

Recommended Reading

- Barcus, Nancy. *Developing a Christian Mind*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1977.
- Blamires, Harry. *The Christian Mind*. Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1968.
- Holmes, Arthur. *All Truth Is God's Truth*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- McKay, Donald. *Clockwork Image*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1974.
- Schaeffer, Francis A. *The God Who Is There*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1968.
- _____. *Escape from Reason*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1968.
- Sire, James W. *The Universe Next Door*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1976.

Chapter 3

Man: Naked Ape and Nothing More?

Wayne M. Becker

A lecture series like this provides me with one of those rare opportunities to draw together into the same forum two topics that are exceedingly important to me—my academic profession and my religious faith. I come to campus every day with two hats, one labeled “biologist” and the other labeled “Christian.” Usually I’m obliged to wear them one at a time, but this lecture gives me a chance to wear both of them at once. I am grateful for that, because I regard it as tremendously exciting to be a biologist, but am also aware that biology is the study of life with a small *l*. I see a lecture like this as an appropriate occasion to underscore my conviction that there is also a dimension of life that is meant to be spelled with a capital *L*. So I propose to wear both hats at once right now, seeking to share with you the difference it makes to look at life through the eyes of the “Christian alternative.”

We ought to begin, I think, by asking—the Christian alternative to *what*? If it is our intention in this series to ad-

dress ourselves to the Christian alternative to secular dogmas, then clearly our starting point must in each case be a long, hard look at the prevailing secular dogma to which we are claiming an alternative—to which, indeed, we are claiming a *superior* alternative. In biology as perhaps in every discipline, we come quickly to the heart of the matter when we ask, what does secular wisdom have to say about the nature of man? You see, it is as we consider the nature and meaning of man that the contrasts between secular thinking and the Christian alternative often come into sharpest relief. That brings me to the title for this lecture, which asks, poignantly I hope, “Man: Naked Ape and Nothing More?”

The title of course derives from a very engaging book by Desmond Morris called *The Naked Ape*,¹ first published in 1967 and now billed rather immodestly by the publisher as “the sensational worldwide bestseller,” which indeed it may be. Morris is both an insightful zoologist and a gifted writer. He describes the human animal as the naked ape that he in reality is, mincing no words and stressing our intimate biological kinship with the animal kingdom. Morris explains his emphasis well in his introduction, from which I quote:

I am a zoologist and the naked ape is an animal. He is therefore fair game for my pen and I refuse to avoid him any longer simply because some of his behaviour patterns are rather complex and impressive. My excuse is that, in becoming so erudite, *Homo sapiens* has remained a naked ape nevertheless; in acquiring lofty new motives, he has lost none of the earthy old ones. This is frequently a cause of some embarrassment to him, but his old impulses have been with him for millions of years, his new ones only a few thousand at most—there is no hope of quickly shrugging off the accumulated genetic legacy of his whole evolutionary past. He would be a far less worried and more fulfilled animal if only he would face up to this fact. Perhaps this is where the zoologist can help.²

I don't want to detract from Morris's efforts. I happen not to agree with all his inferences and conclusions, but I applaud his effort. He provides a perspective that we need, a reminder that, despite all our pretensions to the contrary, we as a species are intimately linked with the animal kingdom. We are, biologically speaking, an integral part of it.

This might be a good point at which to address a few words to some of my Christian friends who seem often to take strong exception to our kinship with the animal kingdom in general and with other primates in particular. As a biologist, I have trouble understanding that aversion. I wonder whether those who harbor it have ever stopped to consider how utterly our understanding of human physiology and our practice of medicine, for example, depend on exactly the kind of biological similarities between the human species and other animals that some seek to ignore or minimize. I am profoundly appreciative of the similarities. I applaud the basic unity of design and function that underlies all of biology. I am glad that the genetic code is universal, so that which is learned about bacteria often has relevance to human beings. I am glad that horse insulin corrects human diabetes. I am glad that my metabolism is so much like that of the rat and my vitamin requirements so similar to those of the guinea pig. We ought to have a litany of praise for our relatedness to the animal kingdom. It is the link that makes biomedical research on rats, guinea pigs and monkeys relevant to human health and well-being.

The Secular Dogma

The problem as I perceive it is not that Desmond Morris—or anyone else, for that matter—seeks to stress man's links with the rest of the animal kingdom or even to view man as a naked ape. The problem comes with a secular philosophy that is not satisfied simply to describe man as a naked ape, but insists on adding, *and nothing more*: a naked ape, and nothing more. The problem comes when science is used not

just to describe and define man, but to circumscribe and limit man—to say that when the scientific description is complete, man stands fully defined and fully explained.

Having read Morris's book* from cover to cover and taken note of all he has to say about such naked-ape activities as feeding, sleeping, fighting, grooming and mating, I find myself haunted by the question, "Is that all there is? Is all of reality to be found in the naturalist's notes? Are we really just naked apes and nothing more?"

If you turn to the chemist, things if anything get grimmer. The chemist painstakingly examines and analyzes the human body, reducing it to its constituent elements and compounds. A price is then assigned to each, the numbers are added up, and the claim is made that, at current market prices, the human body is worth a grand total of 97 cents. Let's go back to zoology! There at least we were naked apes.

But wait a moment. If you don't like the chemist's prices, the biochemist turns out to be more helpful. Writing recently in the *New York Times*, Prof. H. J. Morowitz of Yale University provided his own intriguing insights. Upset at the chemist's price tag of 97 cents, he wrote,

I decided to make a thorough study of the entire matter. I started by sitting down with a catalogue from a biochemical company and began to list the ingredients. Hemoglobin was \$2.95 a gram, purified trypsin was \$36 a gram, and crystalline insulin was \$47.50 a gram. I began to look at slightly less common constituents such as acetate kinase at \$8,860 a gram. The real shocker came when I got to follicle-stimulating hormone at \$4,800,000 a gram, clearly outside the reach of anything that Tiffany's could offer. For the really wealthy there is prolactin at \$17,500,000 a gram, street price. Not content with a brief glance at the catalogue, I averaged all the constituents over the best estimate of their percentage in the composition of the human body and arrived at

\$254.54 as the average price of a gram dry weight of human being. . . . The next computation was done with a great sense of excitement. I had to multiply the price per gram by my dry weight. The number literally jumped out at me—\$6,000,015.44. I was a Six Million Dollar Man!³ Morowitz then went on to point out that the discrepancy between the 97-cent figure and the six-million-dollar price tag lies in the complexity of the molecules. He ended by noting that "we are, at the molecular level, the most information-dense structures around, surpassing by many orders of magnitude the best that computer engineers can design or even contemplate."

My point, however, is that all of this is just symptomatic, in a sense, of a secular world view that places inordinate confidence in our ability to understand and describe man in the same way and on the same terms as we seek to define and understand other phenomena in the natural world. Secular dogma insists that man is part of the natural world and can be fully understood as such. It is based on the presupposition that the only realities in the universe are those that can be explained and described in scientific terms, and that any assumptions to the contrary are not only unnecessary but invalid. Specifically, of course, it excludes the notion of God. As part of such a universe, man can be adequately and fully defined and delineated in terms of things that can be observed, measured and quantified. And in that outlook, when all the observations, measurements and quantitations are complete, our understanding of man will be complete. There is no value, purpose or meaning that lies beyond.

Such presuppositions are very significant. It is crucial that we recognize them as such—both because of the consequences that seem to flow logically from them, and also because of the contrast they afford to the presuppositions that underlie the Christian alternative. For the present, though, let's pursue this secular view a bit and see where

it leads. In particular, I'd like to explore what it has to say about the past, where we've come from, and about the future, where we're going to. It seems to me that ultimately the values by which we live in the present are shaped by our conception of the past and our view of the future.

First, the past. Where do we come from, and what is the destiny that has already shaped our ends? For the answer of secular science, I turn to Dr. Jacques Monod, French molecular biologist and Nobel laureate, who presents the case eloquently in his recent book, *Chance and Necessity*.⁴ The answer Monod espouses, of course, is evolution: "chance" in his title refers to random, unpredictable mutations; "necessity" refers to natural or Darwinian selection.

I want to make clear at this point that I have no quarrel with evolutionary theory per se. It seems to me a quite tenable hypothesis which accords well with much of the available scientific evidence. I find myself comfortable with evolution as theory, though I object when it is treated or presented as established fact. I am in fact reluctant to be drawn into controversies over creation *versus* evolution, preferring rather to think of creation *by* evolution. I will come back to that idea later. For the moment, suffice it to say that I have no particular objection to the evolutionary viewpoint. My quarrel lies rather with the philosophical framework in which it is usually understood and presented, a framework that is especially visible in Monod's writings.

His argument in *Chance and Necessity* is sophisticated and relies on data and judgment concerning molecular and cellular structure. Nonetheless, the primary thrust of his book is not scientific but philosophic. Much of what he says is based not so much on his scientific investigations as on his philosophic presuppositions. Listen to the way Monod puts it:

Chance alone is at the source of every innovation, of all creation in the biosphere. Pure chance, absolutely free but blind, at the very root of the stupendous edifice of

evolution. This central concept of modern biology is no longer one among other possible or even conceivable hypotheses. It is today the sole conceivable hypothesis. And nothing warrants the supposition—or the hope—that on this score our position is likely ever to be revised.⁵

The Consequences

That kind of argument becomes for Monod, and for many scientists like him, the basis of their entire view of reality. They assume that the only thinkable position is that man is "the result of the impersonal plus time plus chance," as Francis Schaeffer puts it.⁶ With such a position, there is nothing in the universe to which man can appeal with regard to purpose or values. Man, whoever or whatever he is, is alone. Near the end of his book, Monod writes, "If he accepts this message—accepts all it contains—then man must at last wake out of his millenary dream and in doing so wake to his total solitude, his fundamental isolation. Now does he at last realize that, like a gypsy he lives on the boundary of an alien world. A world that is deaf to his music, just as indifferent to his hopes as it is to his sufferings or his crimes."⁷

No real past, then; certainly no direction and clearly no purpose. Just chance: pure, blind, free chance. Much of secular science marches to its tune and worships at its altar, reciting litanies very much like those of Monod.

And what of the future? If the past is just a roll of dice, what does the future hold? Entropic doom, perhaps, if we wait long enough. The energy mainsprings of the universe run down inexorably, and everything ought to pass out of existence eventually, vanishing in an ethereal puff of maximized randomness. In a way, I suppose there's a certain justice in it all—from randomness we've come, to randomness we shall go. Or if you don't like the whimper of entropy, try the bang of nuclear holocaust or the agonies

of massive overcrowding, depletion of nonrenewable resources, or global starvation on the spaceship earth.

The scenarios vary, but the theme is always the same. If ours is a universe in which we are completely alone, the future offers little cause for hope. Ironically, that is the point Monod seems to make when he concludes *Chance and Necessity* with these words: "Man knows at last that he is alone in the universe's unfeeling immensity, out of which he emerged only by chance. His destiny is nowhere spelled out, nor is his duty. The kingdom above or the darkness below; it is for him to choose."⁸

But the real irony is, how shall he choose? Or, for that matter, how is he able even to tell "below" from "above"? For is it not the case that the values by which we live in the present rest ultimately on our concepts of the past and the future? And if it is true that ours is a past without purpose and a future without hope, how shall we live in the present? Where are we to get our values and our moral principles? If there are no absolutes against which we can measure our actions, how shall we understand what value is? One thing seems clear: if man sees himself as Monod sees him, values are up for grabs. Anything can become a value.⁹

Then, of course, it becomes a temptation to define what *ought* to be in terms of what already *is*. Monod recognizes this and is quoted in an interview in the *New York Times* as saying, "One of the great problems of philosophy is the relationship between the realm of knowledge and the realm of values. Knowledge is what *is*, values are what ought to be. I would say that all traditional philosophies up to and including Marxism have tried to derive the 'ought to' from the 'is'."¹⁰

Increasingly, that is what we seem to be doing in our society as we move further and further from our historic Judeo-Christian moorings. Thus Kinsey studies human sexual behavior, and the primary effect of his report is to suggest that whatever is average behavior is right. The *is*

becomes the *ought to*. The average becomes the norm. So I look up my age on his chart and find that as long as I'm having sexual intercourse 2.4 times per week, I'm right on. He doesn't specify with whom, and I have certain troubles with that 0.4, but at least I know what ought to be! And with modern means of accumulating data, such sociological norms are eminently practicable. That is what Marshall McLuhan is emphasizing when he says that democracy is finished and that we are living in a global village. All we need are enough computers to record what enough people are thinking and doing at any given moment, and that then becomes the value, perhaps even the law of the world.¹¹

The only other workable alternative for moral values in such a godless universe would seem to be the development of some sort of decision-making elite. Thus, B. F. Skinner issues an agonized call for a "culture controller."¹² Monod tells us that to achieve a stable-state society will call for "some form of world authority,"¹³ and Sir Francis Crick, another Nobel laureate in molecular biology, writes, "Some group of people should decide who should have more children and who should have fewer. You have to decide who is born."¹⁴

When we hear language like that, bells ought to ring. Here are yet more voices, respected scientific voices, calling for the development of an elite that will set up arbitrary values, arbitrary absolutes to control the world. How many more Thousand-Year Reichs do we need before we recognize such voices for where they ultimately lead?

The problem, of course, is that with man being considered a product of the impersonal plus time plus chance, all values are up for grabs, and we end up with a past with no purpose, a future with no hope, and a present with no real values to live by. And if the picture looks bleak, don't blame me—it's not my picture! It's just the logical, perhaps even inevitable consequence of a world view that recognizes as reality only things that can be observed and measured in

a laboratory. A philosophy that places man just a notch above the apes. A naked ape, and nothing more.

Worship at that altar if you must, but know what you're worshipping. Recognize the pit of despair that lies just behind that altar, and listen well to the litany your high priest is chanting: "A world deaf to man's music, indifferent to his hopes. . . alone in the universe's unfeeling immensity, his destiny nowhere spelled out, nor his duty."

The Alternative

But then know this: *there is an alternative*. You don't have to settle for a world view that begins with nothing but chance and ends with nothing but despair. There *is* an alternative, and it is the Christian Alternative. It says, "Naked ape, yes—but there's more. Man is more than a naked ape, more than a pile of chemicals, more than an information-dense structure. The analytical description may be accurate, but it is not adequate. In the Christian world view, man has a value and a purpose that goes beyond the analytical capacities of science. It is an alternative that begins not with chance but with God. It ends not with despair but with hope. And its litany is the Litany with a Difference! Listen to it, as it flows from the psalmist (8:3-5, 9 NASB):

When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained;
What is man, that Thou dost take thought of him?
And the son of man, that Thou dost care for him?
Yet Thou hast made him a little lower than God,
And dost crown him with glory and majesty! . . .
O LORD, our Lord,

How majestic is Thy name in all the earth!

Quite a difference, isn't there, between the Dirge of Monod and the Hymn of the Psalmist. The difference you hear is the difference of the Christian world view, which I want now to examine.

We begin as we did for the secular world view, by looking

at the presuppositions on which the Christian world view rests. Which means we begin with God, for that is the unique and distinctive feature of the Christian position: it begins with God. If a Christian world view is anything at all, it must begin with the basic idea of a God who exists outside of man, a purposeful, caring God under whom and by whom man and nature were created and apart from whom man can never be fully understood. Notice that this is our axiom. We are not setting out to prove God's existence; we are assuming it. It is our basic presupposition, the basis on which our world view rests.

For many that is the stumbling block. It is apparently easier for many to profess almost unlimited faith in a random collision of atoms than in a caring God. Let me illustrate with an exchange of correspondence from my own file cabinet. A few years ago I was in the midst of correspondence with a publisher who wanted me to write a textbook on cellular biology. Letters had gone back and forth, and we were at the stage where I had received a fairly detailed position paper, laying out their thoughts on the "ideal" cell-biology book as they conceived it. After wading through several pages of detailed descriptions of content and design, I came across this intriguing paragraph under the heading, *Origin of Life*:

Topics to be discussed: cosmology, formation of earth, primeval soup, first cells. This is usually far too briefly discussed, if at all. This text should contain as explicit and detailed an account of the process as the latest findings make possible, including perhaps some frank speculation that would give the student a better handle on the subject, though he should be warned of the uncertainty inherent in studies of life's origins. This discussion could also make clear why God is an unnecessary hypothesis. I replied with an equally rambling letter, and concluded on page four with the following:

One final point, though: I find myself profoundly dis-

turbed by the comment under item B-4 that “this discussion could also make clear why God is an unnecessary hypothesis.” A biology text has a responsibility to present and summarize our current understanding on possible explanations concerning the origin and evolution of life forms, and I would attempt seriously so to do. It has, in my opinion, no right whatever to theological pronouncements which are purported to derive from such a discussion. That a speculative consideration of primeval soup should lead to a summary dismissal of a theistic viewpoint strikes me not only as untenable and irrelevant, but also as sadly absurd. I could in no wise contribute to a textbook which purports to draw theological conclusions from pseudoscientific speculation. You might, by the way, wish to consider the appropriateness of a note of praise that God in His infinite wisdom and patience has not yet seen fit to declare you an unnecessary hypothesis.

The problem, of course, as I indicated, is that the existence of God cannot be deduced from the data—since, in the Christian view, God is the source of the data, and his existence is an essential presupposition. What we *can* do, as with any world view, is to look at the *consequences* of the Christian alternative and see how they compare with what we know or can perceive to be true. To examine some of these consequences, let’s look at what the Christian alternative has to say about the past, the future, and the present, in that order.

First, the past. Here we turn not to the chance and necessity of Monod, but to the creative power of a sovereign, caring God. In this, we agree with the writer of Genesis that “in the beginning God created.” As Christians, we understand all of the physical universe as the design and creation of God. Thus, when I as a biologist look through the electron microscope into a subcellular world hundreds of thousands of times smaller than I can see with the unaided eye

and find myself awed and amazed at the intricacy of design and the marvels of structural integration, I don’t have to attribute all that intricacy, all that design and all that order to random events over eons of time. I realize that I am looking directly into the handiwork of an omnipotent God, from whom I have every right to expect intricacy, design, order and purpose.

I am not easily distracted by those who insist that creation and evolution must be viewed as mutually exclusive alternatives. To me, creation by evolution is more helpful than creation versus evolution. To me, the miracle of creation remains a miracle regardless of the time scale by which God worked, especially when I realize that God is timeless, operating outside our dimensions of time and space. For him, the Bible says, a thousand years become as but a day. Whether six days or billions of years, it remains every bit as marvelous. It would, I suppose, be a supreme bit of irony if because of the time span the best of our scientific minds could be fooled into looking at isolated events and claim to see only random chance at work.

Fundamental to the Christian world view, then, is the conviction that all of nature is God’s creation. And because God is purposeful and caring, I can search with confidence both to know him as Creator and to discern the purpose and meaning of his creation. In that search, I find myself aided immeasurably by the fact that God has revealed himself not only *in* his creation, but also *to* his creation. Beyond the natural revelation in creation, which I as a scientist count myself privileged to explore, he has revealed himself in human history—first to his chosen people, the people of Israel, and then supremely and personally in the life, death and physical resurrection of Jesus Christ. God continues to reveal himself experientially in the lives of his people, among whom I rejoice to count myself. All of that revelation—natural, historical and experiential—is attested to by biblical documents whose authenticity and reliability

are beyond serious challenge (Prof. Schoville will discuss that elsewhere in this book).

If anything whatsoever is clear in all of God's revelation, it is this: man occupies a distinctive position in creation. Man is not merely a part of nature, not merely a naked ape. He is that, to be sure, but he is more. When you are all done describing man as an animal, you are not yet finished—in the Christian view. There is something further, something more. The ultimate meaning of man lies outside himself. It is to be found in his relationship to the God who has created him and who calls him into fellowship.

Man exists as a distinctive object of God's creation, and can be adequately understood only in that context. The Bible's way of putting it is that man is "created in the image of God." Prof. Wilkes has already paraphrased that for us by saying that man is capable of receiving communication from God and exchanging communication with God, and that is a phenomenon you cannot measure in the scientific laboratory. Man is only one end of a conversation, and you will never fully understand the conversation by analyzing only one end of it.

So far, then, we have two unique and tremendously significant features of the Christian alternative: a *past* characterized not by random chance and blind accident but by the direction and purpose to be expected of a creative God, and a *view of man* that moves beyond being a naked ape to being made in the image of God.

And if that is the past, what can we say of the future? Simply this. It is a future with a hope. If the universe has been called into being by a purposeful God, and if we are created in his image to share in his nature, then surely all of this is going somewhere. That, too, is part of God's revelation. Indeed, it is the most glorious part of that revelation. We are given to understand that, however dimly we may at times perceive it, all of history is moving not toward entropic doom or global catastrophe, but toward a future

that culminates in the reign of Jesus Christ as King of kings and Lord of lords. It is a reign in which all of his people will share.

Now don't misunderstand that hope as some kind of airy-fairy, pie-in-the-sky dream. The Christian is painfully aware of the multitude of problems threatening the quality and even the existence of life here on earth. Indeed, the Christian ought if anything to be more concerned than most people about the bettering of human society. Such Christian concern has been borne out again and again in history, including the history of higher education. But the real hope of the Christian alternative lies not in any sort of utopian human society, but in the firm conviction that, ultimately, our citizenship is not of this world. Ours is a future with the stamp of eternity on it, sealed by the historical fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ and by the promise that because he lives, we too shall live.

The Choice

The Christian alternative, then, offers a past with a purpose that is rooted in God and a future with a hope that is grounded in eternity. That past and that future in turn have real bearing on the present. We have a present with both a sense of direction to move in and a set of values to move by. We have direction because we know where we've come from and where we're going. We see God's purpose at work in the past. We know something of his ultimate plan for the future. We sense his guidance in the present. We have values to live by because he has, in his revelations to his people, shown us the moral principles by which we are to be guided. As Christians we ought not (indeed we dare not) grope about for societal norms, hoping to find what ought to be in what is. Nor need we join in agonized calls for cultural controllers or elitist authority. By the Christian perspective we are created in God's image to live by his precepts, and we are enabled to do so by the power of his in-

dwelling Spirit.

This, then, is the Christian alternative to the secular view that looks on man as little more than naked ape. Instead of blind chance and random change, we see the purposeful, creative hand of God. Instead of seeing doom and catastrophe ahead, we look to a future that culminates in the reign of Jesus Christ. Instead of groping for values among arid human philosophies, we find them in the revealed will of God. Instead of despairing of a world that is, in Monod's words, "deaf to our music and as indifferent to our hopes as it is to our sufferings," we rejoice in a God who listens for our music, who cares about our hopes and who shares in our sufferings so intimately that he came among us in the person of Jesus Christ to make our sufferings his own.

In the light of all this, the Christian alternative sees man as he was really intended to be: not just a naked ape to be studied and described, not just a collection of chemicals to be analyzed and priced, not just an accident whose number came up, but the object of God's creative power. To live in everlasting fellowship with our Creator, we must realize that what some dismiss as an "unnecessary hypothesis" is in reality the only presupposition worth staking our life on.

So the two altars stand today, as in Old Testament times they did on Mt. Carmel. The voice of the prophet still echoes over them, "How long will you hesitate between two opinions?"

The altar on the left is labeled "secular world view." The one on the right is labeled "Christian alternative." The former recognizes as reality only things that can be observed and measured in the laboratory. The latter recognizes value and purpose that lie beyond. The former sees man as a naked ape; the latter, as the image of God. The former calls us to believe that beyond the physical universe and the natural world lies nothing. The latter summons us to confess that beyond the physical universe and the natural world God *is*. Make no mistake about it. Both require acts of faith.

Listen once again to the litanies, and then choose your altar carefully—because much of what you are, or ever will become, depends on the altar at which you worship.

First, from the altar on the left, the words of Jacques Monod:

Chance alone is at the source of every innovation, of all creation in the biosphere. Pure chance, absolutely free, but blind. . . . Man knows at last that he is alone in the universe's unfeeling immensity. His destiny is nowhere spelled out, nor is his duty.¹⁵

And from the altar on the right, these words from the prophet Isaiah: (42:5-6 NASB)

Thus says God the LORD,

Who created the heavens and stretched them out,

Who spread out the earth and its offspring,

Who gives breath to the people on it,

And spirit to those who walk in it,

"I am the Lord, I have called you in righteousness,

I will also hold you by the hand and watch over you."

Those are the litanies, those the altars. The choice before you is clear.

Notes

¹D. Morris, *The Naked Ape* (New York: Dell, 1967).

²*Ibid.*, p. 9.

³H. J. Morowitz, "The High Cost of Being Human," *New York Times*, 11 Feb. 1979, p. 41.

⁴J. Monod, *Chance and Necessity* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1971).

⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 112-13.

⁶F. Schaeffer, *Back to Freedom and Dignity* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1972).

⁷Monod, pp. 172-73.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 180.

⁹Schaeffer, p. 14.

¹⁰J. Monod, quoted by J. C. Hess, *New York Times*, 15 Mar. 1971, p. 6.

¹¹Schaeffer, p. 15.

¹²B. F. Skinner, *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1971).

¹³Monod, quoted by Hess, p. 6.

¹⁴F. Crick, "Why I Study Biology," a lecture delivered in St. Louis (March 1971) and quoted by Schaeffer, pp. 16-22.

¹⁵Monod, *Chance and Necessity*, pp. 112, 180.

Recommended Reading

Monod, J. *Chance and Necessity*. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1971.

Morris, D. *The Naked Ape*. New York: Dell, 1967.

Schaeffer, F. A. *Back to Freedom and Dignity*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1972.

_____. *Genesis in Space and Time*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1972.

Skinner, B. F. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1971.

Chapter 4 Christian Doubts about Economic Dogmas

J. David Richardson

What is meant by "The Christian Alternative to Secular Dogma" in the sphere of economics? What does economics believe which could in any way be construed as an alternative to Christian belief? My answer is threefold and will serve to outline my talk.¹

First, economics has views on the nature of man that are shared in common by most economists worldwide but differ from Christian views.

Second, economics has views on the desirability of certain "economic systems" (a term I will define later) which can be classified broadly along a continuum from individualist to collectivist systems. In Christian belief, however, far more important than the systems themselves are economic relationships among individuals and groups *within* an economic system.

Third, some economic historians, commentators and a