

RELIGIOUS IMPLICATIONS OF EVOLUTION

BY EDWARD O. SISSON

WE may well at the outset recall two or three points which are prerequisite to a clear view of our problem. First as to the role of Darwin himself, and the reason why his name is so interwoven in the whole concept of evolution that to many people Darwinism and evolution are synonymous terms. We know of course that Darwin did not originate the idea of evolution, which is on the contrary at least as old as Aristotle; Darwin entered the arena at a time when the progress of science had begun to throw an intense light upon the theory, and when scientists were keenly awake to its significance and eager for facts and for any reasonable hypotheses bearing upon it. This is most strikingly evidenced by Wallace's wholly independent and almost identical formulation of the theory of natural selection.

Darwin did three distinctive things: (1) first he surpassed all his predecessors in his tireless and long-continued amassing and organizing of facts; he ransacked earth and sea and air for details of plant and animal life, and marshalled his army of facts with consummate skill and boldness. After the issue even of his first book it was impossible to ignore his utterances, and the eyes of the whole scientific world were fixed upon him. The shades of Aristotle and Francis Bacon must have gloried in his magnificent survey of the living world.

(2) Second he put forth the first clear and definite theory of the *modus operandi* of evolution—the way species originate. This was his theory of natural selection, based upon the struggle for existence. This theory is so simple in form that a child can understand it, and so intimately related to the commonest facts of life that its logic is almost irresistible; it is a notorious fact that in

spite of Darwin's own extreme modesty and scrupulous caution, the doctrine was almost immediately seized by less cautious hands and carried far beyond Darwin's sound conclusions, to the grave detriment of the cause as a whole. Moreover the theory of natural selection, as based upon the struggle for existence, was at once seen to have unavoidable bearings upon the whole philosophy of life and the universe, including the theme we are now discussing, its relation to religion and morals.

(3) Finally, Darwin placed man unequivocally under the principle of evolution, and marshalled an invincible array of facts to establish his descent from lower forms and, incidentally, to show his close relationship with the apes. This very last point, biologically only a detail, nevertheless quite naturally so shocked the minds of people in general that it became to them the sum total of both Darwinism and evolution, and even today it is probable that the majority of all persons who know the name of Darwin at all, think first and last of monkeys. It was of course this last point in Darwin's teachings that raised a furious storm of protest and precipitated the war between evolutionists and anti-evolutionists which raged with such fury for more than half a century.

This story, so familiar to all, is repeated here to insure a clear picture of the joining of the issue in the great fight. While Darwin provided practically all the original proposals, it was really Huxley who carried on the war. He called himself "Darwin's bull-dog." Darwin quietly abandoned his earlier orthodox theological views, and shunned religious controversy; Huxley coined the term agnostic to describe and declare his own opposition to the whole body of dogmatic theology, and mercilessly hammered his opponents with his formidable biological logic. He was as polemic as his friend Darwin was eirenic, and loved nothing better than to carry the war far into the enemy's territory. When we are inclined to wonder at the persistence and recrudescence of anti-evolutionism, this history of the early conflicts may afford some light.

For some years back the United States has been the scene of an extraordinary recrudescence of the religious conflict over evolution, so peculiar to us as to fill people in other lands with amazement. Into this unhappy controversy over evolution I desire to interject the following striking utterance concerning the destructive effects of modern science, and particularly of Darwinism, up-

on morals and religion,—a piece of testimony which I have not seen used or quoted by any of the contestants:

“Never in the history of man has so terrific a calamity befallen the race as that which all who look may now behold advancing as a deluge, black with destruction, resistless in might, uprooting our most cherished hopes, engulfing our most precious creed, and burying our highest life in mindless destruction.”

I offer these astounding words freely to both parties in the present battle royal over evolution; yet I doubt whether either side will welcome the testimony: for to one side the witness may seem a traitor to the cause which he and they represent; and to the other side he will be under suspicion,—they will ‘fear a Greek, even tho he brings gifts.’

Yet the testimony should have a powerful appeal and great authority for both parties: to the anti-evolutionist because of its passionate and eloquent utterance of his view of the case; and to the evolutionist because the speaker is himself a devoted admirer and disciple of Darwin, and one of the most notable of his successors in the study of the evolutionary process. For these are the words of *George John Romanes*,¹ renowned biologist, one of the protagonists of the principles of evolution, and, what is deeply significant, the leader in applying these principles in the spiritual field,—the evolution of *mind*. Moreover this tragic verdict was recorded not at the first startling appearance of the Darwinian theory, before men’s minds had had time to recover from the shock and readjust their conceptions to it, but in 1878, twenty years after the appearance of the “Origin of Species,” and nineteen years after the “Descent of Man.”

I use these words of Romanes for a point of departure: they seem to me to carry a profound lesson to both sides of the evolution controversy; and what is still more important, to point to certain healing and unifying phases of the question at issue. The first and plainest lesson is that the honest opponents of evolution must not be set down as mere fools or bigots,—fools and bigots doubtless find their way into the anti-evolutionist camp, and heavily handicap its cause; but it would hardly be safe to give the evolutionist

¹*Candid Examination of Theism* (Boston, 1878), p. 51; also quoted in *Darwin and Modern Science* (Cambridge University Press 1909), p. 486.

camp a clear bill on this score. If Romanes could think and feel so powerfully as his words indicate concerning the moral and religious consequences of modern science, even after he had spent years in studying the problem, why should we be surprised that there are men today in plenty who shudder at evolution and feel themselves divinely commissioned to fight its maleficent influence?

For these words of this brilliant evolutionist really sum up the indictment which saner fundamentalists bring against evolution, and which many of the less intelligent "feel in their bones." The evolutionists today will never understand the passionate antagonism of the anti-evolutionists until they get a far better conception of the ominous fears which the mind of Romanes felt with painful clearness, and which, in vague and cloudy form yet no less menacing, beset the minds of many men and women today.

On the other hand, and for the special notice of the anti-evolutionists, we must remember that Romanes was but thirty years old when he made his despairing prediction of the destructive results to flow from Darwinism: he lived to see that his fears were exaggerated, and to realize in part at least, and indeed help to build, the truth which we may today see with ever-growing clearness, that the doctrine of evolution does not destroy but rather enhances and justifies the hopes and aspirations of religion and ethics.

Let us then consider the great fears which Darwin's work stirred in men's minds concerning religion and morals, and which are still the main basis for the aversion which great numbers of honest and well-intentioned men and women, many of them intelligent enough in other fields, manifest toward the whole doctrine of evolution. After that we may endeavor to unravel some of the misunderstandings and confusion by virtue of which these fears continue to tyrannize over men's minds long after their original grounds have been wholly or largely removed.

There were and still are three of these fears: and they are all shadowed forth in Romanes' words. First is fear of *the loss of God* as the divine Creator and Conserver of the universe, and the handing over of all things to the dominion of blind forces, in particular to one ruthless and inhuman force known vaguely as "the struggle for existence." Second is fear of *the degradation of man* to the status of a mere animal and consequently the abrogation of his di-

vine Sonship and glorious destiny. Third is fear of *the break-down of ethics*, both in theory and practice, thru the triumph of the same force which has ousted the Creator: struggle for existence, the "reign of tooth and claw," and the defeat of every claim of altruism or idealism.

These were the horrid portents that forced themselves upon the sensitive soul of Romanes and impelled him to the eloquent and tragic utterance quoted above. We cite him in passing as a veritable hero of faith in that despite these specters, he drove straight forward in his search for truth; his conduct seemed to say, in the words of holy writ, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him." How much more truly religious than to take refuge in evasion or denial of the results of the use of reason!

First, then, men feared that natural selection had displaced God as Creator: that all creatures, including man himself, had been "evolved" by this new impersonal agency, not only undivine, but actually inhuman. If we are to understand this fear we must remind ourselves that the very concept of "creation" was at that time mirrored in men's minds from the type of story represented by the book of Genesis with its details of order and time, and its definitive and punctuated periods. The aggressive evolutionists, such as Huxley, nicknamed this concept "the carpenter theory," and easily made it the butt of ridicule. Nor can it be denied that many advocates of the new doctrine went far beyond the restrained and modest conclusions of Darwin, and often made a clean sweep of the whole divine element in the origin of the universe. Huxley himself, "Darwin's bull-dog," supplemented scientific argument with vigorous denunciation of his adversaries. Many a man who now lives comfortably with a thorogoin belief in evolution can still recall the chill and shock of the suspicion that after all the world had, like Topsy, "just growed," and that all its marvel and beauty witnessed not to an omnipotent and eternal God but only to two vague abstractions, one of them, "Natural Selection," cold and negative, the other, "Struggle for Existence," cruel and ruthless. I do not see how anyone can doubt that Romanes' own mind was tortured by this specter of a Godless universe.

The second fear was as clearly grounded as the first: if man was offspring of a "lower animal," how should he escape the base inheritance of soul-lessness and mortality? The new doctrine

seemed to invalidate his most precious claim, that he was, tho fallen, yet of divine origin, and that the way had been opened for his redemption and return. He was like one who had been brought up as prince in a royal house, and now was found to be an unwitting impostor of the meanest birth, worthy to be exiled forever from the palace of his joys and hopes. What wonder that a storm of angry denunciation broke from the civilized world, and especially from those who felt themselves the heirs and guardians of the Great Hope, the religious believers? When we consider how deep and poignant was the effect of this horrid suspicion cast over Man's legitimacy, we need not wonder at Romanes' lament; still less, if we could see the case in its true perspective, should we wonder, or be angry or scornful, over the fact that hundreds of thousands of people today still feel only unbelief and indignation toward evolution.

This horror of blood-relationship with lower forms has been intensified in a very curious but inevitable way: our nearest kin, our cousins, as it were, are—*Monkeys!* This fact, which seems like one of the grim jokes of nature, is responsible for no one knows how much of the fury and scorn of anti-evolutionists always and everywhere. How strange a thing is the human mind—our logic, as we flatteringly call it! A comparative anatomist scrutinizing the make-up of gorilla or chimpanzee is completely convinced of man's kinship to the apes; but the ordinary citizen, with at least average intelligence and education, takes one look at the monkey cage in the zoo, and turns black in the face with rage at the villainous evolutionists who want to make out that he and the monkeys are "cousins." Of course it is exactly because the apes and monkeys are so shockingly like us that we resent it so! The monkey cage is almost an indecent sight for this very reason. Who can blame Mr. Jiggs for resenting the physiognomy of the orang-outang? Long before Darwin appeared the simians were abused and slandered thru the unconscious resentment of man over their plaguey likeness to him. Our very language bears evidence of this, for "ape" and "monkey" are nouns and verbs of contempt, yet the conduct which they represent is intensely and characteristically human.

That these cousins of ours, especially the great apes, are exactly the most nearly human of the lower animals is becoming increasingly clear thru the results of fair and unprejudiced scien-

tific investigation; consider for example, the refutation of Du Chaillu's libel on the gorilla by Akeley and others; and the showing of high mental powers in the chimpanzee by Köhler. Not only in the rudiments of intelligence but also in the realm of morals these creatures stand high if not highest among the animals.

The last of the three fears is by far the least in the minds or on the lips of the controversialists on either side, but it is likely to prove the most serious of all, most prolific in harm to our lives and destiny, and most intractable and obstinate to conquer: this is the threat against all forms of idealistic ethics involved in the concept of the universal and dominant *struggle for existence*. As is well known, Darwin started his systematic inquiry from this doctrine as a base of reference; his immense labors massed and exposed to view an infinity of facts of nature manifesting the working of the law. It seemed as tho science had come to testify in behalf of the maxim of selfishness—"Every individual and species for itself, and extermination take the hindmost!" The peculiar peril of this phase of Darwinism is that it accords and co-operates with powerful impulsions in our own nature, while the others are obnoxious to our sentiments and emotions: I have little doubt that ethics has far more to fear from "struggle for existence" than religion has to fear from all the rest of the evolutionary doctrine.

But no one can hold Darwin to any special responsibility for this doctrine: the struggle for existence had always been part, and often nearly the whole, of the experience of Man as well as the lower animals; Malthus had expounded the main facts before Darwin began his work, and so given Darwin his first clue. Besides, two great political systems based upon the struggle for existence were already in flourishing existence when Darwin was studying the problem: *laissez faire* in government and economics, and war in international relations. Still further the vast mass of men practice and have always practiced "struggle for existence" morals in certain broad areas of conduct, notably business and politics. So, ironically enough, this greatest danger has been the smallest fear.

Thus far, then, we have endeavored to set forth with the utmost brevity the three great fears engendered in the minds of men by the work of Darwin and his followers. These are not the fears of fundamentalists or anti-evolutionists alone, but, to a greater or lesser degree, of persons free from rigid or narrow views on any

subject, but still concerned for the future of the human race. Romanes, as we have seen, was profoundly and painfully seized with these fears, and saw no escape from them. Henry Drummond wrote his "Ascent of Man" to help those who, like himself, could not resist the proofs of the evolutionary theory, but still clung to the doctrines and practices of religion.² I cannot but feel that reflection upon the reality and prevalence of these fears might aid advocates of evolution to understand their opponents better and ultimately succeed better in converting them. In this sense this first part of my essay is addressed particularly to evolutionists, especially to those involved by choice or necessity in the defense of the doctrine.

We turn now to an examination of the fears themselves, to see whether the doctrines of evolution really justify them, and still more, whether evolution is really guilty of any treason against God, Man, or Righteousness.

First as to God. Natural selection, so far from eliminating a creator, demands infinitely more creation than the old notion of creation itself. Selection, of whatever sort, cannot even begin until some other power has made more than is needed. The ancient writing pictures God as making "the heavens and the earth" in six days, and "resting" after He had made them: Jesus on the contrary says that God is working "up to now,"—and we do not suppose that God stopped working at the time Jesus spoke. The doctrine of evolution spreads creation out over the vast ages of time and the boundless areas of space.

One more point for orientation, which I conceive to be of crucial importance: that is the question of what evolution really is: its "*to ontos on*," in Aristotle's phrase. Words exercise a peculiar power over us, and the word evolution is no exception. I read but recently in a learned philosophical work, the writer of which is in full accord with the evolutionary theory, the statement that "as evolution is an unrolling, there must have been a rolling-up." I suspect that the great majority of people think of evolution as an *un*-rolling or *un*folding. That is the precise etymological significance of the word, as it is likewise of the German equivalent. Now, what-

²Consider also the imposing work of Kropotkin, in his *Mutual Aid as a factor in Evolution*, and Sutherland in *The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct*, to counteract the mass of facts given in evidence on the side of struggle for existence.

ever evolution is, an unrolling is just exactly what it is *not*. I cannot too strongly stress this negative, in order to make room for the fullest and clearest impression of the positive. Take the evolution, or as we commonly call it, the development, of an individual organism. As development goes forward, membranes, tissues, organs, appear. They bud out, first in almost shapeless form, then gradually, imperceptibly, taking on the image of the adult structure. Now the development began in a single protoplasmic cell: just what is in that cell the biologist is investigating eagerly with great success; he finds marvellous structures in its tiny bulk: but never the structures of the future adult: never fins in the fish germ, nor wings in the bird germ, never legs, nor arms, nor eyes, nor brains in any germ. In the germ, all these organs *are not*; in the same identical individual when adult, these organs *are*. That is development, and it is emphatically not unfolding nor unrolling, nor, be it noted, "un" anything! For "un" is negative, and evolution is very positive.

The same logic holds exactly of the larger development, commonly called evolution, in the race. The eozoic slime had indeed the "promise and potency of all life," but what later in the ages emerged in plant and animal species,—leaves and branches and trunks,—limbs and sense-organs and nerve-systems,—these it had not: in the eozoic age they were not there; in due time they were there. That is evolution. Manifestly, then evolution is just exactly creation; and the vast moving picture of the universe which we call Science, is precisely the first genuine portrayal of what creation is. Thus evolution enormously expands creation: every blade of grass, every smallest insect or bird, even the micro-organism embodied in a single cell, still are the scene of creation. Bergson's "Creative Evolution" is of course the grand proclamation of this new truth.

Nor does the theory of evolution refute the idea of design or intelligence in nature, nor lessen the force of this idea in pointing to the existence of God: that argument, whether sound or not, is just as valid as it was before Darwin wrote: it has however infinitely more material to work with, for modern science, largely under the stimulus of Darwin's achievements, and by following out his method, has vastly expanded our knowledge of the amazing complexity of the world. Fortuitous concourse of atoms is

futile to explain even a single snow-crystal, to say nothing of the endless billions of crystals—or the perpetual succession of kaleidoscopic form of plant and animal life. For all these run thru endless cycles and series, always marshalled by law, yet always fertile in ever-new diversity. All this, the miracle *par excellence*, has been expanded and lighted up by the doctrine of evolution and the methods of evolutionist workers. As Walt Whitman says: "A single mouse is enough to stagger sextillions of infidels."

Genesis declares that God (or rather *Jahveh* or *Elohim*) created the world: but the ancient writer refrains from offering any slightest hint of how the world was made. Man, we are told, was made "from the dust of the earth"; true enough, as the dust of mausoleums witnesses; but how was man made? Shall we borrow the negro preacher's exposition, that God made several men of mud, set them up to dry in the sun, and left one out too long—hence the black race? I have no desire to be merely humorous, but rather to stress the fact that the doctrine of evolution gives us for the first time a picture of how God creates: the remarkable thing is that evolution represents God as consistent with himself, for it teaches that he made races and species from the beginning as he makes them now—never by sudden act or fiat, but always by growing them, by causing them to arise from infinitesimal origins, transform themselves by gradual stages, move in order toward the goal of their fore-ordained destiny. That is evolution.³

Next, what of Man? Is the doctrine that man is related to the "brutes" the "greatest menace to the church," as one of the most conspicuous leaders of the anti-evolutionists declared? Is Man forever disgraced, are his bright hopes of heaven either here on earth or in a distant future cancelled and lost if it should be admitted that he is akin to "the lower animals"? Did not God make them also, and beholding them did He not bless them and declare them good? How could Mr. Bryan and how can any believer in the Bible presume to such supercilious contempt for these humble but

³There is a more subtle, quasi-metaphysical aspect of this fear: that the evolutionary portrayal of the total history of the cosmos is not merely Godless, but *mindless*, except for the latest period, which is a mere moment compared with the illimitable reaches of pre-human existence. The most recent special form of evolutionary doctrine, *emergent* evolution, naturally intensifies this aspect. At this point I can only say that this yields to the same general treatment as the fear with regard to God—and leaves the problem in the same challenging posture.

still divinely created beings? Let them listen to another utterance from holy writ—"What God hath cleansed, call not thou common." I defy any man reading the Genesis story of creation to find the least shadow of ground for despising the lower animals, or indeed any item whatsoever of the created world. On the contrary the whole account of creation is remarkably continuous, with almost identical language, and of each successive level Jahveh says, "It is good." Away then with the notion that the Bible supports the view that a belief in man's blood relationship with the lower orders is a menace to the church or anything else.

But let us come down to the facts of life: has the anti-evolutionist then never been so happy as to own and love a dog, a horse? Has he never known, himself or by observation, the truly passionate love between a boy and a dog, with the dog usually playing the more "human" part? Has he never even heard the innumerable stories of the super-human fidelity of a dog, even a common cur, to his master? In brief does he know nothing of the moral virtues of the glibly-called "lower creatures"? If he missed the plain teachings of his own supreme authority, the Bible, has he also been blind to the abundant confirmation all about him of the divine hand in the making of the "beasts"?

Out of my file of ethical data I draw two items as evidence in the case, either of which can be multiplied indefinitely in common observation and current reading; the first is a case of a "brute," and as it happens one of the despised monkey family itself:

"The baboon possesses most admirable qualities....A deep, absorbing, and self-sacrificing love for any creature which is helpless and is dependent upon it in any way, is one of the baboon's most striking characteristics. This love on occasion prompts the despised chasma to deeds of unsurpassed heroism....That they will (in defence of their young) attack and destroy the leopard, the python, and even more dreaded man, armed with his mysterious firestick, is undoubted, and may be taken as a proof of noble and self-sacrificing courage."⁴

The other is a press dispatch, and deals with a member of the human species:

"Because his father, 77 years old, feeble, unable to work, and with no money, had not purchased and prepared his supper, H——K——, aged 38, cleft the skull of the aged man with a shingling

⁴W. C. Scully. *Atlantic Monthly*, December, 1919.

hatchet. The bleeding body was left lying on the kitchen floor, while the murderer, his mother, and his three brothers, sat around and cursed because the old man had failed to prepare supper."

What of war as practiced by mankind in all ages, and, grievous to say, most of all as practiced by those human groups who pride themselves on the loftiness of their civilization? Is there anything in the whole range of animal conduct so shocking and so totally hostile to the Christian religion? What wonder that Dean Inge has called Man the "fiercest of all beasts of prey"?⁵

I have no desire to accuse my own species, nor to belittle the vast gulf which yawns between man and his humbler fellow-creatures; but who can resist the conviction that facts like these estop us from all supercilious contempt for the "brutes," and from any lofty indignation that we should be found to have blood relationship with them? The little child's touching and simple love for his animal pets is another example that sometimes the truth is hidden from the wise and prudent and revealed to babes. The fact is that the roots of all the cardinal virtues manifest themselves in the lower orders of creation as rudiments and foreshadowings of their fuller and richer fruition in Man; in the terms of religion we may well say that God planted them there. When we consider how extensive and definite is the anatomical correspondence between Man and his close mammalian neighbors in the animal kingdom, how his whole physiological life is almost identical with theirs, why should we wonder to find in them the clear beginnings of intelligence, of altruism, of love, of the social life, of marriage and the family? This great body of fact, pervading the whole area of biology, was almost meaningless to the older view of science, and is filled with significance under the new evolutionary conception. Again speaking in terms of religion, Man appears as the consummation and crowning glory of the Creator's work.⁶

Finally the ethical problem: Are competition, rivalry, antagonism, war, the basic principles of the universe? Are altruism and love and sociality mere wraiths and shadows, hovering above the battlefield, but powerless to ameliorate the carnage and destruction? This is the most ominous of the three great fears: but, as already

⁵The actual statement said "European man"; but strict logic would, I think, justify my phrasing.

⁶For a terrible indictment of Man as far below the other animals see Mark Twain's "The Mysterious Stranger," perhaps the most striking expression of profound conflict in the soul of the great humorist-philosopher.

said, evolution and the evolutionist have no special responsibility; it is almost an accident that the terrible facts which create this fear were linked so closely with the studies and discussions that underlie the doctrine of evolution. The facts are there in any case, and had long been apparent to acute observers and had long disturbed thoughtful minds. Not Darwin but Malthus dragged them into view, and Malthus was not an evolutionist.

The first thing to note on this phase of the subject is the existence of a great mass of fact refuting any supposed supremacy of the struggle for existence: Kropotkin and Sutherland have filled bulky volumes with the abundant evidence of the principle of mutual aid, of the struggle for others, of altruism, reaching far down in the animal scale. It was inevitable that Darwin should stress the individual and egoistic element in the struggle, as being the particular force leading to the origin of species. Furthermore struggle, war, battle, slaughter, are dramatic, startling, make a profound impression on our minds; while co-operation, peace, amicable living together, are undramatic, and just elapse without making any particular impression. But the broad study of evolution is just as much interested in co-operation as in rivalry, in love as in war, in altruism as in egoism.

Next it must be pointed out that an evolutionary view of life and of Man is full of hope; indeed it seems to hold out the only hope for ethics and the higher life. If Man really was created at some past time perfect, in the image of the Divine, and has degenerated to his present imperfect state, must we not look with dread to a further downward course in which we shall sink to ever-deeper sin and evil? But if Man had his origin in lower forms, simian, reptilian, aquatic, finally protozoan, and has now attained his present eminence over his fellow animals, what may not be hoped for in the long ages to come?

To be more specific: we have now a deficiency of many needed elements, of intelligence, of altruism, and social virtue; only in an evolving order can we hope to gain the needed increase of those qualities; but in an evolving order we are justified in expecting them; for the emergence of the new is the very essence of evolution. Whether or not we are evolving in the desired direction is indeed a fateful question, but it concerns all parties alike, evolutionist and anti-evolutionist; it is just the supreme question of life. Science

falls far short of furnishing any convincing answer: we solve it if at all by faith, and by works in accordance with our faith: to such faith the evolutionary view of the universe is the most powerful aid, if not indeed the sole support.

What then are the religious implications of Evolution?

First, the evolutionary picture of Man's Origin is the sole and only ground for Hope and Faith. If man was made perfect and has degenerated to his present state, we may as well despair. But Man has grown, or rather is growing out of the very beasts of the field, out of the slime of the earth, finally out of the stardust, perhaps out of impalpable electrons! From this angle his present situation is bright with promise.

Second, it is the evolution of spirit that is of supreme moment. All that has been done thus far is mere scaffolding, preliminary, not fundamental at all, but symbolic, suggestive, a "propaedeutic" to the real concept of creative evolution. A stellar universe, no matter how many light-years wide, nor how many eons long, without man—without Us—is after all "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." Not much more meaningful is a Carboniferous or Reptilian age—with trees springing like weeds from a prolific swampy earth, and dinosaurs blundering about among them. The tiny mammals creeping timidly in the shadow of the plesiosaur now carry the meaning of the visible universe. But even these, grown to Mastodons and Megatheriums, are no answer to the "Riddle of the Cosmos." Only when Man appears does Meaning appear. "Man," says one biosophist, "is the rationale of the sea-anemone," and at the other end of the crescent line of thought is St. Chrysostom's profound saying, "The True Shekinah (the visible presence of God) is Man."

Third, an absentee God is now forever impossible. All the old separatist pictures are idolatrous, no matter how beloved the images they bear. Everything less than pantheism is from now on mere atheism. If God is not here and now, He is nowhere and never. The Samaritan said, "Here must God be worshipped"; the Jew, "No, here is the sacred spot." "God is a Spirit," said Jesus, "and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth." But spirit and truth have one clear dwelling place—in human hearts—and these are the cosmos, even if microcosmos.

Fourth, progress is the only ethics, and the only religion. "But

life has a meaning, after all," says Nietzsche, "that the Superman shall come to be." So again—from a strange coincidence—the man whom Nietzsche delighted to dishonor, Jesus: "I am come that men might have life, and have it more abundantly." For what is more abundant life if it is not the Superman? And how can life possibly become more abundant if it stays rooted in its tracks? The only way out is forward.

True, many ways beckon us forward; we do not know which to take. This is the hazard of life and the hazard of evolution. We are all peering into the dark uncertainty. This is the negative; what of the positive? The positive, the Everlasting Yea, of evolution, you have already read in its greatest prophet, the brilliant author of "Evolution Creatrice." "Plus the new"—that is evolution. So long as being remains what it is, folded or unfolded, it is not evolving, and there is no evolution. Only when that which is *not* becomes that which *is*, can we predicate evolution or development; only when the new and different supervenes on the old and same, in brief only when creation occurs. Let us make one change in Bergson's phrase and call it Evolutional Creation; for creation is the essence and evolution is only the form. This is almost the complete answer to all the supposed difficulties between evolution and religion.

Only in an evolving world could man find his place. A perfect world would afford no exercise for his best powers. Only in a world containing an admixture of what we call evil, can man's moral nature grow. For only as the way is open to do wrong, can the will act to do right. Somewhere in the flow of evolving being, on the front of the wave of development, there and there only, is freedom, and there humanity thrives, as the crown of life and the ever moving consummation of the process of evolutional creation.

Finally, what is practically a word of personal "confession and avoidance": I have used the standard religious terms freely throughout because this is the simplest and clearest way to deal with the question. But neither this use of words nor the argument at any point is intended to imply any dogma whatsoever. So far as the word *God* is concerned, I am not acquainted with any positive or specific definition of the term which can be recommended: it is rather, for the time being, a lost word. Jalveh, Zeus, Osiris, Buddha, and the rest of the historic "gods" are either obsolete or sym-

bolic. To hold that the values which have inhered in the concept of God can be conserved and reformulated is a great act of faith; and such faith, so far from being barred by the evolutionary concept, is now possible only by grace of that concept. So with righteousness: is Man moving toward a Kingdom of Heaven, a more noble and lovely life and order, or downward toward wreck and annihilation? Any stand, inward or overt, on this supreme question is likewise an act of faith; here too a positive faith is favored, not blocked, by the concept of evolution. I know no better summing up of these faiths than that of the greatest of our religious figures: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."