

No. 4

IS EVOLUTION TRUE?

How Did Man  
Come to Be?

By

W. BELL DAWSON,  
M.A., D.Sc., M.Inst.C.E., F.R.S.C.,  
Gold Medallist in Geology and the Natural  
Science, McGill University; Fellow of the  
Royal Society of Canada; Laureate of the  
Academy of Sciences, Paris.

---

BY KIND PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR.

AUSTRALIAN EDITION.

Published by  
THE CHRISTIAN WORKERS' DEPOT,  
145 Commonwealth Street, Sydney.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

Quantities at Greatly Reduced Prices.

## How Did Man Come to Be?

WE know that for long ages there were only plants and trees, birds and animals on the earth; and if we ask how it is that there are people in the world now, the plainest answer is what the Bible tells us: that God created man upon the earth. But in these days there are many who do not wish to believe this; and they question what the Bible says. For many scientists have been saying that men came from the animals, which gradually improved themselves until they could think, and could make tools and build houses, and do many other clever things. There is a great deal to be said about all this; so let us look first at what the Scriptures themselves say about creation.

The book of Genesis, which tells us that God made the world and placed man upon it, has always been called one of the books of Moses; so that he no doubt wrote it. But it is almost certain that the account of the creation as he wrote it down was very much older than his time. We can also see a very good reason why God should tell men so early in the world's history about the creation. For when all things in heaven and on earth were made by Him, there can be only One true God. If men believed this, they could not suppose that there are many gods; and they would thus be kept free from idolatry and superstition, as well as from other errors which lead them entirely astray.

If we look through the Scriptures, we find that the patriarchs and prophets, throughout Bible times, believed most certainly that God created man. The Psalmist, five centuries after the time of Moses, calls upon all lands to know that the Lord is God; for "it is He that hath made us, and not we ourselves" (Ps. c.). The last prophet of the Old Testament, six hundred years later than the Psalmist, says: "Have

we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?" (Mal. ii. 10). Before the time of Christ, some learned philosophers arose among the Greeks (then the most intelligent nation) who tried to find out by reasoning how the world came to be; but the Apostle Paul, when he spoke to the Greeks at Athens, told them plainly that "God . . . made the world and all things therein," and that He "hath made of one blood all nations of men" (Acts xvii. 24, 26). In the prophecy of Revelation, one of the latest visions shows an angel flying in the midst of heaven, and saying with a loud voice to every nation, and tongue, and people: "Fear God, . . . and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea" (Rev. xiv. 6, 7). So we find this doctrine of God as the Creator throughout the whole Bible from the first verse to the end.

### The Search of Evolution.

There are many who are unwilling to believe that God created man, because this means that man was pure and good at first; and that men have fallen from that high level because they did not obey God; and most people still take their own way and live to please themselves. So they like to believe what some learned men tell them; that men have come up from the animals, and that they have become as clever as they now are by gradually improving themselves. This is the doctrine which Evolution teaches. Those who think this, take all the credit to themselves for becoming intelligent and clever; for they suppose that men never needed the help from God. They think also that they are not responsible to God, and will not have to give an account to Him for what they do. What Evolution teaches, leads people to think this; and we see at once that it is the exact opposite of what the Lord, the Holy One, declares: "I have made the earth, and created man upon it."

## Is Evolution True?

When we look into the idea that man is an improved animal, we should remember that this is only a small part of the wide theory of Evolution. For this theory must begin at the beginning of things, if it is to stand; as we have shown in previous numbers of this series. From the time that life appeared in the world, the plants and animals which we find in the ancient rocks, raise their voice against Evolution and not for it.<sup>1</sup> It thus finds no sure foundation there. Yet when we come to man, few people consider how needful it is to have some groundwork to start from; because they are only interested in how human beings came to be what they are. So they want to begin their dinner with the dessert; they do not like the solid meat first, to make their dinner complete.

When there is nothing to show that any Evolution went on before there were men in the world, we may well ask for very clear proofs as to the Evolution of man. It is certainly difficult to find any proof that some poor creatures, after getting to be half beast and half human, gradually groped their way upward till they became men. The more we come to know, the greater the difficulty, in proving such a thing; and because of this, the evolutionists come to disagree among themselves, and have even to change their views. Yet the public still believe things about men and monkeys which have been given up by scientists. The newspapers also mislead us; because what they print is always in favour of Evolution; and the points against it they do not publish.<sup>2</sup> So we need to be careful to look into what

<sup>1</sup> See previous numbers in this series, entitled: "Is Evolution True?"

<sup>2</sup> An eminent scientist, widely known in educational circles, says in a private letter: "The Press affords every opportunity to publish modernist and evolutionary ideas, but the counter-statements are boycotted; and the result is that the young people hardly ever get the chance of hearing a serious presentment of the truth."

## How Did Man Come to Be?

is known with certainty, and what has to be given up as unlikely and unproved.

**Darwin's Views.**—A great discussion about man began when Charles R. Darwin wrote his first book in 1859; which is now over seventy years ago. The general idea that people got from his books was that man has descended from the monkey, by improving gradually. But the question at once came up: Why should improvement take place? From everything we know in nature, nothing rises to a higher level by itself. From the minutest atom to the mightiest star we hear the one voice: We cannot improve ourselves. The great races of creatures which were so highly developed in the past ages of Geology have all deteriorated. How, then, could improvement take place? Science itself insists that everything which happens must have some cause; and that if animals developed into men, there must have been some force which pushed them onward and upward. We read in our nursery books about the three swans which were turned by magic into three brothers, or the princess who became a frog to punish her for her haughtiness. Yet even in these stories there was a witch's wand or some enchantment to make these things happen. But evolutionists could scarcely rely on such things to turn animals into men; and if they cannot show some reasonable cause for it, Evolution becomes no better than a fairy tale.

Now, Darwin was a scientist, and he, therefore, saw quite plainly that if his theory was to stand, he must find some "actuating causes" which would make it work out. He, therefore, put forward three impelling forces which he said would be able to change monkeys into men.<sup>1</sup> We need not trouble now to explain these, or to follow the arguments about them; for many able men have looked into them carefully during all these years, and new dis-

<sup>1</sup> These were: (1) Natural Selection, (2) the Struggle for Existence, and (3) the Survival of the Fittest.

## Is Evolution True?

coveries have been made by experiments with plants and animals.<sup>1</sup> The outcome is that Darwin's three causes are not able to bring about the result. This is admitted by a well-known scientist, who is keen to persuade everyone that Evolution is right; and we can take it from him that no cause is known that can change one creature into another. He even says that since we know more, it is now far more difficult to find a cause than it was in Darwin's time.<sup>2</sup>

So this difficulty stands yet as an impassable barrier in the path of evolutionists; and they can hardly ask us to believe Evolution till they can themselves find a way around it. This does not mean that they have given up trying, for many reasons are put forward. Yet these only give rise to arguments; for they admit that they do not know where to look for a way out of the trouble.<sup>3</sup>

Notwithstanding all this, evolutionists are very unwilling to give up their views; and so they say: "Even though we may not know what it was that caused apes to change into men, we still believe it." So let us look next to see whether there is any proof that such a thing really happened.

**The Missing Link.**—When Darwin's book appeared, people at once said: "If men came from monkeys, we ought to be able to find creatures that are half-way between the two." It was very reasonable to think this; and so the search began for what was called the "missing link" between man and the monkey. We must remember that this began seventy

<sup>1</sup> Notably Mendel's Law regarding reproduction.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. H. F. Osborn, head of the American Museum of Natural History, at British Association meeting, August, 1926, said frankly: "Our enhanced knowledge makes the problem of the causes of the origin of species infinitely more difficult even than it had appeared to Darwin."

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Osborn says further regarding causes: "The old paths of research have led nowhere, and the question arises: What lines shall new researches and experiments follow?" (See "Origin and Evolution of Life," preface and page 10.)

## How Did Man Come to Be?

years ago; and all the remotest corners of the world have been searched and the most degraded men have been hunted for, in every continent; but no men half-way back to monkeys could be found. Then it was said: We must go further back. And so search was made for skulls of men who lived before any history was written in their part of the world; but with no better success, as we shall see presently.

A noted biologist of the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, Dr. Austin H. Clark, says of this: "There are no such things as missing links. Missing link are misinterpretations." And Professor Virchow has said: "The ape-man has no existence and the missing link remains a phantom."

So the evolutionists have been obliged to change their views entirely. Since there is no direct link or connection to be found, it is useless to keep on saying that man has developed from some monkey or ape. The new idea that they have taken up instead, is to suppose that man and the monkeys have "a common ancestor." This means that men are not in a direct family line from monkeys, but that they are "cousins" to them. Yet there is no creature known which can be taken for a "first grandfather" to men and apes; and this common ancestor can no more be found than the missing link could be. Indeed, a very prominent evolutionist says that it is not likely he ever will be found; for "the roll of the ages must have erased by now all traces of the common ancestor from which scientists conclude man and monkey developed."<sup>1</sup> A very strange thing to say, when perfectly preserved skeletons of creatures are found, which lived long ages before men were in the world. There is thus nothing to prove that this supposed ancestor ever existed. So we see once more that Evolution can only be proved

<sup>1</sup> Address by Dr. Osborn, as retiring President, Amer. Assoc. Advancement of Science, Dec., 1929.

## Is Evolution True?

by what is not known. It is a theory founded on ignorance.

As to the want of proof for Evolution, an eminent scientist, Dr. William Bateson, is very outspoken. What he says is all the more forceful, as he tells us that his faith in Evolution remains unshaken. He says that it is impossible any longer to agree with Darwin's theory, and we cannot see how new kinds of creatures began; there is no account of how it happened that we can accept. Although it is essential for Evolution to show how one creature turned into another, this is still utterly mysterious to us. Yet we may believe in Evolution, if by belief we mean faith, the evidence of things not seen.<sup>1</sup>

We can readily see how far-reaching this statement is. For Evolution is a theory which is put forward as an explanation of how man as well as other creatures came to be what they are. Yet this learned leader in science admits that it fails in the very thing it was meant to explain. He also says that there is so little to prove it, that it can only be taken on faith. Surely, then, the Christian believer has quite as good a right to hold to his faith, that the Lord Almighty created man, as the Scriptures tell us. It is thus plain that we must make a choice, which of the two we will believe.

## The Intelligence of Man.

The contrast between Evolution and what the Bible tells us will come out clearly if we ask: Were men intelligent at first, as the Bible says; or did they only learn to be clever and skilful during thousands upon thousands of years since they were animals? For it is plain that if apes or any other beasts turned

<sup>1</sup> This is a fair outline, in simplified wording, of his statements at the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in Toronto, Dec., 1921.

## How Did Man Come to Be?

into men, it would take very many thousands of years for them to learn to make tools and weapons and pottery. We see, then, that evolutionists are obliged to imagine a vast stretch of time since there were creatures which were even half way between animals and men. They have also to suppose that the earliest of men were very stupid indeed; and that they only became intelligent very gradually.

If we are studying the remains of men who did not leave any inscriptions or other writing, the only way we can judge of their intelligence is by the things which they made, or by the size of their brains as shown by their skulls. When men need tools and weapons for hunting, the best material which they can readily get to make them of is very hard stone such as flint. So flint knives or axes, and flint arrow-heads, are among the earliest things we find that belonged to primitive men. Other things that they did might not leave any trace or remains.

**Flint Implements, and Cave Men.**—If we dig into the remains of any ancient tribe which used flint implements, can we be sure that they lived immensely far back in a remote Stone Age? Is it certain that there were no civilised people anywhere in the world at that time? For throughout history there has always been a "Stone Age" in some part of the world, at a time when other countries were civilised. In the sixteenth century, when North America was discovered, the Indians there were living in the Stone Age, while Europeans were beginning to print books. Their flint implements were precisely the same, to the last detail, as those of the ancient Stone Age in Western Europe. They both had flint arrow-heads and polished stone axes; hammer-heads grooved around, for lashing to a handle, and a grooved tool for a gouge. If these implements, from two different continents and so far apart in time, were mixed together, no expert

## Is Evolution True?

could sort them out.<sup>1</sup> There is need to be careful, therefore, before saying that men who used stone implements must be extraordinarily ancient. For even to-day, some tribes are still using them.

It is now coming to light that men who lived in caves long ago, in the middle of Europe and as far as Britain, were very probably wanderers and pioneers in these outlying lands, at a time when people were quite civilised in the more settled centres. Sir Flinders Petrie, the noted archaeologist, said recently: "There is no doubt that civilisation came from the East, and that Europe was the "Wild West" of Asiatic civilisation." Sir Boyd Dawkins has pointed out the great uncertainty of any very ancient date for early men; and says that "the later civilisations of the East may have been in full swing at the time when the British tribes were living in the Neolithic culture," that is, in the Newer Stone Age.<sup>2</sup> This would shorten the time very much indeed, which evolutionists try to stretch out into long ages.

We may safely say, therefore, that any evidence for the great antiquity of man is gradually fading away; and this places another difficulty in the way of evolutionary theories, which require a vast amount of time for man to improve from an animal. In contrast with this, what we would specially point out is that if men began with intelligent minds, able to think and speak, as the Bible says, there is no need for any such immense stretch of time for his development. We will see next what we can learn about this from the skulls of the most ancient of men.

<sup>1</sup> See figures of flint arrow-heads and stone tools, from Europe and America, shown on opposite pages, in "Fossil Men and their Modern Representatives," by Sir William Dawson, the eminent geologist.

<sup>2</sup> The recent work "The Dawn of European Civilisation," by V. Gordon Childe, points to the same conclusion in tracing the early peoples which spread over Europe.

## How Did Man Come to Be?

**The Oldest Skulls.**—It is no doubt fair to say, in a general way, that the intelligence of an ancient man is shown by the size and shape of his head, when we have nothing but his bones to judge by. The face of a dog slopes back to the top of his head, and he has no forehead to speak of. So the evolutionists no doubt expected to find a series of heads going all the way back to the shape of a dog's head. But they have searched the world, and have found no such thing. Yet when only broken pieces of a skull are found, a complete picture of the head is made with the face of an ape in front, merely because they think it extraordinarily old. Such degrading pictures are published in books and periodicals, although they are pure fabrications, when the face of the skull was wanting.

Another very unfair means is taken to make it appear that ancient men had almost no forehead. There are some very old skulls which have a heavy ridge along the eyebrows over the eyes. It is known by experts that this indicates keen sight, and the ability to notice quickly, which is so useful to a hunter. But if a view of such a skull is taken from a special direction, it gives the appearance of a very sloping forehead. Yet when it is looked at squarely from one side, it is seen that the forehead is just as high and round behind this ridge (or if the ridge were removed) as an ordinarily shaped head.

Let us hear, then, what genuine scientists have to say about skulls, after all the search that has been made to the ends of the earth. What they say has all the more weight when some of them are wishful to prove Evolution; but we may rely on their honesty. There is often much dispute however; for example, one of the most ancient skulls was so broken up that it was put together in two very different shapes by two specialists.

Sir Flinders Petrie, who discovered very ancient remains near the Nile, explained that the skulls

## Is Evolution True?

found were precisely like those of modern men and women. Sir Arthur Keith, in describing the skull found in Galilee, which he thinks to be one of the earliest types of men, says that the size of the brain "fell only a little short of that of the average modern Englishman of to-day."<sup>1</sup> Dr. H. F. Osborn, in speaking of the "Dawnman" found at Piltdown in England, says that the brain space of this skull was at least equal to that of certain primitive tribes still in existence. He also puts its age much further back than was formerly supposed; which would make it one of the oldest known.<sup>2</sup> Dr. A. H. Clark, of the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, has said: "There is nothing to show that man was in any way connected with monkeys. He appeared suddenly and in substantially the same form as he is to-day."

There are thus no heads to be found, which are half-way between men and animals; and the extremely ancient dates for early men are proving to be mere guess work. Yet if Evolution were true, there would have to be all shapes of heads, from men to animals; but we do not know of any. We see then, once again, that if we want to prove Evolution, we have to fall back upon "what we don't know."

**The Account in Scripture.**—We may turn from these vain imaginations to the account that we have in the Bible about the earliest men. All that anyone is asked to admit is, that the first men were intelligent; for if this is true, the history of the Bible is perfectly reasonable. It is a great mistake to think that men who live in a simple way, must necessarily be "savages." A primitive man who can find a living for himself and his family in the woods or on the sea shore is by no means to be despised. Every-

<sup>1</sup> See details in the "Weekly Times," Aug. 20th, 1925.

<sup>2</sup> Report of Amer. Assoc. for Advancement of Science, meeting in Dec., 1929.

## How Did Man Come to Be?

thing has to be obtained at first hand, for there is no shop to get anything from. Clothing has to be made from skins, or by weaving hair or strips of bark. The father has to find the food by hunting or fishing; and the mother has to make her own needles of bone and to manufacture thread from fibre or sinew. The parents may take much trouble in training their children. The boys, to get their living, must be taught to use a bow and arrow and to make fish-hooks and tools; and the girls have to learn about the cooking and clothing, and how to make ornaments. We are not speaking of the moral side; for these primitive people may be full of superstition, and very cruel to their enemies.

In the account in Genesis, we read that God put man in a place which He had prepared, called Eden; in which there were not only fruit trees for food, but gold and onyx stone which is a superior kind of flint. We know that flint tools were the first that were used; and gold is one of the very few metals found pure and ready for use. Some primitive tribes, like those in Peru, made their ordinary dishes of gold; which shows that it is not difficult to work. It is thought that "bdellium" (the other material mentioned in Gen. ii. 12) would be for ornaments or beads<sup>1</sup>; which the earliest of men and women delighted in. It is in harmony with nature that there should be the beautiful as well as the useful.

We find comparatively soon, in the seventh generation from Adam, that men had learned how to do many useful things. This came about in a way that we see very often in history; for there may be many trials to invent something that is needed, but at last some genius arises who finds the way to do it. A noted man call Lamech, had three very clever

<sup>1</sup> This is the interpretation given by Sir William Dawson, the geologist, in "Eden Lost and Won," page 72.

## Is Evolution True?

sons; and one of them succeeded in taming cattle. It would then be possible to get milk, which is such a boon to the human race. Some very early monuments depict the milking of cows, to commemorate this worthy achievement. The ancients wished every little child who drinks milk to remember this.

Another of his sons, Jubal, "was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ." A "father" in this old-fashioned meaning, is one who began it and taught others; so we may call him "the father of music." He was a genius indeed, for he found out the two most effective ways there are to make music; the stringed instrument like the harp, and the wind instrument or pipe. The only other way to make a musical note is by striking something that gives out a sound; like a drum or a bell. So the two kinds of music he discovered have held their own until the present day. The third son, Tubal-cain, learned how to work "brass and iron," and he could only have done so by smelting them from their ores. There are very elementary ways of doing this, which primitive tribes use even now; but it would be a long story to go into it all. Yet we need not make the Bible into nonsense, as if it said that Tubal-cain built great steel works.

Now, we may do well to notice the quiet and simple way in which the Bible mentions these remarkable achievements. There is truly a "divine simplicity" about it. The names of the men who accomplished these things are mentioned, which they certainly deserve. But it is not said that they found them out in a day; it may have taken them half a lifetime to succeed, as most inventors in later times have found. There are no fanciful tales mixed in with this history; and it is very unfair indeed to say that it is all a myth, and may not be true. If we look into one of the old myths we will see the difference.

## How Did Man Come to Be?

Take for example the myth about the working of metals. Vulcan is the hero who does this. He found that what he needed, to make iron things, was a great heat; so he put his forge inside a volcano. This must be so, because the volcano is called after his name. When he pounds on his anvil in the volcano, the mountain trembles. He makes red-hot thunderbolts there, for Jupiter the god of the weather; and these are plainly seen when Jupiter hurls them out of the dark storm cloud, and the lightning flashes forth. This is mythology, with much that is still more absurd; such as the great fight with Chaos and Darkness in the beginning, when the gods made the sky out of the skin of the slain monster. If we found any such things in the Bible, there might be some excuse for saying that it is mythical.

**The Bible Found Correct.**—According to the Bible, therefore, man was a capable and intelligent being when he was first created; and before any very long time, he tamed cattle, invented music, and learned to work metals. These things were accomplished between one and two thousand years from the days of Adam.<sup>1</sup> We see then how wide a difference there is with the ideas of Evolution, and how reasonable the Bible history is.

Let us hear what a well-informed archaeologist, Dr. A. H. Sayce, of Oxford, has to say, in view of all that has now come to light: "Neither in Egypt nor in Babylonia has any beginning of civilisation been found. As far back as archaeology can take us, man is already civilised, building cities and temples and carving hard stone into artistic form. . . . The fact is a very remarkable one, in view of modern theories

<sup>1</sup> The time is not very certain, because the detailed genealogy is in the line of Seth; and the Lamech we have spoken of was a descendant of Cain. The limits here stated are sufficiently near, however, to compare with the vast time required by Evolution.



### Is Evolution True?

of development, and of the evolution of civilisation out of barbarism. Whatever may be the reason, such theories are not borne out by the discoveries of archaeology. . . . Where we look for the rude beginnings of art, we find an advanced society and artistic perfection. Is it possible that the Biblical view is right after all, and that civilised man has been civilised from the outset?"

We may well believe that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, to show us truly our relation to our Maker, and that the duty of man is to fear God and keep His commandments. Yet man failed in this at the beginning; and until the present day, we all have a tendency to follow our own way. We will take up in the next part the wondrous explanation which the Bible gives, of how evil and trouble have come into the world; and how men may be brought back into their true relation to God. For Evolution does not understand or acknowledge this; and the most serious harm that it does is to set aside the need for forgiveness and reconciliation to God, which the Scriptures declare to be the deepest need of human beings.

---

A series of 16-page pamphlets specially prepared for the Students of High Schools, etc.—

#### IS EVOLUTION TRUE?

1. How the Creator has Planned for His Creatures.
2. What the Stars, Plants, and Atoms Tell Us.
3. The Story of Living Things Long Ago.
4. How Did Man Come to Be?
5. Error, and the Way of Truth.

---

Threepence per copy; 2/6 per dozen (post free).  
Large quantities for free distribution at greatly reduced prices.

---

Winn & Co., Printers, Sydney.