "The apparent (*sic*) history of vorticella implies a choice, and the power has not been lost" (p. 108).

He has already said on page 106 that "Protoplasm has not only a nervous capacity but may be modified along purposive lines." The "apparent history" specified seems mainly to consist in the ability "to develop a special locomotory band of cilia, which is resorbed when it becomes fixed again." Purposive modifications of protoplasm and choice in the vorticella! Purpose and choice are known to us absolutely and only as properties of free self-conscious personality. They bear absolutely no other meaning in human language. They are the essential things whose gradual evolution should be traced in a volume on psychogenesis; and here they are suddenly introduced, thrust in without explanation, and postulated as already existing in protoplasm and vorticella!

The best feature of Professor Meek's postulation of what he is professing to derive is that he is so clear and emphatic about it. He proceeds to speak about the individuality of vorticella functioning psychologically: "It may appear absurd to invoke the aid of memory in the case of amoeba and even unnecessary in that of vorticella. . . . But however diverse the shape and habit may be, a definite individuality is preserved which functions as a whole, and the adaptation is *psychological* (my italics) as well as morphological and physiological" (p. 108). This is just the blunt statement that vorticella has mind, individuality which functions psychologically; and on the next page we are told that in these minute organisms we see the genesis of soul: "It is evident that the strong urge of life is not merely to manufacture protoplasm, endowed with energy, but to preserve it and to maintain and increase its effectiveness. The variations are adaptative and originate by a process which, regarding psychology as including all the various manifestations of life, may be called psycho-genesis" (p. 109).

It seems hardly necessary to go farther. Professor Meek tells us that he has now traced the genesis of soul. What he has really done is just to record some of the movements and reactions of very lowly forms of living matter, and to thrust in without any explanation or justification consciousness, memory, purpose, choice, individuality, all that we mean by Soul.

From vorticella he proceeds to anthropoda, to crustacea, annelids, molusca, sand eels, flatfish, and then proceeds to insects, to birds, rabbits, etc., attributing to one and all of them the sense of satisfaction, of safety, reliance, comfort and stability. For instance (of crustacea, annelids, molusca, sand eels, and flatfish): "It is to be concluded (they) have each of them a psychological satisfaction in the accomplishment" of their purpose, *e.g.*, in the case of flatfish, the accomplishment of flatness (p. 118). And on page 119 we are told that "life histories which involve conspicuous and profound pathological change result likewise in a state of psychological satisfaction"; and on page 120 he is assured that whatever is the quality relied upon for protection it is "accompanied by an attitude of mind, by a sense of safety and reliance, and this feeling of dependence, of comfort and stability," which "has clearly played a dominant role" in Evolution.

All these assertions display that supreme evolutionary quality of imagination, but they do not display in any sense the genesis of soul. Soul is merely postulated by a mass of assertions and absolutely gratuitous hypotheses.

Footnote.—In these words a member of the French Academy explained "What has closed the doors of the Academy to Mr. Darwin," *viz.*, that the science of the *Origin of Species and Descent of Man* is "not science but a mass of assertions and absolutely gratuitous hypotheses." (Quoted by Mr. Douglas Dewar in his *Man a Special Creation.*)

At this point Dr. Morton was obliged to cease dictating, and in view of clearness of his argument, which his racy expressions so greatly enliven, we can scarcely regard the fact as less than tragic; but he left behind a number of notes on slips of paper, and, knowing something of the order in which he intended to use these, the following is an attempt to reconstruct the rest of the paper. It must be clearly understood that Dr. Morton was not responsible for what is hereafter printed in small type, which is only inserted to make the paper read more consecutively.

There are only two alternatives. 1. We say that activities of the lowly animal forms and of all up to men are mechanical reactions, inevitably simulating thought and choice. This is the probably true interpretation of beavers building a dam in a room. Or 2. We assume that the lower animals have a mentality and freedom like our own. But in this case, having first interpreted their activities by use of our own, we must not then turn round

and interpret our own nature in the "light" of the mentality of lower animals. This is a perfect circle. And, the great thing, we must make self the undisputed norm.

* * * *

To try to learn about ourselves from animals is only to confound thinking. It muddles what in itself is the crystal depth of self-conscious personality.

* * * *

But about them we *know* nothing, in the clear and certain manner in which we know ourselves: and we must determinedly beware of turning back upon ourselves and belittling our own personality by supposing it to be no more than animal.

* * * *

The following illustration may help to elucidate part of Dr. Morton's meaning. If I see my dog, who is ill, slinking about with his tail between his legs, I understand that he is afraid that he is going to be punished for something. But I must not gather that I only recognise as wrong acts that are likely to bring unpleasant consequences to me.

The Evolution of Man, Marcault and Hawliczek, p. 9: "The very atoms themselves are centres of vibrant power, so that there is indeed no such thing as "dead" matter. There is force, life, everywhere in the Universe, and therefore consciousness, "even in the atoms of which every mineral is composed." This is clearly to confound motion with life.

Page 12. (After letting Wells describe the earth when it was like the interior of a blast furnace) they say "in the real sense life is never absent where there is matter."

* * * *

Page 8 quotes Dr. Annie Besant: *A Study in Consciousness*, Theosophical Publishing House. "Consciousness and life are identical . . . We have called consciousness turned inwards by the name of life, and life turned outwards by the name of consciousness," p. 42. Page 15 (of Marcault): "It will at once become evident that the nature of consciousness is intimately related to the nature of the form through which the outward turned life is pouring."

All this is pure supposition; about *ourselves* we know, or may know, something; the rest is inference or imagination.

Page 19. Argues that if form is capable of manipulation, and responds to the touch of life and environment; that means that "form" has "the quality of sentiency" which is sheer assumption. They say: "The mineral kingdom is slowly developing this quality"!! They identify "responsiveness to impressions" with "sentiency"!!

Chambers's Dictionary defines "sentient" as (adj.) discerning by the senses: having the faculty of perception and sensation. (N.S.) Sentience, Sentiency.

Page 20. "The swelling of the seed, the growth of root and stem and flower, the opening and the closing of the petals, the production of the seed for the further propagation of the plant, all these are signs of the stirring of a power within the form, of a rudimentary consciousness which is capable of taking action appropriate to the exigencies of external conditions." This is simply a begging of the question of the origin of consciousness.

(We must resolutely refuse to allow our thinking to be confused. All the above "movements" within ourselves, or the parallels, are *not* in general a part of consciousness at all. Further, there is no likeness between plant and man. Further, the only consciousness we know is our own, and that is the prerequisite of rational free personality.)

The Metaphysics of Evolution. By Thomas Whittaker. The greatest "begging of the question" of all is in Whittaker's statement that mind-stuff only becomes consciousness by the assumption of form by elements of mind-stuff. That form is the body. So the body can say: "This consciousness is mine," whereas what actually happens is that consciousness says: "This body is mine."

* * * *

(Whittaker, page 37.) He starts with "mind-stuff"—which is merely fancy; then suddenly we read of "The individual mind"—which is merely assumption of what he cannot derive. (We need to know its origin.) Then he says: "Consciousness depends on the assumption of form by elements of mind-stuff"—which simply begs the question.

Readers may like to have the context of this important quotation. It reads thus: "Mind-stuff is not, as some critics have supposed, a substance combining physical and psychical properties, matter, according to Clifford,

is purely a phenomenon. The external world is a kind of 'dream' to each of us . . . To inorganic things correspond elements of 'mind-stuff' not ordered in such a way as to enter into a consciousness. Consciousness depends on the assumption of form by elements of mind-stuff; and, though all elements of mind-stuff have the possibility of assuming the form of consciousness, not all have actually attained that form."

The term "mind-stuff," like Herbert Spencer's expression, "The substance of mind," seems to be a contradiction in terms. "What is mind? No matter, What is matter? Never mind."

Sir J. Jeans, in *The Mysterious Universe*, says: "The old dualism of mind and matter, which was mainly responsible for the supposed hostility, seems likely to disappear . . . through substantial matter resolving itself into a creation and manifestation of mind."

But this is sheer confusion. Granted 1, that all matter, *e.g.*, in a block of stone or in man, is ultimately electrons making up vibrant power; or 2, that matter resolves itself into a manifestation of mind; yet there still remains the clear difference between the block of stone and the living body of men. There is often crystalline form in the mineral, but no one ever dreams of applying to it the language of life, let alone of consciousness, still the old difference between living and non-living stands, and is as clear as ever.

It is not Jeans's view that matter is "resolving itself into a creation and manifestation of mind" that is objected to, but that "The old dualism of mind and matter . . . seems likely to disappear."

CONCLUSION.

There are two extremes in the evolutionary camp. On the one hand are those who, consistently with their awful theory, regard man just of the earth earthy, a being of no account; coming, passing and leaving in a few thousand years no trace behind him worth noticing. The earth is a tiny and very unimportant speck in the illimitable Universe, and "Man is a little stir in the primeval slime, a fuss in the mud which means nothing."

That is true consistent evolutionism; but there is another school which tries to borrow all the great things which consciousness tells us about ourselves, all the great things which are confirmed by the Bible, and professes to derive these by slow stages from the slime and the mud. I really prefer the simple

consistent evolution which remains slimy mud, beastly from start to finish. That will betray hardly any decent people ; but the school which so illegitimately borrows from Man and Bible all the great qualities, and while deriving them from the mud and slime, admits their reality and glory, is utterly inconsistent, and is proving itself deadly and is covering all Christendom with poison fumes and death.

Man is free. Life is crowded with illustrations of unmistakable free choice, *e.g.*, we can go out into the garden and dig that bed and plant the cabbages ; or we can go to the club instead. At every stage we are free in thinking, deciding, acting, giving up the work.

Where did this freedom come from ? Evolution is mechanical and has no opening for freedom. Elan vital and all forms of vitalism are just blunt, blind, confused recognitions of personality, freedom, God.

DISCUSSION.

Dr. J. BURNETT RAE said : Ladies and Gentlemen, I feel honoured at being asked to take the chair on this occasion. For the sake of the visitors present, I should say that Dr. Schofield was for many years closely associated with the work of this Society. In addition to being a distinguished physician and psychologist, he was keenly interested in the relation of Science and Religion, and made notable contributions towards the solution of its problems. I accepted the invitation because of my interest in the subject to be discussed, and I looked forward greatly to hearing Dr. Morton. I had not the pleasure of knowing him personally but I remember his generous observations about my own Schofield Memorial Paper three years ago. I was struck then by some of his comments for they indicated to me a mind that was exceptionally keen and of no ordinary quality. I am told by Colonel Skinner that his contributions to the discussions here were always stimulating and helpful.

Since then I have read two or three of the papers which Dr. Morton gave to the Victoria Institute, and although I cannot altogether agree with his position, no one could fail to be impressed by the sincerity of his mind, and the lucidity of his expression. He was widely read and made one feel the significance and importance of the subjects which he treated. In fairness to him it must be

remembered that this Paper which we are about to hear was written on his death-bed and that it is unfinished. Had he lived, Dr. Morton no doubt would have revised its style and might have remoulded to some extent its form.

A Memorial Service to Dr. Morton was held in the Central Hall on Monday, the 27th, when the Institute was represented by Mr. Edwards. An appreciation by Sir Ambrose Fleming was read on that occasion.

I understand that it is usual for the Chairman to open the discussion and that he is expected in the interests of truth to be frank in his comments. I confess I feel diffident about this, as it seems unfair to criticise when the writer is not with us to reply or elaborate his point of view. But one feels that it would be entirely in line with his intention that we should make use of what he has written as a stimulus to our own thoughts and that we should state freely our own convictions. You will realise, I am sure, that as a psychologist I am more interested in the *fact* of the soul, and in those conditions which make for its health and development, than in the problem of its origin, of *how* it came to be. I am neither a biologist nor a metaphysician, and to estimate Dr. Morton's paper rightly one should have to be both these. I hope, however, that some understanding of the mind, and of its relation to other elements of our nature, qualify me to make a few remarks on this occasion.

Psychology, strictly speaking, is the science of the soul, but it has come to mean the science of mental behaviour. This need not—and should not—exclude consideration of that aspect of our mental nature which is concerned with spiritual things.

There are different schools of Psychology. Certain of these, as Dr. Morton has pointed out in other papers, base their Psychology on a materialistic view of things, the Behaviourists, for example, and I should include the pure Psycho-Analysts also. But there are others and I have no hesitation in saying that I notice in psychological thought to-day a definite trend towards a more spiritual interpretation of life.

This paper is unfinished, but from his other writings, more especially "The Concept of Evolution in the New Psychology," read in 1930, and "The Supposed Evolutionary Origin of the Moral

Imperative," 1933, we have a fair idea of Dr. Morton's general position. At the outset of the paper in our hands he clearly states the position he is concerned to establish. Briefly it is this, that our only real knowledge is of ourselves, everything else is inference and assumption, and we must not explain lower forms of mentality by our consciousness, and then derive our consciousness from them.

Up to a point this appears to be reasonable, but I would remind you that Science is based upon inference and upon assumptions, called hypotheses, which we submit to the test of experience. To exclude this method altogether would be to ring down the curtain as soon as it goes up.

It may be argued, for example, that no man could really understand the feelings of another man, or the way a woman looks at things; but if you tread on her toe and she behaves in a way that seems familiar and similar to how you would behave if she trod on yours, may you not legitimately infer that she has a feeling of pain not unlike your own, although you cannot prove it.

Now there is no doubt that in some respects animals are extraordinarily like human beings. We notice that the nervous system, the alimentary, circulatory, excretory, and reproductive system of animals have a close resemblance to that of man. And we notice also an ascending scale of development, not regular certainly often broken, that still is there, and no one I suppose will dispute that. In view of the facts, it is hardly surprising that we should ask whether these higher aspects of man's nature which are distinctive of him may not be found in embryo, in rudimentary form, lower down the scale. I am not saying that they can be, I only say that it is not illogical to inquire.

The existence of physiological and morphological features in lower forms of life does not seem to distress Dr. Morton, but he will not allow psychology in any shape or form. It is difficult to understand this position. I see no objection to speaking about the psychology of a dog or a hedgehog, provided you mean by psychology the science of mental behaviour. Animals have characteristic mental process and dispositions. It seems impossible to doubt, for instance, that they have memory—an elephant has a very long one: a dog can exercise choice, whether, *e.g.*, he will follow his master or a

stranger. They can play games with you, and to some extent stick to the rules! Their feelings indicate an intelligent appreciation of facts. Much of their conduct is no doubt imitative; but so is a child's; it does not appear to be entirely imitative.

It must be obvious, however, that there is an essential difference between animals and human beings which makes certain similarities of comparatively little account. My criticism is not that Dr. Morton draws a line of demarcation between man and lower animals but that he draws it in the wrong place. I accept his conclusions, but not his reasons for them. To base your belief in the unique character of man's soul upon the denial of mental capacity in the lower animals seems to me to be resting it upon a very shaky foundation.

What is the essential quality in man's nature? He has, or can have, what we call personality. The basis of this I discover in the fact that whereas the lower animals are under the compulsion of instinct, and cannot free themselves from this compulsion, man can detach himself from the stream of life. He has the power of reflecting upon his thought and feelings and activity. Animals know; they know their enemies, their masters, their young, nests and lairs—they exercise forethought and discrimination, but man alone knows that he knows. He has self-consciousness which is the basis of the intellectual and moral life. He attaches values to things and knows these belong to the unseen and eternal. He distinguishes in this way good and evil. He can use natural instincts and desires so as to make them serve a higher purpose than their natural use. He can even reverse the order of nature, so that things which in the ordinary course might do him harm may do him good. Man's field of vision, his range of interest, is infinitely greater than that of any other creature, but the essential difference between him and them does not depend on this difference, but upon man's power to reflect upon his life and choice. In this way he ceases to be determined by pure instinct, and is more and more influenced by the ideal; the man becomes less dependent upon his physical nature and environment. "Though our outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day." But if this faculty confers infinite powers and prospects it means also struggle and pain such as no

other creature can experience. "There is surely," says Sir Thomas Brown in his *Religio Medici*, "a piece of Divinity in us all, something that was before the elements, and which owes no homage to the sun."

Increasingly we come to realise that the soul has its home in a spiritual universe which gave it birth and which is necessary for its health and preservation. As the body is sustained by its environment and can only live in relation to it, so the soul lives and moves and has its being in God.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I apologise for speaking at such length. Had Dr. Morton been with us to-day it would not have been necessary, and probably I should not have been left with a certain question in my mind. Assuming the possibility of what is called Emergent Evolution, that is the creation of man as distinct from other forms of life at a definite epoch in a gradual evolving history of creation, would it be inconsistent with the Biblical account of Creation? and secondly, would it necessarily imply that evolution is anything more than a method of the Creator; not the cause of Creation, but the way of it?

Mr. GEORGE BREWER said: After reading the vain attempts of Evolutionists to account for the soul of man by a process of evolution, it is refreshing to turn to God's inspired Word, the first statement of which is "In the beginning God;" and in Gen. ii, 7, we read "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

The theory of Evolution, being pagan in its inception and teaching, as well as demoralising in its results, is admittedly held by some scientists as being the only alternative to special creation; and the endeavour of some professing Christians to reconcile the theory with the doctrines of the fall and redemption of man, is deplorable.

Assumption, supposition, speculation, and imagination; all comprised in that magical word, hypothesis; these are the materials upon which Evolution is founded and built up, and as one scientific observer has aptly remarked, "the present vogue of this theory in the popular and pseudo-scientific mind, may be likened to the continual, though dwindling, activities of a central commercial

'trust,' whose supporting subsidiary companies have all gone into bankruptcy."

The attempt to account for the origin of the soul of man, by a process of evolution, constitutes a kind of superstructure on the theory as applied to the physical realm; and as Dr. Morton has shown in his valuable paper, is reared upon the same sandy foundation.

Whatever may be said of the similarity of the framework of man to that of the lower animals, which of itself should prove that both are the work of an infinite creative mind, the moral consciousness, personality and free will of man, reveal characteristics which cannot be compared with the natural instincts, more or less mechanical, of the brute creation.

The universality of the moral imperative, called conscience, is revealed by the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (chap. ii, 14): "When the nations, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another."

Moral consciousness, freedom of choice, and the inherent sense of right and wrong, of which no trace can be found in the lower animals, and which often cause man to act contrary to his natural desire for self-preservation, or self-interest, is shown both in Scripture and profane history, as well as in the experience of everyday life, producing a feeling of dependence upon, and responsibility to, a Supreme Being, having power to approve a right decision, and to inflict punishment for a wrong one.

Utter failure is the result of every attempt to bolster up the theory of Evolution as a process of ascent, whether in the inorganic, organic, or moral spheres; and as Mr. A. J. Pollock has observed in his excellent pamphlet *Evolution*, it is not only unscriptural, but unscientific; leading professors, contradicting one another on matters vital to the theory, have with their own tongues and pens dug the grave of the very theory which they seek to maintain.

Lieut.-Col. T. C. SKINNER said: I had not intended taking part in the discussion, but our Chairman, to whose remarks on the paper

we have all listened with great pleasure, has left with us a challenging question to which it would seem incumbent on some one of the audience to make reply.

If I understood it aright, the question was whether or not the Scripture account of human origin, or the origin of the human soul, might be held to consist with a theory of "emergent evolution." If so, I would venture very humbly to subject the challenge to a dual test, viz., of Scripture itself, and of Science.

First; whereas in the Bible we have the unmistakably clear statements that "God created man in his own image," and that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," there is no hint whatever on which we might base any theory of man, or man's soul, having been derived from the lower animal creation by evolutionary process. Thus, I think, we must conclude that Scripture, at any rate, lends no support to the theory.

Second, as regards Science; while I make no profession of being a scientist, and can only accept the testimony of those who may rightly be regarded as such, it has been stated as a matter of scientific fact, and confirmed from this platform by Dr. Rendle Short,* that of all the elements known to science (90 or more) only 14 or 15 are found in rock or soil, and of these only 13 are found in the human body; there being no elements found in the body that are not found in the soil, those most plentiful in the soil being most plentiful in the body, and those scantily found in the one being likewise few in the other. The conclusion, therefore, seems irresistible that where it is stated in Scripture that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground," and elsewhere, "Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return," we have declarations of unquestionable fact, confirming the accuracy of Scripture from the scientific standpoint and lending no support to any theory of man's gradual emergence from lower forms of animal life. If man's body came from, and, at death, returns to, the dust, whence came his soul? Surely not from the lower creation!

I submit, therefore, with all deference, that the answer to the Chairman's question must be no!

* V.I. Transactions, vol. lxxvii, 1935, p. 264.

Dr. BARCROFT ANDERSON said : “ Mr. Chairman, Dr. Morton has made it quite clear in his paper that he uses the word soul to represent the entire person. In the remarks you have made concerning the soul and psychology, are we to understand you as using it with this meaning, or with the meaning the words *psuche* and *psuchikos* have in the Scriptures, as when Paul wrote :—“ The soulish man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he get to know them for they are spiritually discerned.” (1 Cor. ii, 14.)