

# CHARLES DARWIN AND THE DOCTRINE OF MAN

by JAMES R. MOORE

**T**HIS paper was prepared to mark the centenary of Darwin's "Descent of Man" (published in 1871). The author, whom we welcome as a newcomer to our pages, is a graduate of the University of Illinois at Urbana and of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and is about to begin a course of post-graduate research in the Manchester Faculty of Theology.

**A**NYONE hoping to write on Charles Darwin with some degree of penetration must find himself suffocated in a veritable avalanche of books, journals, magazines, and monographs. If there remains any literary life in him, it is certain to be extinguished by the multiplied footnotes and bibliographies within the materials he has at hand which reference additional mountains of works that threaten to engulf him. The distinguished subject of this essay was himself compelled to write in 1876: "For some time I collected all that appeared on the *Origin* and on my related books, and these amount (excluding newspaper reviews) to 265; but after a time I gave up the attempt in despair. Many separate essays and books on the subject have appeared; and in Germany a catalogue or bibliography on 'Darwinismus' has appeared every years or two."<sup>1</sup> Therefore the present writer has chosen to confine his researches mainly to secondary sources in order to save his literary life and sanity. However, he does not admit failure to recognize the vast primary literature surrounding Darwin's reception in the nineteenth century theological community.<sup>2</sup>

But not even secondary sources are necessary to demonstrate that man has not quite known what to think of himself since the end of the Middle Ages. In fact the media inform us daily that he is, alternately, the highest form of animal life, and the most artistically cruel beast which inhabits the planet. However, historical sources do go far to explain the human identity crisis in terms of the rise and flowering of modern science. In this, Charles

<sup>1</sup> Francis Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin: His Life Told in an Autobiographical Chapter and in a Selected Series of His Published Letters* (new ed.; London: John Murray, 1902), p. 42. This volume is an abbreviation of the three-volume *Life and Letters* (1888) whose aim is to retain the personal parts of the large edition.

Darwin, more than any other, accounts for the schizophrenic illusions of grandeur and bestiality which shake twentieth century men. *Why* this is true is the burden of this study. *How* this obtained can be shown by tracing historically some of the effects of science on man.

### I. MAN AT THE HANDS OF SCIENCE

In the fifteenth century the time was ripe for a cosmographical revolution. The Ptolemaic divorce of cosmological theory from astronomical practice had lost its universal acceptance, even if only questioned by the speculation of Nicholas of Cusa (*Learned Ignorance*, 1440). To this last great philosopher of the dying Middle Ages belongs the distinction of proclaiming the world's infinity, an idea which for man marked the end of an era. For an infinite space has no privileged center at which the earth might rest. The

<sup>2</sup> Indispensable background studies are found in Arthur O. Lovejoy's *Great Chain of Being* (1936) and J. B. Bury's *Idea of Progress* (1920). Loren Eiseley offers perhaps the best overall introduction to *Darwin's Century* (1958) from the scientific standpoint; the volume includes a basic six-page bibliography covering its major personages. Also one may consult a recent and detailed general history of the church in the latter part of the century in Owen Chadwick's *Victorian Church*, Part Two (1970). For "a study in the relations of scientific thought, natural theology and social opinion in Great Britain, 1790-1850", see Charles Coulston Gillispie's masterful *Genesis and Geology* (1951); the elaborate 28-page "Bibliographical Essay" covers virtually all materials in English for the period under the headings, "Secondary Materials", "Biographical Sources", "Contemporary Literature" ("Works of a Theological Character", "Scientific works", "Popular Science", "Miscellaneous"), and "Periodicals" ("Scientific Societies and Their Publications", "General Periodicals and Journals of Opinion"). 42 pages of notes and an index concluded this indispensable volume.

One of the finest general bibliographical sources for the post-*Origin* conflict between biology and theology, despite its distinctive bias, is A. D. White's *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology* (1896). White covers responses from America, Australia, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Rome, citing 46 serial publications and 49 books in the notes to pages 70-88 in volume one of the two-volume work. Useful but far less extensive are the references in the "Historical Introduction" to *Evolutionary Theory and Christian Belief* (1957) by David Lack. In its concluding "Suggestions for Further Reading" *Evolution and Religion* (ed. by Gail Kennedy in Heath's "Problems in American Civilization" series) contains a sizable bibliography on Darwin's social and theological influences in America. Charles Woodruff Shields also cites a great number of authors and titles in *The Final Philosophy* (1877) but unfortunately neglects to give more specific bibliographic information. Works not unlike *Genesis and Geology*, dealing explicitly with the present topic, are: Mary Frederick, *Religion and Evolution Since 1859* (1934); and W. Irvine, *Apes, Angels, and Victorians* (1955).

scientific labors of Copernicus did in fact displace the earth once and for all, thus dislodging man from the center of nature.

While religious men were wondering at their new status, other men turned their eyes heavenward. First Galileo and later Tycho Brahe reinforced Copernicus by their observations, establishing to the amazement of all the immensity of the universe and the seeming insignificance of man. But in Isaac Newton there was an epiphany of divine insight into the vast unknown:

"Nature and Nature's laws lay hid in night;  
God said, 'Let Newton be!' and all was light."

Drawing from the physics of Galileo and the laws of Kepler, a dauntless Newton laid bare God's order in his *Principia Mathematica* (1687). Man, once humbled, had been elevated; if the cosmos does not move about him he might at least know how it does move.

Forthwith, natural law ruled the world. On the Continent it was believed that God had created the "best of all possible worlds" and therefore, had no cause to interfere with its mechanism. In a more conservative England Samuel Clarke held against Leibniz that God constantly supervised his creation and occasionally tinkered with his clockwork. But when La Place had demonstrated the inherent rationality and mechanism of the cosmos, God was finally relieved of his duties. Though Kant, after formalizing the barriers to his penetration of the finite, could make him a postulate, La Place found "no need of the hypothesis".

The Enlightenment secular city in France—boasting its demographers, political theorists, and educators—was borne along by the progress of science. Cultivated and informed opinion ruled the world. England, on the other hand, swept by the revivals of Wesley and Whitefield, found herself outclassed, having little of her own scientific opinion to match the wit of French *philosophes*. Nonetheless, "the development of the idea of progress in England paralleled its growth in France, though here it assumed a theological form and was not at all anticlerical". The doctrine of man's Fall was not conducive to a notion of historical progress, but there went with it the conception of a celestial world which "when secularized provided the English idea of progress."<sup>3</sup> Erasmus Darwin (1731-1802), whose natural philosophy was to figure greatly in the intellectual development of his grandson, "was . . . a product of the immediate circumstances of the day."<sup>4</sup> Like

<sup>3</sup> Stephen F. Mason, *A History of the Sciences* (new revised ed.; New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 327.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

Lamarck, Darwin believed in an inner force driving each organism onward and upward to still higher forms.

A revolution for "*liberté, égalité, fraternité*", despite its negative implications for science, brought men's eyes back decisively to their own realm. Darwin's century inherited the faith of the *philosophes* that there are simple categories upon which to found a science of man as a social animal. Comte developed his "social physics", Marx his economic theory of surplus value and political theory of the class struggle, and Spencer eventually claimed to deduce from evolution everything from astronomy to ethics. But in England it was mainly through Lamarck (1744-1829), the last of the *philosophes*, and James Hutton (1726-1797), that the impetus for another Copernican revolution was derived.

Eyes, once glued to telescopes, began to search the earth as man's province in the kingdom of natural law. Could it be that things are ". . . on earth as it is in heaven"? The incipient interest in life, represented in the eighteenth century by the massive work of Linnaeus (1707-1778) in "systematic biology" and of Buffon (1707-1778) in comparative anatomy, reached full-blown proportions in Lamarck's *Zoological Philosophy* in 1809. Lamarck developed his theory of continuous organic evolution with man at the top of a rectilinear scale of being that stemmed from a certain primeval source. God had first created this source and then, according to Lamarck, had allowed living things to develop upward from it through the agency of an inner life force and according to "secondary law as unswerving as that which the astronomer reads in the heavens".<sup>5</sup> Hutton, dissatisfied with speculative theories of the earth current in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, directed his exacting attention to geological phenomena which record the life history of the globe. His scientific *Theory of the Earth*, published just two years before his death, set forth the thesis that all past geologic processes proceeded at the present observed rates, and thus, that all geologic formations were the product of uniform forces operating over vast periods of time. "James Hutton, in other words, was the creator of a . . . world machine whose laws of operation were as unswerving as the cosmic engine of the astronomers."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Loren Eiseley, *Darwin's Century*, Anchor Books (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961), p. 193. See J. S. Wilkie, "Buffon, Lamarck and Darwin: The Originality of Darwin's Theory of Evolution", in *Darwin's Biological Work*, ed. P. R. Bell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71.

By 1809, the year of Charles Darwin's birth, all the elements were present for his shattering synthesis. Biological progression and vast epochs of time were at his disposal. It remained for Charles Lyell (1797-1875) to show in his *Principles of Geology* (1830-34) that uniform geology was in fact the key to uniform biology. With this work the "high priest of uniformitarianism" accorded eternity the status infinity had held 300 years earlier, providing in principle for Darwin what Nicholas of Cusa bestowed on the Copernican era. Now that man possessed time in addition to matter and motion, anything might happen. Even man himself.

## II. DARWIN'S DOCTRINE

Like other epoch-making figures in human history, Charles Darwin has tended to excite equal and opposite passions: among the hosts of scientists he is esteemed as the progenitor of all that is progressive and modern in man's understanding of the world; among many Christians, at least until the last quarter-century, he has been considered the very font of heresy, the epitome of all that is degrading and demonic. Of the former passion all educated men are well-informed. The latter passion does still find occasional subdued representation in the works of modern-day Christians and must therefore be all the more deplored for its atavism, as well as for its superficiality. For example, two evangelical scholars make the facile statement that as Darwin's "religious faith ebbed his faith in evolution developed. It came in to fill up the void that was being left by creation".<sup>7</sup> This they assert without the slightest indication that there were objective scientific data which ostensibly directed Darwin's theory. Moreover, in R. E. D. Clark's admirable study, *Darwin: Before and After*, one encounters a similar piece of tendentious psychoanalysis in the claim that Darwin's chronic nervous disorder, and excessive anxiety over his scientific work "almost certainly" stemmed from "the suppression of his religious needs. His life was one long attempt to escape from Paley, to escape from the Church, to escape from God."<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Robert T. Clark and James D. Bales, *Why Scientists Accept Evolution* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1966), p. 35. The title of this 113-page book makes a pretentious and quite misleading claim which has been briefly criticized in Richard P. Aulie's letter to the editor of the *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, XXII (March, 1970), 33-34, n. 6.

<sup>8</sup> Chicago: Moody Press, 1966, p. 85. Bolton Davidheiser's *Evolution and the Christian Faith* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1969) is the most recent contribution to the "Christian anti-Darwinist" literature. It receives an even-tempered review in the *Journal* cited *supra*, pp. 28-29.

In all fairness, of course, one must mention the ludicrous aspects of scientific response to Darwin. On the one hand there is the accusation sounded loudest just after the *Origin of Species* was published in 1859, which maintained in one way or another that Darwin was some half-informed redactor of eighteenth and nineteenth century biology who used the *Origin* as an opportunity to publish the accounts of his travel adventures in the islands of the New World. This interpretation has stood condemned from its inception, and most recently by Michael T. Ghiselin in *The Triumph of the Darwinian Method*.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand there is the fanciful extrapolation of Darwin to the extremes of pan-evolutionism manifested by Herbert Spencer, Ernst Haeckel, and by the sycophants of twentieth century scientism. This conception has been nicely laid to rest in C. S. Lewis's "Funeral of a Great Myth".<sup>10</sup>

With all this said, we can be sure that justice and scholarship—of Christian men especially—will accord to a historical figure the same consideration bestowed on a contemporary acquaintance. In the case of Darwin, the attempt was made earlier to place his scientific labors in historical context. It will now be helpful, before discussing Darwin's doctrine of man, to attempt to give sympathetic understanding to the intellectual influences on his maturing thought. "Great acts of scientific synthesis are not performed in a vacuum. The influences, the books, the personalities surrounding a youthful genius are always of the utmost importance in terms of the way his own intellectual appetites come to be molded."<sup>11</sup>

We need not here repeat the familiar story of how Darwin, disillusioned with medical school at Edinburgh, was sent to Cambridge by his father to study for the ministry (though it is not often emphasized that medicine and divinity were *Dr. Robert Darwin's* preferences for his son's education, and in *that* order). Beginning at Cambridge Darwin came under influence not so much from doctors of divinity as from Professors Sedgwick and Henslow. He became acquainted with Sedgwick, a leading geologist and orthodox Christian, on a geological trip in North Wales.<sup>12</sup> The

<sup>9</sup> Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969. Not only hostile scientists but hostile Christians as well ought to become acquainted with this excellent book. G. G. Simpson thinks "the book as a whole is already unquestionably one of the very best on Darwin and his work" (*Science*, 167 [6 March, 1970], 1363).

<sup>10</sup> In *Christian Reflections* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1967), pp. 83-92.

<sup>11</sup> Eiseley, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

<sup>12</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *op. cit.*, pp. 24-25.

extent of their friendship is evident from Sedgwick's warm and lengthy letter to Darwin after the publication of his *Origins*.<sup>13</sup> As for Henslow, one of the scientific polymaths of the day, Darwin wrote in his autobiography that it was their friendship "which influenced my career more than any other." Not only was Henslow instrumental in introducing Darwin to Sedgwick, but was responsible as well for Darwin's voyage on the "Beagle", the turning-point in his scientific career. Henslow himself, observed Darwin, was "deeply religious, and so orthodox, that he has told me one day he should be grieved if a single word of the Thirty-nine Articles were altered."<sup>14</sup>

It was Sir Charles Lyell who had the greatest personal influence on Darwin's life. "I never forget", said Darwin, "that almost everything I have done in science I owe to the study of his great works."<sup>15</sup> On the "Beagle" the first volume of Lyell's *Principles of Geology* was "studied attentively" and found to be "of the highest service."<sup>16</sup> Upon receiving the first copy of *Elements of Geology*, Darwin "read it through every word" and was "full of admiration of it";<sup>17</sup> Lyell's *Antiquity of Man* was considered by him "of the highest class."<sup>18</sup> But it was the geologist's conversation and companionship which made his writings truly move Darwin's mind. Writing to Lyell regarding his *Elements*, Darwin quipped, "There is no pleasure in reading a book if one cannot have a good talk over it."<sup>19</sup> In later years he reflected:

I saw more of Lyell than any other man, both before and after my marriage. His mind was characterised, as it appeared to me, by clearness, caution, sound judgment, and a good deal of originality. When I made any remark to him on Geology, he never rested until he saw the whole case clearly, and often made me see it more

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 216-18. In this letter of November, 1859, Sedgwick, while deploring the conclusions of the *Origin*, referred to himself as "an old friend of yours", and "your true-hearted old friend".

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>15</sup> Francis Darwin, ed., *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (2 vols.; New York: D. Appleton, 1898), II, 374 (letter of February 23, 1875), cited by Clarke and Bales, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

<sup>16</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin*, p. 27. Francis Darwin wrote, "I cannot doubt that it 'smoothed the way' for the author of that work [the *Origin*] in his early searchings, as well as for his followers" (p. 168). He adds to his evaluation the reminiscence of Professor Judd: "It was the reading of the *Principles of Geology* which did most towards moulding his mind and causing him to take up the line of investigation to which his life was devoted" (p. 168).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145 (Letter of August 9, 1838 to Charles Lyell).

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 254 (letter of February 24, 1863 to J. D. Hooker).

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145 (letter of August 9, 1838 to Charles Lyell).

clearly than I had done before. He would advance all possible objections to my suggestion, and even after these were exhausted would long remain dubious.<sup>20</sup>

Religiously, however, Lyell's influence could hardly have been positive. Phlegmatic about doctrine and a nominal church-goer, Lyell appeared to Darwin to be "very kind-hearted, and thoroughly liberal in his religious beliefs, or rather disbeliefs; but he was a strong theist."<sup>21</sup>

"There is nothing so powerful in all the world as an idea whose time has come," wrote Victor Hugo. Born into an era ripe for a theoretical harvest in the biological sciences and brought under the influence of some of the era's greatest scientists, orthodox and otherwise, Darwin's brooding mind, by dint of painstaking observations and long hours of reflection, conceived that idea. "Darwin's ingenious theory . . . was indeed one of those great moments in human thinking which, like a flash in the night, suddenly illuminated new vistas for the seekers of truth in the science of life."<sup>22</sup> New vistas there were, but also new problems. If species arose inexorably one from another by adaptation and persisted through natural selection, was it possible or reasonable to declare a limit to the extent of the process? Such a limit would in fact be entirely arbitrary from a scientific standpoint, as Darwin himself recognized. Consequently he took care to include a single significant reference to man in the conclusion of the *Origin*: "Light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history". Not until later editions did he venture to add the adjective "much" to the word "light".

The omission of man from the panorama of his epochal work was neither a mistake nor a tacit confession of ignorance by Darwin. Writing to Wallace, he confided, "I think I shall avoid the whole subject, as so surrounded with prejudices, though I fully admit that it is the highest and most interesting problem for the naturalist".<sup>23</sup> But to Jenyns he offered a reason for the single reference: "With respect to man, I am very far from wishing to obtrude my belief; but I thought it dishonest to quite conceal my opinion".<sup>24</sup> The plan was well-conceived. An ambiguous hint con-

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> Alexander Wolsky, "A Hundred Years of Darwinism in Biology", in *Darwin's Vision and Christian Perspectives*, ed. by Walter J. Ong, S. J. (New York: Macmillan, 1960), p. 11.

<sup>23</sup> Francis Darwin, ed., *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (3 vols.; London: John Murray, 1888), II, 109, cited by Eiseley, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

<sup>24</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *ibid.*, II, p. 263, cited by Eiseley, *ibid.*



cerning man would be sufficient to fulfil the demands of honest scholarship. Then, if the *Origin* were well received, he might elaborate his beliefs on the origin of man himself in a separate volume. In any event, said Darwin, "It would have been useless and injurious to the success of the book to have paraded, without giving any evidence, my conviction with respect to his origin".<sup>25</sup> Another entire treatise would at length be required for so vast and poignant a subject.

*The Descent of Man*, published in 1871, embraced no new doctrine of man for Darwin. "As soon as I had become, in the year 1837 or 1838, convinced that species were mutable productions," he declared, "I could not avoid the belief that man must come under the same law".<sup>26</sup> The deduction was plausible and strictly scientific. It did not cut against the grain of his religious convictions, either when it was conceived or when his *Descent* was published, because Darwin had over the years drifted from any dogmatic moorings of his Christian heritage.<sup>27</sup> Even with the inevitable orthodox influence of Sedgwick and Henslow, there was no controlling reason in Darwin's mind why man could not have evolved from lower species. However, one might note that Darwin "postulated his theory and extended it to man without a single subhuman fossil to demonstrate the extrapolation".<sup>28</sup> He found appeal only to the meagre data of homologous structures and embryonic development in setting forth the "Evidence of the Descent of Man from some Lower Form" (Chapter 1).

What then was Darwin's response to the ancient psalmist's query, "What is man?" It was a question fraught with enormous implications. On the positive side, he was convinced that man had risen, "though not by his own exertions, to the very summit of the organic scale; and the fact of his having risen, instead of having been aboriginally placed there, may give him hope for a still higher destiny in the future". But with this hopeful doctrine went a frightful disillusionment. Darwin felt compelled to acknowledge that "man still bears in his bodily frame the indelible stamp of his lowly origin", and is thus susceptible to the fears, the passions, and the debilities present in the rest of the animal kingdom.<sup>29</sup> This in itself would not be so bad if weakness did not touch that out-

<sup>25</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin*, p. 46.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> See Darwin's autobiography (*ibid.*) and the surface treatment by R. E. D. Clark (*op. cit.*, pp. 81-95).

<sup>28</sup> Eiseley, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

<sup>29</sup> *The Descent of Man* (2nd ed.; New York: Hurst, n. d.), pp. 643-44.

standing attribute of man, his mind. But there was no scientific reason to deny that it did. Hence the frightful disillusionment: all of man's intellectual endeavors, too, must bear the "indelible stamp of his lowly origin".

Struggle as he would, Darwin could not avoid the point. He concluded in his *Descent* that "the birth both of the species and of the individual are equally parts of that grand sequence of events which our minds refuse to accept as the result of blind chance".<sup>30</sup> At the end of life he expressed the same conviction, the "impossibility of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe, including man with his capacity for looking far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity".<sup>31</sup> Moreover, in order to escape the clutch of fate Darwin reached a second conclusion: "I feel compelled to look for a First Cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man".<sup>32</sup> Yet, with tenacious honesty, he asked himself, "Can the mind of man, which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animal, be trusted when it draws such grand conclusions?"<sup>33</sup>

It was a painful position in which Darwin found himself. Having read Paley's *Natural Theology* while studying for the ministry, he could later in life remark that he "hardly ever admired a book" more than it, and that he "could have almost formerly said it by heart".<sup>34</sup> Yet at life's end he admitted that "the old argument from design in Nature, as given by Paley, which formerly seemed to me so conclusive, fails now that the law of natural selection has been discovered".<sup>35</sup> It followed that the idea of God may be a cultural accretion and the "immortality of the soul" must at best be left an open question because the advent of the soul "cannot possibly be determined in the gradually ascending organic scale".<sup>36</sup> At this point, however, despite the overwhelming logic of his science, Darwin's religious sentiments prevailed; for, believing in the perfectibility of man, he found it "an intolerable thought that he

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 637.

<sup>31</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin*, p. 61.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62.

<sup>34</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, II, 15, edition cited by Clark and Bales, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

<sup>35</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin*, p. 58. Cf. Eiseley's observation: "Darwin did not destroy the argument from design. He destroyed only the watchmaker and the watch" (*op. cit.*, p. 197).

<sup>36</sup> C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, p. 637.

and all other sentient beings are doomed to complete annihilation after such long-continued slow progress".<sup>37</sup>

A "free man's worship" found no place in Darwin's experience. No clear evidence exists that he ever did decide the dilemmas of chance and providence in their relation to man's origin and nature. Man, for Darwin, was indeed the noblest creature, but whether the chance outcome of inexorable laws operating for aeons of time, or the providential and immortal product of a divinely attended cosmos, he did not know. Once he remarked, "I feel most deeply that the whole subject is too profound for the human intellect. . . . The more I think the more bewildered I become. . . ."<sup>38</sup>

The wonder of human achievement was lost . . . in the sick revulsion of the wounded human ego. The fallen Adam had stared into the mirror of nature and perceived there only the mocking visage of an ape.<sup>39</sup>

### III. RESPONSE AND RECONCILIATION

The love affair between science and traditional theology reached its abrupt and unceremonious conclusion. In Charles Darwin a new suitor had arrived, snatched science from the hands of parson naturalists and professors of "Natural History and Theology", and had taken her away to the logical conclusions of naturalistic thought. The abduction was not to be so easily performed however; by pursuit, pleading, or sheer pugnacity clerics and theologians determined to retrieve their lost handmaiden. At no point was their conflict with Darwinism more heated than in the controversy over man's origin and nature.<sup>40</sup>

Darwin managed to avoid much of the direct onslaught. For this he would in part thank Lyell who advised him years earlier "never to get entangled in a controversy, as it rarely did any good and caused a miserable loss of time and temper".<sup>41</sup> Moreover—we may be sure that soon after its publication (November 24, 1859) his *Origin* received competition for the heresy prize from the shocking *Essays and Reviews*; thus was ecclesiastical reaction diverted from focusing its critical attack on it. Later, in 1863, Darwin could thank both Lyell and Thomas Huxley for saving him the pains of controversy, for the former published his *Antiquity of Man*, and the

<sup>37</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin*, p. 61.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 236 (letter of May 22, 1860 to Asa Gray).

<sup>39</sup> Eiseley, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

<sup>40</sup> See David Lack, *Evolutionary Theory and Christian Belief* (London: Methuen, 1957), chap. 8.

<sup>41</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin*, p. 43.

latter, *Man's Place in Nature*. Like *Essays and Reviews*, both books served to drain off some of the clerical choler, and, in a greater sense, conditioned the public for *The Descent of Man*.

Huxley however was called Darwin's "bulldog" for another reason. To understand this one must first realize that Darwin's supporters seemed very few in number in the months following publication of the *Origin*.<sup>42</sup> Opposition was coming from a great number of scientists and from such theologians as had closely identified themselves with the scientific establishment.<sup>43</sup> Because it was a *silent* majority (as it happened) who supported Darwin, the gap between science and theology became greatly enlarged by his vociferous opponents. In the second place it is necessary to point out that the issue "was not concerned solely with the truth of a particular theory". Involved was "a fight for the freedom of scientific enquiry against religious dogma and prejudice, of truth against authority".<sup>44</sup> Darwin himself was neither verbally gifted nor temperamentally equipped both to argue his own theory and to champion the cause of scientific freedom. He would have to enlist an eloquent, tough-minded scientist and personal friend if he expected the issues to be resolved in his favor. Thomas Huxley was such a man.

Darwin did not even find it necessary to arrange a confrontation. The occasion happily presented itself on Saturday, June 30, 1860, at the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Having pledged the day before to answer an anti-Darwinist who had voiced his puerile sentiments, Huxley sat before a capacity audience as he listened to Bishop Samuel Wilberforce revile Darwinism "for a full half hour with inimitable spirit, emptiness, and unfairness". Said one eye-witness:

It was evident from his handling of the subject . . . that he knew nothing at first hand. . . . He ridiculed Darwin badly, and Huxley savagely, but all in such dulcet tones, so persuasive a manner, and in such well-turned periods, that I who had been inclined to blame the President for allowing a discussion that could serve no scientific purpose, now forgave him from the bottom of my heart.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>42</sup> In his *Apologia pro Vita sua* (1864) Cardinal Newman doubtless expressed the sentiments of many silent supporters of Darwin: ". . . at the moment it is so difficult to say precisely what it is that is to be encountered and overthrown." To him "it seemed to be a time in which Christians had a call to be patient" (cited by Lack, *op. cit.*, p. 19).

<sup>43</sup> L. E. Elliott-Binns, *The Development of English Theology in the Later Nineteenth Century* (London: Longmans, Green, 1952), p. 25.

<sup>44</sup> Lack, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

<sup>45</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin*, pp. 237-38.

Wilberforce himself was a great man in his own right, a person possessed of rare personal charm and zeal. Among many noble feats, he had effected reforms in episcopal administration, introduced parochial missions, and founded the theological college at Cuddesden. But he had ventured too far afield when he spoke theologically of things biological. Another eye-witness recorded a few of his words on this memorable occasion:

I should like to ask Professor Huxley who is sitting by me, and is about to tear me to pieces when I have sat down, as to his belief in being descended from an ape. Is it on his grandfather's or his grandmother's side that the ape ancestry comes in?

In a graver tone he concluded his oration with the assertion that Darwin's views were contrary to the revelations of God in the Scriptures. Huxley then took the floor and launched the broadside which earned him the "bulldog" appellation, part of which reads:

I should feel it no shame to have risen from such an origin. But I should feel it a shame to have sprung from one who prostituted the gifts of culture and of eloquence to the service of prejudice and falsehood.<sup>46</sup>

Most of the orthodox were not gifted with the urbanity and eloquence of a Wilberforce. Dean Church observed that they behaved "more like old ladies than philosophers".<sup>47</sup> A. D. White does not fail to record every turn of their invective: Darwin's work was "a huge imposture from the beginning", "a jungle of fanciful assumption", and, outstandingly, "an attempt to dethrone God"; those who gave their allegiance to him were "under the frenzied inspiration of the inhaler of mephitic gas".<sup>48</sup> Some went so far as to suggest that Darwinism had been sent by God to distinguish between the true believers and the rest.<sup>49</sup> While the tidal crest of controversy launched in England fifteen years before was beginning to inundate North America, in 1874 a cooler and more learned Charles Hodge published *What Is Darwinism?* "The most popular

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* Many versions of the exchange were current. That cited here is the shortest reported by Francis Darwin and seems to embody the substance of the reports. Wilberforce's views were in fact quite open and were articulated with sincere conviction. He accepted the idea of natural selection but argued forcibly (see his review of the *Origin* in the *Quarterly Review*, July, 1860) that it could not account for man's unique moral and spiritual condition. See Lack, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15. One needs only mention the Scopes' "Monkey Trial" of 1925 to show how little religious spokesmen across the Atlantic profited from this history. Like all those who do not learn from history, they are condemned to repeat its mistakes.

—<sup>47</sup> Elliott-Binns, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

<sup>48</sup> *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology* (2 vols., reprint ed.; New York: Dover Publications, 1960), I, 71.

<sup>49</sup> Elliott-Binns, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

exposition of anti-Darwinian views" of the time,<sup>50</sup> his book made it indubitably clear that whether atheism or theism ultimately became attached to the Darwinian philosophy made little difference to Christianity. In either event, asserted Hodge, the philosophy was inherently hostile because its conception of man's origin, his life, and his destiny "was essentially different from the Christian conception of creation, fall, and redemption."<sup>51</sup>

The Roman Church had its cut-and-dried methods for dealing with the problem. Orestes A. Brownson, a convert from infidelity and brilliant American essayist, urged a representatively rigid position of non-compromise. Though aware that the English naturalist St. George Mivart, a Roman Catholic, believed that evolution was consistent with the teachings of Augustine, Aquinas, the Suarez,<sup>52</sup> Brownson called for a categorical repudiation of nineteenth-century geology and biology as regressions from the science of Aquinas. According to him man could not possibly have descended from the ape because the *differentia* of man are not present in the ape and therefore cannot be developed from it.<sup>53</sup> Another writer, the French Catholic physician Constantin James, produced in 1877 a book in which Darwin's *Descent* was called a "fairy tale", a volume "so fantastic and so burlesque". Upon receiving a copy of *On Darwinism, or the Man-Ape*, Pope Pius IX wrote to James that "it refutes so well the aberrations of Darwinism". Man's pride, the Pope continued, proclaims him independent, his own king, priest and God, and then "goes so far as to degrade man himself to the level of the unreasoning brutes, perhaps even of lifeless matter . . .". For his service to God and Church James was made an officer in the Papal Order of St. Sylvester.<sup>54</sup> But for others who persisted in believing that "the doctrines of the Church can ever receive a sense in accordance with the purposes of science other than that which the Church has understood and

<sup>50</sup> Gail Kennedy, ed., *Evolution and Religion: The Conflict Between Science and Theology in Modern America* ("Problems in American Civilization"; Boston: D. C. Heath, 1957), p. 11.

<sup>51</sup> John Dillenberger, *Protestant Thought and Natural Science* (London: Collins, 1961), p. 244.

<sup>52</sup> Charles Woodruff Shields, *The Final Philosophy* (New York: Scribner, Armstrong, 1877), p. 355. Mivart's book is *Genesis of the Species*.

<sup>53</sup> Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

<sup>54</sup> White, *op. cit.*, I, 75f. Elated at this final development, James expanded the work into a new edition published in 1882, *Moses and Darwin: The Man of Genesis compared with the Man-Ape, or Religious Education Opposed to Atheistic*.

still understands", the Vatican Council of 1870 reserved the anathema.<sup>55</sup>

By 1877 Charles Woodruff Shields of Princeton could observe that there was "a large and increasing class who are seeking to blend the whole paleontological series in one continuous creation or creative evolution . . .". Darwin, Hooker, Wallace, and other lesser naturalists no longer bore the standards of evolution alone, for they had "begun to receive recruits from the ranks of earnest laymen and zealous divines, bringing with them the orthodox banner of creationism into the very thick of the battle".<sup>56</sup> Charles Kingsley, Christian Socialist and antagonist to John Henry Newman, exhibited the new attitude very early: "I must give up much that I have believed and learned", he wrote to Darwin after reading a pre-publication copy of the *Origin*. "All I have seen of it awes me."<sup>57</sup> In reality Kingsley was bent on saving something of Butlerian and Paleyan natural theology, but only by developing it further in an attitude of calmness, hope, and goodwill.<sup>58</sup> For him it was loftier to think of God designing "primal forms capable of self-development into all forms needful *pro tempore* and *pro loco*" than to cling to a fiat creation of individual species.<sup>59</sup>

This kind of interpretation gained greater currency than any other, but with man himself excepted from the evolutionary continuity. Benjamin Field's popular *Student's Handbook of Christian Theology*, first published in 1869, left evolution without condemnation as an unproved hypothesis, which in any event cannot account for man's noble nature.<sup>60</sup> The Bampton Lecture for 1884 agreed in general with Darwin's theory but emphasized that it neither accounts for the "Moral Law" and the "spiritual faculty of man", nor does it jibe with the biblical teaching of man's essential difference from the animals. The lecturer, Frederick Temple, a contributor to *Essays and Reviews* and later Archbishop of Canterbury, believed man's spiritual faculty was implanted long ago after his body had developed from lower species. Because this divine ennobling of man is inaccessible to science, said he, "there is nothing in all that Science has yet taught, or is on the way to teach, which conflicts with the doctrine that we are made in the

<sup>55</sup> Elliott-Binns, *op. cit.*, p. 31. Cf. n. 42 above.

<sup>56</sup> Shields, *op. cit.*, pp. 354-55.

<sup>57</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin*, p. 229 (letter of November 18, 1859).

<sup>58</sup> Dillenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

<sup>59</sup> F. Darwin, ed., *Charles Darwin*, p. 229 (letter of November 18, 1859).

<sup>60</sup> New edition, edited by Rev. John C. Symons (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896), pp. 129-30, 136-39.

Divine Image . . .".<sup>61</sup> In America, Henry Ward Beecher converted to Darwinism and subsequently became one of the most outspoken defenders of its compatibility with revelation. His sensational *Evolution and Religion*, published in 1885, taught the existence of two revelations, one special and one general, the first recording the "unfolding of *man* and of the race" and the second revealing the "divine thought through the unfolding history of *matter*".<sup>62</sup> Though man's ape ancestry was for Beecher an unproved hypothesis, it was nevertheless one which he was inclined to accept because of the light it threw on human life and history! But drawing back at the critical point Beecher maintained that "there was a time unknown, and methods not yet discovered, in which man left behind his prior relatives, and came upon the spiritual ground which now distinguishes him from the whole brute creation".<sup>63</sup> One of the most interesting attempts to exempt man from his Darwinian "descent" was that of James McCosh, professor at Princeton Seminary, and formerly of Queen's College, Belfast (1852-1868). Taking a vigorous stand against the widespread denunciation of evolution among American clergy, he produced *The Religious Aspect of Evolution*, which after 1890 "exercised a great influence upon American intellectual life".<sup>64</sup> There McCosh advanced the doctrine that the emergence of man from amidst the species was the consequence of divine "natural election". That is, it was his belief that God had used Darwinian natural selection providentially to bring into being man, his designed end product in the evolutionary process. Unfortunately for McCosh, his Calvinistic immanentizing of biology was destined to founder when the science of genetics showed that random mutation was the ultimate source of variation and when evolutionary progress became divorced from Christian theology in the twentieth century.<sup>65</sup>

Those were days filled with tensions and hostilities. In 1869 the philosopher Henry Sidgwick wrote:

I feel convinced that English religious society is going through a great crisis just now, and it will probably become impossible soon

<sup>61</sup> Lecture VI, "The Relations Between Religion and Science", in A. O. J. Cockshut, ed., *Religious Controversies of the Nineteenth Century: Selected Documents* (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), p. 265.

<sup>62</sup> Kennedy, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>64</sup> Ernst Benz, *Evolution and Christian Hope*, trans. by Heinz G. Frank, Anchor Books (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968), p. 153.

<sup>65</sup> Dillenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

<sup>66</sup> From *Henry Sidgwick: A Memoir*, p. 187 (letter of January, 1869), cited by Elliott-Binns, *op. cit.*, p. 10.



to conceal from anybody the extent to which rationalistic views are held, and the extent of their deviation from traditional opinion.<sup>66</sup>

The signs of impending crisis began in 1860. "The most sensational theological event in England" in mid-century—apart from the appearance a year earlier of Darwin's *Origin*—was the publication of *Essays and Reviews*. Its effect at a time when the Darwinian controversy was already "inflaming partisan feeling, . . . was explosive".<sup>67</sup> Because it was an attempt on the part of prominent scholars to mediate between new critical knowledge and the historic creed, "a widespread state of alarm arose." "For the moment Evangelicals and Tractarians forgot their differences to join up in the outcry against it."<sup>68</sup> On the other side of the crisis in belief, twenty-nine years later, the change in religious thought pattern is reflected in the essays of *Lux Mundi*. While the earlier essays were generally radical and innovative, the Anglo-Catholic authors of *Lux Mundi* represented a more conservative liberalism gone on the defensive. Some of the writers even looked backward through the intellectual currents rather than forward. The book itself elicited some commotion from the old guard of the Church, but nothing to be compared with the reaction to *Essays and Reviews*. The religious public had become insensitive to "rationalistic views" and controversy in the decades which saw science follow after Darwin in one accord and not a little theology with it.

While some younger theologians "threw everything into the seething pot and wondered what would emerge,"<sup>69</sup> there was a greater mind than theirs in their midst. Today his accomplishments seem all the more significant for having place in a life filled with almost unbelievable incongruities. Born in 1851 and raised in an orthodox, evangelical home, he was trained at Edinburgh, in natural science at the University and in theology at New College. Following a summer term at Tübingen he returned to England to work extensively with D. L. Moody in the revivals of 1873-1875. First proving himself helpful in the administrations of Moody's famous "Inquiry Room," he was soon sent out by the great evangelist to hold "men's meetings" and to minister to those who had made commitments throughout the mission. His eloquent speech and great personal compassion were instrumental in leading hundreds to faith in Jesus Christ. A decade later, after lending his aid to Moody's second campaign in the Isles, he was

<sup>67</sup> Bernard M. G. Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), p. 309.

<sup>68</sup> Elliott-Binns, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

appointed to a theological chair as Professor of Natural Science at the Free Church College, Glasgow, which position he held until his early death in 1897.

This is the remarkable story of Henry Drummond, "possibly the most important among the Anglo-Saxon theologians of evolution".<sup>70</sup> His contribution to the harmonizing of Christianity and science in general, evolution in particular, can hardly be overestimated in terms of its scope and influence. By the time of his death, his *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, published in 1883, had sold over 120,000 copies in Great Britain alone and had brought him praise and gratitude from hungry souls the world over.<sup>71</sup> Even today one finds his devotional classic, *The Greatest Thing in the World*, on bookstands everywhere. The genius of Drummond's accomplishment was that "he did not simply try to attach a theological tail to the Darwinist theory of evolution".<sup>72</sup> On the surface it may have appeared that he was merely tail-tagging, or proposing a new analogy, not as Butler did between religion and the course of nature, but between Christianity and biological science. However, for Drummond Christianity was more than a tangent or an analogy to evolution. It was evolution. Evolution both in the natural and in the spiritual spheres proceeding according to fixed laws had produced higher forms of life (as evidenced in Darwin's *Origin* and in God's Bible) and, as God's cosmic plan, had reached its simultaneous natural and spiritual perfection in Jesus Christ and the epoch of new humanity inaugurated by him. The inorganic order evolves, separated from the organic by the catastrophic gap between matter and physical life. The organic order evolves, embracing the inorganic, and separated from the spiritual world by the catastrophic gap between physical and spiritual life. With the advent of Christianity, according to Drummond, there is a spiritual "Third Kingdom", embracing both inorganic and organic orders, in which the further lines of all evolution are being disclosed. This he called "the evolution of evolution".<sup>73</sup>

This startling anticipation of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin came from one who possessed the deep conviction that the power of the historic Christ transforms human lives and conforms them to his

<sup>70</sup> Benz, *op. cit.*, pp. 156-57.

<sup>71</sup> George Adam Smith, *The Life of Henry Drummond* (New York: George H. Doran, 1901), chap. 9.

<sup>72</sup> Benz, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

<sup>73</sup> Henry Drummond, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1887), pp. 401ff. See Smith's chapter "Evolution and Revelation" (*op. cit.*, chapt. 10).

image.<sup>74</sup> The incongruity between Drummond's evangelical profession and his evolutionary theology is however softened in his last work, *The Ascent of Man*. There one finds a glaring conflict with biblical Christology in an anthropology which claims that Man is "the Alpha and Omega of Creation, the beginning and end of Matter, the final goal of Life".<sup>75</sup> Too, it is difficult to know just what to say when an alleged evangelical locates "the higher human Soul" in "the warm world of the affections", or when he considers man not truly human until "love becomes to him the breath of life" in which lies "all happiness and goodness, and truth and divinity".<sup>76</sup> Finally, in the book's last chapter, where evolutionary progress, the divinization of all nature, is equated with Christianity in the crassest fashion, one is convinced that Drummond has in fact abandoned biblical orthodoxy. Whereas others attempted to coordinate Scripture with a reasonably postulated version of evolutionary theory, understanding man in biblical context, Drummond subsumed all revelation under a fanciful notion of pan-evolutionism in which man ascends unhindered and uninterrupted from primordial slime to a kingdom of perfection.<sup>77</sup>

#### IV. IMMANENCE, PROGRESS, AND THE ANCIENT DREAMS

In Drummond's conclusion to *The Ascent of Man*, which speaks of the immanent God of Evolution and of man's onward and upward "development through Ideals" which is itself the "Perfect Ideal", we have in summation the two aspects of the predominant theological response to Darwinian evolution in the nineteenth century. How right Reardon is to observe that "in time the Darwinian theory . . . was assimilated, more or less. But the effect of the assimilation upon theology was to stress the immanence of deity in the cosmos at the expense of the divine transcendence and magisterial control over that which, in the beginning, had been

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Teilhard de Chardin's *Divine Milieu* and Drummond's place in the development of "man's concept of the future, from the Early Fathers to Teilhard de Chardin" in Benz (*op. cit.*, chaps. 9-13).

<sup>75</sup> 3rd ed.; New York: James Pott, 1894, p. 116.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 216.

<sup>77</sup> "The reason why men grudge to Evolution each of its fresh claims to show how things have been made is the groundless fear that if we discover how they are made we minimize their divinity" (*ibid.*, pp. 333-34). "Love is the final result of Evolution. . . . Evolution is not progress in matter. Matter cannot progress. It is a progress in Spirit, in that which is limitless, in that which is at once most human, most rational, and most divine" (p. 335). "Evolution is Advolution; better, it is Revelation—the phenomenal expression of the Divine, the progressive realization of the Ideal, the Ascent of Love" (p. 339).

created *ex nihilo*".<sup>78</sup> It is not hard to understand how this aspect of the synthesis, what Kenneth Hamilton has termed a "revolt against heaven", came to pass. There was the influence of post-Kantian German philosophy, of Hegel, Schopenhauer, and the *Naturphilosophie*. Through Thomas Carlyle came the poetic insights of Goethe, and from America there was not a little literature of the so-called Transcendentalists.<sup>79</sup> The rise of biblical criticism was certainly an important factor. But, above all, it was the deism of the Enlightenment, whose influence theologians were compelled to escape if they cared for their faith, which created the environment for the rise of idealistic immanentism, at least in the Anglo-Saxon world. Butler and Paley had suffered almost total demise under the impact of an advancing science whose concern it was to show that terrestrial phenomena are as orderly as the heavens. A new and better apologetic was desperately needed, as Darwin himself discovered in his struggle to retain man's significance in the face of what Loren Eiseley calls the "unexpected universe". Then, rather suddenly, the issue was forced: from one point of view,

Darwinism appeared and, under the guise of a foe, did the work of a friend. It . . . conferred upon philosophy and religion an inestimable benefit, by showing . . . that we must choose between two alternatives. Either God is present everywhere in nature or he is present nowhere. . . . It seems as if, in the providence of God, the mission of modern science was to bring home to our unmetaphysical ways of thinking the great truth of the Divine immanence in creation. . . .<sup>80</sup>

Drummond as quoted above exemplifies not only immanentism but also the "idea of progress" in post-Darwinian theology. Man had suffered the ultimate degradation at the hands of Darwin and his followers. In tortured incredulity he asked, "Is it true that man is no more than a fortuitous offspring of the parent order, a kind of cosmic joke? No," he said to himself, "such a view is too bad, too unbearably humiliating to be true." But rather than being driven to despair by his radical romantic inconsistency, man, constitutional optimist that he is (read "sinner"—for the Gospel is, at first, *bad* news, and *then* good, and is by no means merely optimistic), chose to believe in the perpetual and unlimited progress

<sup>78</sup> Reardon, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

<sup>79</sup> See Clement C. J. Webb's study of *Religious Thought in England from 1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933) with the special attention it pays to immanentism and idealism.

<sup>80</sup> Aubrey Moore, "The Christian Doctrine of God", in *Lux Mundi*, ed. by Charles Gore (New York: United States Book Co., n. d.), p. 82.

of his species, and not only *homo sapiens*, but his crafts, his institutions, and his universe.<sup>81</sup>

Without a personal knowledge of God through Jesus Christ and of his revelation in Holy Scripture, one might demonstrate historically that man will not merely formulate such an ideology occasionally, but inevitably. Man without God is either pessimist or optimist, either materialist or idealist, either overlooking his divinity or exaggerating it. Nineteenth century science and the theology which responded to it in idealistic immanentism and progressivism are the prime examples. The tragedy of their conflict and synthesis is the psychic wound suffered by man on account of the struggle, described by Ernest Renan with prophetic insight in 1849:

If, through the constant labour of the nineteenth century, the knowledge of facts has considerably increased, the destiny of mankind has, on the other hand, become more obscure than ever. The serious thing is that we fail to perceive a means of providing humanity in the future with a catechism that will be acceptable henceforth, except on the condition of returning to a state of credulity. Hence it is possible that the ruin of idealistic beliefs may be fated to follow hard upon the ruin of supernatural beliefs, and that the real abasement of the morality of humanity will date from the day it has seen the reality of things. . . . Candidly speaking, I fail to see how, without the ancient dreams, the foundations of a happy noble life are to be relaid.<sup>82</sup>

The present century did in fact see the rise of a new realism having its roots in Hume and Kant which summarily stripped away the idealistic accretions of nineteenth century theology. The "ruin of idealistic beliefs" came in 1903 with G. E. Moore's classic "Refutation of Idealism";<sup>83</sup> the "real abasement of the morality of humanity" began in the same year, again in Moore, with the publication of his *Principia Ethica* showing the impossibility of a naturalistic ethic. Morality itself succumbed eleven years later in "the War to end all wars", and with it any notions of human progress. At present the "foundations of a happy and noble life" have not yet been relaid for modern man. Since Darwin rather,

<sup>81</sup> J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (reprint ed.; New York: Dover, 1955), p. 335.

<sup>82</sup> From the preface to *The Future of Science*, cited by James Orr, *The Christian View of God and the World* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954), p. 67. In the note to the quotation Orr includes the words Renan wrote elsewhere: "We are living on the perfume of an empty vase".

<sup>83</sup> Originally published in *Mind*, collected in Moore's *Philosophical Studies* (1922), and now reprinted in Morris Weitz, ed., *20th Century Philosophy: The Analytic Tradition* (New York: The Free Press, 1966).

the foundation has been crumbling beneath the twisted superstructure of his theologies. According to Langdon Gilkey, "the modern sense of radical contingency, relativity, and temporality . . . has its origin in Darwin". "More than any other result of modern inquiry", his theory has undermined the idea of meaningful life in a supernatural, providential, and teleological order.<sup>84</sup>

Indeed, post-Darwinian man is in the throes of an identity crisis. First displaced from the center of a providential universe, and now shown to be the chance product of blind forces operating through endless aeons of time, man, like Darwin himself, becomes increasingly bewildered the more he considers his plight. One thing is certain: the confused dreams of dignity and abundant life which from ancient time he has been unable to suppress, will not be realized apart from a transcendent view of himself. Wittgenstein was right: "The solution of the riddle of life in space and time lies *outside* space and time." Neither immanentism nor progressivism but rather a tough-minded biblical realism supplies the needed transcendent perspective, the foundation for a happy and noble life that *is* laid, which is Jesus Christ.<sup>85</sup>

*Trinity Evangelical Divinity School,  
Deerfield, Illinois.*

<sup>84</sup> *Naming the Whirlwind* (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), p. 40, n. 4.

<sup>85</sup> Erich Sauer, for example, shows the nobility of man according to the Bible and science in his much-acclaimed *King of the Earth* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1962).