

Why I Cannot Accept Evolution

by Dr. Manford George Gutzke

Foreword

Some years ago I was confronted by a very sincere person who said to me: "Well, you do believe in Evolution, don't you?" And I was led to say just as sincerely, "No! I do not believe in Evolution." That opened a time of sincere discussion. When our personal discussion was ended the other party said to me very earnestly: "You should write that down. Others could be helped, as I have been." So I prepared a paper which I have never published. When this problem came to public attention again just recently I regretted that I had not published the paper I had prepared.

So now I aim to publish my account of *Why I Cannot Accept Evolution*.

I do not present this as a comprehensive study of the problem of the theory of "Evolution" in any attempt to refute that theory on philosophic grounds in any scholarly approach. But I do offer this statement as "an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear." This is my personal testimony.

I do not accept "the theory of Evolution", as I understand it to be commonly described. At one time in my personal experience I was favorably impressed with the idea of "Evolution", and I arrived at my present conviction by rationally examining all that was involved, so far as I could see. I do not feel that I hold my present view blindly, and have undertaken in the following discussion to set forth my reasons.

I first heard of Evolution when I was in high school. I had read of some of the strange myths reported from the old Greeks and Romans and thus I knew that some thinkers among the Greeks had expressed the idea that all forms of life came from some common beginning. I knew something about Plato's "Ideals" and Aristotle's "Entelechies." I had read of Democritus and his theory of atoms, and so I had considered the idea of Evolution to be a similar brain child of some original thinker among the Greeks. But now it seemed an Englishman named Charles Darwin had done extensive research for fossils all over the world, and at last had proposed in his book, "The Origin of Species," that the occurrence of the various forms of life was due to the impersonal operation of certain natural factors which he named.

As a high school student, I understood this to mean that man had sprung from monkey; that all forms of life were to be understood as being variations produced by the mechanical operation of natural processes. Since these processes were still in operation there was the inspiring and comforting prospect that everything would steadily improve – and so all men would eventually be what they were meant to be: "the very sons of God."

We all understood this was different than the story in Genesis, but no one among us cared about that. We were all eager to receive what was spoken of as "the truth" – and we welcomed the new idea with open arms. Somehow we all felt good about it. It was never too clear what good it would do for us now, but we were comforted in the good feeling we were not living in vain. Out of our own emptiness and weakness something good would come. We might be only the worm or the pupa but out of us would come the lovely butterfly and so life, even if lived in distress and futility, would yet be meaningful because in some dim, distant eon of time men "like gods" would be our descendants.

In the meantime we had the comfortable ease in conscience in feeling we had already advanced from apes to ourselves. Actually we should be praised for our advance. Even seeing the "primitive" peoples of

Africa and Tasmania helped to comfort us in smug complacency and to foster our high hopes. We had achieved this in our upward progress – who would know how far we could go? We considered Jesus of Nazareth as a sort of promise of what we, too, could become in future development, if we were minded to progress in that phase of human experience.

I cannot recall just when I began to take a second look at this total ambitious scheme. Maybe it was my farm experience in raising animals and plants. Hybrids we knew about, but in our own empirical way we had noticed the Mendelian laws of heredity long before I ever heard of Mendel. Maybe it was our common conviction that "blood will tell." Maybe it was the uneasy realization that even if Evolution would produce men-like-gods in the ages to come, that would be no help to *me* now in *this* life! Perhaps if we were Buddhists and believed in reincarnation, this might be valid, but our common feeling was that Wordsworth was indulging in poetic fancy when he wrote "not in utter forgetfulness, not in utter nakedness, but in trailing clouds of glory do we come from God who is our home." To say that "our soul, our lifes star, hath had elsewhere its setting and cometh from afar" might suit his fancy, but was probably just not true. There was something deep and very stubborn in our feeling that I personally was living my life this one time, and all such fanciful notions would not be of any help to me in my next fifty years, if I lived that long.

When once I began to question the notion on the basis of actual fact in history and experience, it became more and more like a pipe dream. Even before I had any convictions as a Christian I was conscious in my own judgment that the old Bible idea of man being created in the image of God from which he fell into sin and ruin had more potential for inspiring dignity and self-respect, than the evolutionary idea of man being originally an animal and only lately acquiring human traits. Some people might be inspired to think that as animals they had progressed this far but I had the feeling in that case I would still be an animal, even if trained well. But I did not tarry long in any such mood of comparing my likes and dislikes about the idea. If Evolution were true I would accept it – but was it true?

I realized even then that I could not say on the other hand that I believed the Genesis account to be true; but I became increasingly skeptical about the possible validity of the evolutionary view. It did not take me long to realize that if Evolution were true, nothing would ever be permanently what it was!! At this point it seemed the whole world became jelly – nothing would be stable. And soon I saw this would extend to morals also. And with that I felt the result would be the total annihilation of all form and structure. One of the first casualties after moral integrity would be the procedure of science. I seemed to realize from the very first of my intellectual experience that science depended upon observation and observation focused upon the material phenomena to acquire data. But if things are in flux, then data cannot be established except as historical events. And there is no way ever to know the external world since it is constantly changing. Thus it seemed that to accept Evolution would be to scrap as outmoded and outdated any data about the universe and to arrive at only simple experience without any known meaning. I had come to know there were thinkers like the English philosopher, Hume, who held some such views. But to me any such conclusion was more pessimistic than I was willing to accept.

Out of this depressing chaos I could look with interest across the chasm of my unbelief at the implications of the Biblical orthodox view. The Bible says there is that which is permanent. To be sure, there is that which is moving and changing like the wind and the waves, and there is growth, development and improvement through selection, but oats will be oats, dogs will be dogs, and I will be I, to the end of the chapter. Certainly I may grow from baby to boy to man, but I will always be the one and same person. In this way "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap" can be felt as true, and this would provide a basis for integrity, stability and constancy in everything.

When I had looked for any example of mutation of species I could never find one. The evolutionist would show me two similar forms and propose that I should believe the more complex originally was the less complex, but he could not show me one observed case where the transfer had occurred under

observation. The evidence that plants and animals reproduced each after his kind was to be seen on every hand. Why should I ignore the obvious evidence on every side that living things reproduce their own kind, and accept as true an idea of something no one had ever seen, such as that one kind of living forms would reproduce a different kind?

Even in my high school days we had seen tadpoles become frogs, but somehow this did not prove anything to us beyond the fact that the frog had an interesting career. We would have told you the tadpole always was a frog, even as the worm always was a butterfly. But we would have jeered at the suggestion that someday the butterfly would become a bird!

When once I recognized there was no actual demonstration of any such thing as the evolutionary process the whole idea collapsed in my thinking like a punctured balloon. Fortunately I had read widely enough to know that the speculative imagination of men has produced many grand schemes for explaining what is, but they are all very much alike. They are tentative hypotheses that hope to capture our approval by their including all we know of the world somewhere in their scheme. When I gave up on Evolution as not demonstrated on the one hand, and actually ruinous for both integrity and science on the other, I had no answer for the problem of the universe until after I accepted Jesus Christ as my Savior and Lord; but more of that later.

Sometime after I became a Christian I found to my amazement that "Evolution" was being seriously considered in various areas of thought within the Church. One whole perspective focusing upon the problem of the Scriptures produced a whole system of critical apparatus which undertook to explain the origin of the Scriptures in terms of an evolutionary process in the production of the literature of the Bible. Another perspective focusing upon the doctrines of Scripture proposed to note an evolution in the Biblical ideas of God, man, morals and salvation itself, so that the New Testament was supposed to be superior because it had "evolved" from the Old Testament. Another perspective focusing upon personal experience had proposed that to become a Christian meant that one "evolved" as a Christian from a pre-Christian pupa stage. In this general approach no attempt ever was made to understand the miracles, since the records of such events had been written in an earlier mental frame, whereas we had now evolved to where we could understand such phenomena better, and could report similar events without recourse to anything miraculous or supernatural. The miracles were simply ignored in a sort of sophisticated intellectual snobbery as unworthy of our attention. I can remember when I could not believe the miracles, but I do not recall that I ever ignored them as being written by incompetent observers.

The general import of such an approach was to render suspect all the historic biographies of men who also claimed they had been born again, and any of the historic doctrines that were based upon the action in grace of a living God who would "save to the uttermost any who came to Him by Jesus Christ." Education was emphasized. And this could be understood when it was seen that American education had accepted the evolutionary view even in its philosophy of learning. "Progressive Education" was actually developed on the premise of the evolutionary concept. When this was brought over into our Church educational literature there was less and less interest in conversion, in the acceptance of Christ, and in the idea of being born again, but more and more emphasis was put upon the ideas that the Fatherhood of God was universal and the brotherhood of man was spiritually to include everyone.

The full significance of this adoption of Evolution by the Protestant Church has never been fully recognized. Throughout all these years when Evolution was being incorporated into the educational theory and techniques of so much of the Protestant Church there had been a recurrence of revivals of evangelistic preaching and teaching to the extent that many, many souls were led by the Gospel into accepting Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord as if they had never heard of Evolution. This resulted in the fact that today in many congregations the burden of leadership now rests upon such as have been born again through faith, and whose personal experience is grounded in the creative action of the Grace of God in the Gospel.

Nevertheless Evolution continues to be the accepted principle of interpretation in various levels of thought, and poses a real threat to the Christian mind on high school, college, and public ideological levels. Most recently I have been asked to consider sympathetically the philosophy of a late European who has set forth his speculations in a grand scheme of explanation which would make the operation of the Grace of God in Jesus Christ a benevolent Master Plan of evolutionary process. As vague and "fuzzy" as many of such speculative systems may seem, they have the common traits of bypassing the need for repentance, providing an easy grace which promises forgiveness as from the loving-kindness of God rather than as a gift provided by the suffering Substitute to the contrite in heart; and assuring the individual that he always was a child of God for whom Christ's death is efficacious quite apart from any faith on his part. The word Evolution may be largely omitted from the elaboration of the argument but the idea is none the less clear: the benefits of the Grace of God are being applied to all men by the gracious operation of this grace in universal natural process after the fashion we call "Evolution."

It is the realization that Evolution now is posed as the true description of God's working in Grace that causes me to undertake to set forth why I cannot accept Evolution today.

"Evolution" can be made to sound so promising as to the future, and so kindly as to the past, that there are times I could wish it were true. When I am told that everything is working together with everything else to produce better and better results, I could wish it were so. To think that our present world is in a stage of development reached as a result of natural processes, and that everything will move up to higher and better things, would actually make me very glad within the context of my own natural human mind.

When someone then claims this is really God's way of doing things, asserting that He is almighty and benevolent, and that He is gracious to the point where we can be sure He is "working all things together for good" to everybody, I could almost be persuaded. Even the Lord Jesus is brought in with appreciation for His grace in taking away the sin of the world, so that now no one need fear the outcome. In this view all are forgiven – all are being affected by the grace of God – all are being developed for good. Even those who did wrong were actually helping out because God can do all things, and will do all things, and can make even "the wrath of man to praise Him." It all sounds so romantic I can feel almost won over to accept it as being certainly worthy of a kind, benevolent Father of All. And so what started out as an idea that all forms of biological life originated from one common source and developed as results of natural processes has thus been developed into an idea that all events are working together because they are controlled by a benevolent guidance, so that everything that ever comes to pass will be gloriously produced in the will of God by forces now at work. At this point I can hear echoes of the poet who wrote:

"Some call it Evolution
Some call it God."

Now let me say right here that I have no objection whatever to the idea that all will ultimately be worked out in the will of God. This I believe and in this I rejoice. And I have no pleasure in the destruction of the wicked; I have devoted my life to the preaching of the Gospel that men might be saved. I rejoice in the glory of our preaching to say "Whosoever will may come . . ." I want men to be saved.

But with reference to the general notion that the will of God will be achieved by the operation of inherent natural factors or by the persistent function of God in His law, I would remember the words of Paul, "for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." Something real and necessary is being omitted in any view that holds the final outcome of the achievement of the will of God as the result of God's own prevailing power exercised in His overruling benevolence in the processes of nature, in such a way as to reduce the need for repentance as a qualification to receive the blessing of God, or to bypass the call for response in faith on the part of those who are to be blessed.

Not long ago a woman very earnestly said to me that such a view which held that God succeeded in bringing His will to pass through all the performances of men and the operations of natural process was actually more glorifying to Him than the orthodox view which held that He sent His own Son to get it

done. She also held the opinion that if Jesus of Nazareth were only a human being and then succeeded in living His perfect life and in saving all men by His righteous sacrifice, His performance would be more glorious than if He had been the Son of God, made "without sin." When I pointed out that her ideas were not scriptural, she admitted that, but suggested the Bible was written by men who lived 2000 years or more ago, and who perhaps did not know as much as we do!! When I proposed to her that they "spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," she looked at me as if I were hopelessly impossible. What bothers me is that she felt her views, though admittedly not Biblical, were nonetheless valid and perhaps even better. In fact, she claimed her views were more Christian than mine!! Here was an application of "Evolution" in her own thinking to the result of a personal self assurance to the point where I could say no more. When I showed her what the Bible said she was left cold, yet she felt her views were sound and true. Whatever church she attended had not taught her differently; she looked on my views as antiquated and certainly inadequate.

While I very well recognize that any procedure that seems to be defensive is at a distinct disadvantage before our modern public, I yet have such a feeling of responsibility to expose dangerous tendencies that I can do no less than to sketch very briefly the several lines of thought which lead me today to reject definitely any theory * of "Evolution" (as I have defined it) as being agreeable to Scripture. Conscious of the intellectual hazards of being specific when dealing with such nebulous ideas in our contemporary thought, I will say that I cannot accept "Evolution" (as I have understood it, and have defined it above) on several grounds.

* There is one variation known as Emergent Evolution which apparently could fit into the Genesis account of Creation, but in the form I knew it there would be no reason to present it. It would add nothing to the mind, whereas in its characteristic way of by-passing the personal acts of God it could actually do harm.

1. As a Scientific Theory

The claim is made that "scientific evidence supports Evolution"; this I must challenge! Years ago while pursuing graduate studies in my doctoral program I was requested in a seminar to frame a question as to the validity of the theory of Evolution; I simply asked for *one demonstration!* Just one case in point where I/anybody could see this mutation of species. That question has not been answered to this day!

I know about the similarity of design and the varying degrees of complexity in skeletal structures, but this does not show one case of transfer – of such changes as are claimed. I am not proposing to set out all my own thought, but I will inject here that at this point I generally think such evidence might indicate One Architect.

The appearance of graduated differences in increasing complexity can be noted, but this is not conclusive as evidence that one form derives from the other by inherent process. On the surface of any lake there is an appearance of waves running across the lake – but do they? What runs? Certainly not the water! One could be fooled by looking at appearances. The amazing truth in our moving pictures is that *nothing on the film moves!* Each picture is a "still," yet there appears to be movement when we *know* there is not any. Walt Disney cartoons have the animated appearance of living movement; but they are *not alive* and they *do not move*.

I repeat the appearance of "mutation" because of varying structures placed side by side is *not evidence* that mutation actually occurs. I always ask one further question at this point in scientific reflection. If evolution of species is true, why are any amoeba extant today? Why have they not all evolved? Why should one branch of the amoeba family evolve into more complex forms of life, whereas another branch continues to this day to reproduce amoeba? If you need to think this through, don't play with it! Demand

personal integrity in your own mind – Why do "primitive" forms exist today? Do you really think they are later "animations" of matter and they will "evolve" into something else than they are? *Why* should you think so?

Before we leave the biological area let us note the Genesis account of Creation. Within the short Chapter 1 there are eight occurrences of the qualifying phrase, "After its kind." There can be no mistake about this emphasis upon a basic consistency of design in the various orders of things as created in the will of God. Any notion of a gradual change in form and character as the result of natural process is definitely excluded. We will want to refer to this again when we look at the moral aspect of this whole question.

2. As Philosophic Speculation

In the area of speculation as to the possible meaning of the universe the idea of Evolution seems to enjoy its widest range of attention. Any attitude toward proposed views is so largely a matter of personal preference, that it would seem futile to demand anything like warranty as to the validity of the insights which are presented. And yet each mind must come to terms with its own judgments about any views presented.

I have always felt that any philosophy of constant change has actually written its own obituary. If everything changes, why not the philosophy too? If nothing is permanent, why should I be impressed with any conclusion such a system would propose? This must change too. Every now and again I meet a hardy mind that is willing to concede this. In this view anything we might say or think is only tentative and temporary. When I meet such a person I realize I can afford to relax – in such a frame of mind nothing really matters. It will all be changed. Of course I can have misgivings about my own personal future, but when consistent they do not have any such problem. In fact they can develop an eerie sort of optimism, as if in a mirage they saw the Heavenly City before them and are expecting to arrive tomorrow. Having lived on the plains and having seen a mirage on many a clear, still day, I cannot share their optimism. Such thinking prompts me to appreciate Epicurus "Let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." Having once shared in the joy of the Christian Hope grounded in the will of our Living Lord, I want to say here only that this sort of view is not acceptable to my heart.

"O Thou who changest not, Abide with me"!

The optimistic suggestion that all will change for the better seems acceptable only to persons who are enjoying prosperous living in comparative security. The whole concept of progress is nice to talk about, but hard to accept in the empirical events of the world in which we live. If "progress" is inevitable because it is the will of God, why are there any primitive nations, societies, cultures, today?

The bright concept of "A Glorious Future" has appeared again and again in the history of thought. Especially the western world has been affected by the predictions of the Hebrew prophets who prophesied of the Messianic Kingdom when "righteousness and peace" will prevail. The Christian Gospel has encouraged believers to look for the fulfilment of God's gracious benevolent purpose: "There's a Bright Day Coming By and By." The advent of science inspired the prospect of "Utopia." And so great a poet as Tennyson could write of

"That far off divine event toward which the whole creation moves."

It can be understood how "Evolution" would seem to promise at long last a process that would achieve this goal. There is one most important fact that must not be overlooked – the Hebrew-Christian prospect of "a Glorious Future" is directly dependent upon the appearance and the work of Messiah, the Christ, the Son of God. This glorious kingdom will be His personal achievement.

In my own study of Philosophy I came to recognize the element of personal preference and the tendency to variance in individual response to the prevailing mood and the popular vogue. It was obvious no attempt is ever made in Philosophic speculation to come to terms with actual reality ** beyond a very

general recognition of the established knowledge and accepted judgments of the prevailing culture. It seems the purpose is not so much to discover actually what really is true, as it is to propose a possible interpretation by way of providing a rationale for living. In the history of thought all varieties of ideas have been held, and doubtless will be.***

When I projected the implications of Evolution and compared these with the actual empirical world and its history as I could know it, I was not impressed to think the idea was valid. When I considered the bearing of such a view upon morals as well as upon the Christian Gospel I found it was just not acceptable. And to those areas I will now proceed.

** American philosophy produced a movement called "Pragmatism" which seemed inspired by some such interest. But it is the general mood today to disparage anything "pragmatic" as being really something less than philosophical. Such disparagement may be valid enough, though it would still leave the larger question unanswered: which is actually more helpful to men?

*** I cannot move on beyond this point without mentioning the appreciation I have of the importance of Paul's warning in Colossians 2:8. When you read that verse keep in mind that the meaning of "spoil" can be felt when you read it as "despoil," or you can just supply the word "rob" and get Paul's meaning. Philosophy can be a precarious preoccupation so far as personal conviction is concerned.

3. On Moral Grounds

The very essence of moral integrity seems to me to be grounded in responsibility for conduct. There is something solid in the Law of the Harvest: "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." This seems to belong to the obdurate fact of the external world. Life will not develop as I wish, and things are not conformed to what I want. There is a stubbornness and arbitrariness in a stone wall which I need to recognize. In the whole universe I am encouraged to realize that a spade is a spade. It belongs to any kind of integrity in me for me to realize that what I do is what I do, and has certain permanent meaning. My actions count because they are as they are. I could wish for some magic to "change" my "evil" to "good," but such wishful thinking is idle in my judgment.

All this is something I need to recognize and to understand, Any suggestion that my actions will not be appraised as evil, because in providence some good later followed: as though to suggest my "evil" action contributed to the "good" result, and therefore is no longer "evil," would be a very welcome escape in my own conscience, but would be devastating in its effect upon my personal integrity.

Thank God my sins can be forgiven! Praise God I can be washed whiter than snow! But let me keep the record straight. I am a sinner, guilty of evil conduct, and rightly condemned to destruction. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Christ Jesus is my Savior who came to redeem me at the cost of His personal sacrifice of Himself The sin which I confess was expiated on Calvary by the Lamb of God and I am free because I accept Him as my Savior and Lord, and not because God is working in some benign fashion to overcome my sin in some universal evolutionary principle of grace.

Such salvation is by no means a general process working in the whole world to the end that all men will be saved! The invitation is *open* to all: "Whosoever will may come." But the truth is that whosoever believeth not is "condemned already because he has not believed on the Son of God."

The promise of Evolution that my salvation occurs in the process of God's working through His own power takes away from my conscience any responsibility to repent. Sin loses its heinous aspect and belongs to the natural predicament I am in, but it is being overcome. Thus there need be NO REPENTANCE - NO CONFESSION - NO CONTRITION - NO ACCEPTANCE OF CHRIST in order to be saved. To hold such a view will cause deterioration of my own integrity, it seems to me. It is not just that I think this is not true – I actually think it is really harmful. Knowing what an appeal such a view

would have to an unrepentant heart and thinking of this effect upon the moral consciousness I cannot accept Evolution even as a permissible alternate view.

But all that I have written actually seems quiet unimportant when compared to the judgment upon Evolution by the Scriptures themselves.

4. In the Light of Scripture.

Lest I be tedious, let me sketch the following observations as briefly and concisely as I can:

(1) As to "Creation"

In Genesis Chapter I there are at least eight times it is distinctly said that the characteristics of each created plant or animal is that it will reproduce "after his kind." This is really significant: Matthew 7:16-20; James 3:12; Galatians 6:7-8.

No one can read Genesis I and II and see here the operation of any process that produces new forms. Paul in II Corinthians 4:6 distinctly says it was "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness." The story in Genesis goes on to say, "And God said . . . and there was."

(2) As to "Guidance"

Throughout Scripture there is the frequent occurrence of the call of God coming to individuals in such a way as to challenge response and obedience. Abraham went from Ur of the Chaldees not in the course of any process in experience – but in a call that actually could be seen as contrary to experience. "By faith he obeyed" is the classic form of the response that inherits the blessing of God.

The men of God who responded in "obedience" exercised judgment in reflection (Romans 4:18-21) and obeyed the call of God in a person-to-person response (Hebrews 11). The very form of the call of Moses (Exodus 3) certainly could never be put into any evolutionary frame.

(3) As to "the Fall of Man"

The Genesis account reports that Adam was given specific commandment to recognize "A Separated Portion" (Genesis 2:17). There was an appearance of arbitrary authority which demanded specific obedience. There is no evidence that such a course of action was anything that Adam arrived at through experience. Without begging the question as to the mode of communication employed, it seems obvious the record states that Adam was instructed by God, and his failure to obey was to be seen as his sin.

Any attempt to handle this account without noting the person-to-person quality of the administration of the whole affair does violence to the record. My point is that Adam failed to obey a clear word of Guidance, having been deceived in the course of his personal experience. There was nothing inevitable nor necessary in this action of Adam.

(4) As to "the Exodus"

I will limit my observation here to this one point: the actual experience of Israel was real and significant, but the Exodus occurred because God personally sent Moses personally to lead the people personally along a way and through experiences that were extra-natural.

The waves and the winds at sea may affect the ship as it sails, but they cannot and do not provide the skipper nor the compass by which the ship steers its course. No evolutionary process could have produced the Exodus; but the Living God did!

(5) As to "record History and Biography"

Doubtless Israel and the men of God in the Bible were normal, natural persons, "men of like passions," but the course of Israel's affairs and the career of God's servants cannot adequately be understood as natural results of any benign, benevolent inherent operation of God's continuous principle of Grace.

"God speaks" and His people do or do not obey. He deals with them on the basis of their response. Even when He overrules to bring His will to pass, each generation and each person is dealt with on the basis of the responsible response to the call of God. Jonah did not immediately obey and his subsequent

experience was not due to any inherent operation of any grace of God, but to the direct intervention of God in his affairs in drastic fashion.

The point I am pressing here is that the significant development in the affairs of Israel and of God's servants was the consequence of the personal acts of a Living God who confronted the will of His people and His servants with His Word, which was to be believed to become effectual.

(6) *As to "Worship"*

I know a strong case can be made for the view that all men tend in religious response to worship something, anything; but to *worship*. I am impressed by the reports of varieties of worship from the case of Cain to John on the Isle of Patmos, and through all the public procedures on the high places, in the groves, in the Tabernacle and Temple and at Pentecost. But the worship described as acceptable in the Bible involved a face-to-face conscious communion with the Living God who could and would accept or reject the worship offered.

Doubtless many worshippers came as a matter of course but there is strong reason to believe such coming was not acceptable. The requirements of confession, of sacrifice for the remission of sins, of repentance for the qualification of the sacrifices, all pointed to the truth that participation in the saving grace of God was a person-to-person affair. It would be a Living God who looked upon the heart, who would receive or reject the worshipper.

I have the strong impression that "much coming" and "many words" could not serve as acceptable "worship," but "a humble and a contrite heart" God would not despise. I do not think of this as the operation of some constant principle of grace – but as the personal response of our eternal God.

(7) *As to "Regeneration, Receiving the Holy Spirit, Christian Life and Growth, Our Eternal Destiny, and all such aspects of the Life we have in Christ."*

In all that is written in the New Testament there seems to be no deviation from the truth as seen in II Corinthians 3:18, which states in so many words the general principle that we live and grow as we personally worship the Living God.

Apparently there is no such thing as any person developing into Christian life or experience as a result of any continuous process. Certainly God is infinite and eternal, everywhere all the time, and "in Him we live and move and have our being" but He became Incarnate in His Son, and has now committed "all things in His hand." The truth is that "as many as received Him to them gave He the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name."

There is no such thing possible as that any person can come to God any other way (Acts 4:12). The way of Salvation in Jesus Christ is a profound truth I will not attempt even to sketch here, beyond this one observation: "Apart from me ye can do nothing." There is no way possible a woman can become a wife apart from having a husband, and there is no such thing as a Christian apart from receiving Jesus Christ.

The only Salvation the Bible describes is the work of God in anyone "Whosoever believeth in Him." This work of God is original and creative as a consequence of the person *receiving* Jesus Christ. It takes the acorn to produce the oak; it takes the Word of God to produce faith in Christ. Any view of affairs that would imply all men will be saved because of some inherent constant working of God is not in line with the Scriptures.

I have no particular zeal for any specific terms to be used in describing the ways of God, but I feel the truth is implied in the Great Commission; the Gospel must be preached that it can be believed and men can be saved through Jesus Christ our Savior and Lord. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12

Without feeling obliged to prove what is right or what is wrong about this or that view of Evolution, it is enough for me to note that all such theories presume to sketch the operation of God's Grace in a natural way. The way they describe it, Salvation is always something to be produced in me by the influence of certain universal factors that operate as impersonally as the pull of gravity or the speed of light. Somehow,

we'll claim, something wonderful is going to happen to me because God is doing it to everybody and will do it to me. It sounds so nice and sweet – but I have the haunting sense of being left out because I *know* I am a sinner, and I feel also that in the Gospel I am being called to repent and to accept Jesus Christ. In other words, I am not convinced Salvation is going to happen to me because God is going to save all men by His Grace in some broad, universal operation; anything that sounds like this is simply not agreeable to the Scriptures.

In the Gospel I am called to accept Jesus Christ as my Savior and Lord. I am instructed to "deny myself, take up the cross and follow Him." There is no Salvation outside of Christ, and to receive Him I must yield myself into His personal control. The moment I receive Him I pass from death unto life. I am a "new creature" not a product of process, but an adopted child of God called into communion with Him. Any theory that would blur my faith in Jesus Christ on Calvary as my atoning sacrifice would never be acceptable to me.

There is one other consideration that makes me wary of any form of Evolution. In the course of my own intellectual career as well as my personal experience (out of which I derive my judgments and attitudes), in every case where I learned of some Evolutionary Theory of the course of reality, such views were presented and sponsored by minds that were intellectually sophisticated and who seemed congenial with the general thinking of the world's intelligentsia. In other words, these ideas seem very acceptable to persons considered brilliant and of great intellectual ability. Paul would refer to them as "the princes of the world" (I Cor. 2:6) and would speak of their views and opinions as "the wisdom of this world" (I Cor. 1:20). Certainly no one would hesitate to classify such intellectual schemes as "the wisdom of men" (I Cor. 2:5). And it is just because "the world by wisdom knew not God" (I Cor. 1:21), and in this ignorance "the princes of this world" "have crucified the Lord of glory," that I am definitely inclined to reject such theories, even as possible descriptions of God's ways of performance.

The plain fact is that the wrong persons endorse and present these ideas. I know that God is no respecter of persons and that He can call a mind like Paul or like Apollos as well as those who are "foolish", "weak", "base", "despised" and insignificant, but I remember that our Lord distinctly said "Except ye be converted and become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 18:3). I read "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight." (Matthew 11:25-26) As I study the New Testament record I am impressed to feel it was the intellectually trained scholars who were forever questioning His teaching, whereas "the common people heard Him gladly." It was the "smart" men who rejected Him. It was the "smart" men that engineered His death. It has been the "smart" men who have despised the simple Gospel of being "saved by the blood of Christ." Intellectual sophistication makes men "proud," and "proud" minds can never understand the truth of Jesus Christ. The very fact that the "smart", "proud" minds find Evolution congenial is enough to make me very suspicious of its validity. In my own humble way I want to walk in the way Paul described in I Cor. 2:1-5, and I simply do not find myself led along the lines of any Evolutionary school of thought.