

## Darwin the Theologian

Darwin did not liberate biology from metaphysical thought as is sometimes claimed—he merely switched the metaphysics.

-Cornelius Hunter, *Darwin's God*

When Darwin lived, he looked out and saw the same world that so many others before him had seen. He observed the same diversity, complexity, and uniformities across the plant and animal world. But he eventually came to posit secondary causes, rather than special creation, as responsible. Darwin's writings and correspondences make it clear that he was driven by a desire to distance God from the suffering, waste, and (what he perceived to be) gross repetition in the natural world. From the very beginning, evolution was not a strictly scientific theory but was developed out of a reaction *against* special creation.

There seems to me too much misery in the world. I cannot persuade myself that a beneficent & omnipotent God would have designedly created the Ichneumonidae with the express intention of their feeding within the living bodies of caterpillars, or that a cat should play with mice.

-Charles Darwin: *His Life Told in an Autobiographical Chapter, and in a Selected Series of His Published Letters* (1892)

Regarding the geological evidence, Darwin himself admitted that the fossil record did not corroborate his theory.

Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely

graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record.

-Charles Darwin, Origin of Species

Even today, over one hundred fifty years later, few fossils are put forward as strong evidence of Darwinian evolution. Among these are Archaeopteryx, Pezosiren portelli, Tiktaalik, Pakicetus, A. afarensis, H. habilis, and Homo erectus, but—significantly—these fossils fit comfortably within the paradigm of special creation.

So, it must be asked: was special creation objectively ruled out? In answer to this question, I challenge the reader of this article to bring to mind even one *fact* (any piece of information that is *indisputable*, being based on *direct sensory* input) that successfully topples special creation.

The success of Darwinian evolution is not owed to its strength as a scientific theory but rather to metaphysical trends that began in the seventeenth century and have continued to the present day. The prevailing metaphysical ideas of our present day—marked by wholesale rejection of the *immanence* of God—are largely perceived as an after-effect of Darwinism but were in fact a driving force behind it.