


1930

Creation Or Evolution

W. W. Otey

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Biology Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Otey, W. W., "Creation Or Evolution" (1930). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 485.
https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/485

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

CREATION
OR
EVOLUTION

By W. W. OTEY

PROPERTY OF AUSTIN VARNER

Presented by Joe Dies
on May 25, 1908

Property of Austin Varner

Presented by Joe. Dies
on May 23, 1938

CREATION OR EVOLUTION

Creation or Evolution

By W. W. Otey

1930



FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE

Austin, Texas.

Copyright, 1930
Firm Foundation Publishing House
Austin, Texas

PREFACE

I offer no apology for the publication of the following pages. Without a doubt the world is in the midst of the greatest revolution of thought since the establishment of the kingdom of Christ. Old forms of political government have crumbled. New forms are being tried. Unrest is everywhere in evidence. Dissatisfaction with the old and a determination to experiment with the new fills the minds of the multitude. The outstanding characteristic of the present age universally is a revolt against constituted authority. Man seems determined not to be longer fettered by old standards. While this revolt against constituted authority was against oppressive political governments, pagan religions and humanly formed creeds, it was not greatly to be lamented. But the revolt has broken over these bounds, and now is arrayed against the authority of the Creator, as revealed through His word written by inspiration. It becomes a matter of the deepest concern. The questions raised and discussed in the following pages lie at the very root of this widespread revolt against Divine authority over man.

Destroy the idea that man came down from God; is accountable to him; will return to him to be rewarded for the deeds done in the body, and you remove the only restraint against evil and the only incentive to good. This belief in man's origin, accountability and reward, is utterly destroyed by the acceptance of the teaching of evolution. That man has been evolved from the lower order of animal life, is the vital thought of Modernism. That man was miraculously created

by God, and has no ancestor but man, is the vital thought in Fundamentalism. Here the mighty battle is being waged. The future influence of Christianity depends on the issue. Who doubts but that Christianity soon will shine forth with more power and glory than ever before?

W. W. OTEY

Austin, Texas,
Firm Foundation.

INTRODUCTION

I have read carefully "Creation or Evolution," by W. W. Otey, and I enjoyed the reading of it very much.

The title is suggestive. One may believe in creation, or one may believe in evolution; but one cannot consistently believe in the Bible account of creation and at the same time believe in the modern doctrine of evolution. The two are antagonistic one with the other, and the author has performed a helpful service in the writing of his book. He has kept it clear from technical language and from quotations from foreign languages so that the book is readable for all classes of people. He has dealt in simple, straightforward style with the important phases of both creation and evolution; and he has shown very clearly the impossibility of believing both at the same time.

The prevalence of teaching on the subject of "Evolution" in our schools and colleges justifies the publication of such a book as this at this time. All people who are thoughtful will enjoy reading the book; but it will be especially helpful to young people, many of whom will have presented to them in the class room the argument which Brother Otey so clearly and strongly refutes.

The average teacher or writer on the subject of "Evolution" begins by discrediting all writers or teachers or those who do not believe in the theory of evolution. All scholars and scholarship, according to evolutionists, are on their side. Indeed, the mere fact that one does not accept his theory of evolution is sufficient proof in the mind of the evolutionist that such a per-

son is devoid of all scholarship. The author of this book shows plainly how utterly false such an assumption is; and the array of testimony which he presents is so ample in quantity and so strong in quality that the effect must be entirely wholesome upon those who are fortunate enough to read the book.

The supporters of the Bible are especially under obligation to the author for his strong, clearly-put arguments showing the truthfulness of the Bible account of creation and the perfect harmony of this account with all true science and all correct philosophy. The reading of this volume will increase the information of the average reader, will strengthen his faith in the Bible account of creation, and will arm him with arguments sufficiently strong to meet the arrogant claims of any modern evolutionist.

The above is my candid opinion of the book after having read it. I do not hesitate to say that it is good in spirit, true in its reasoning, and helpful in the effect which it will have upon its readers. Parents and teachers may put it in the hands of their children and pupils with confidence that its effect will be wholesome.

HALL L. CALHOUN

Belmont Boulevard, Nashville, Tenn., R. 5.

COMMENDATION

I have carefully read the manuscript of "Creation or Evolution" by W. W. Otey. It is a most timely production and I am pleased with his unanswerable defense of the Biblical account of man's origin as against the vagaries and unscientific claims of evolutionists. His discussion of life and its origin is both interesting and instructive, and I welcome his book as a timely contribution to the defense of the right side of a great issue in modern times. It has been my impression for a number of years that one of the severest and most telling charges against the theory of evolution is that it is unscientific, and it is time Evolutionists themselves were learning that science, as the term signifies, is not a bungling and confused system of guesses and suppositions, but a system of demonstrated facts. In view of the infidelity and skepticism so rampant in schools and colleges today, I rejoice to see such books multiplying. From the standpoint of human need, there is a great demand for them.

This well written book will very materially aid students in getting a knowledge of the truth as it is taught in the book of Genesis and of the irreconcilable conflict between it and the undemonstrated claims of the theory of evolution. I wish for the work a wide circulation, especially among the churches.

Louisville, Ky.

M. C. KURFEES.

Chapter I

CREATION OR EVOLUTION

The Issue Defined

Nothing is sacred but truth. Any theory or faith not founded in truth should and must fail. The religion of Christ and evolution are as apposite as the poles. All efforts to harmonize them must fail. Those who attempt to harmonize the two positions lose the respect of both evolutionists and Christians. Christianity is boldly attacked. The theory of evolution seeks to supplant Christianity, and the leading evolutionists categorically deny every fundamental of the religion of Christ. It is true that some evolutionists talk about a God, but not the God revealed in the Bible, and claim that "Evolution and Religion are not incompatible." But the religion such have in mind is not the revealed religion of Christ, but only a religious instinct supposedly inherited from the brute creation.

There are some self-appointed emissaries rushing back and forth between the two opposing camps, but no flag of truce will be unfurled. It is a challenge to Christianity unequalled since the passing of the rack and faggot. It is to be a test of the "survival of the fittest," and but one will be left on the field.

For nearly two thousand years man has rested confident in the belief that he was created in the moral likeness of God, and redeemed through Christ, as truth. If evolutionists can prove that man came up from reptiles and apes, and needs no redemption, then his old beliefs must vanish as mere superstition. The

issue is clearly joined. The "Fittest" only can survive. The weal or woe of men for this world and that to come is involved.

The unmodified religion of Christ is attacked in its every fundamental. It is founded on the belief that man was created in the moral image of God; sinned; Jesus was born of a virgin; performed many miracles; was crucified to redeem man; was raised from the dead; ascended to heaven; was crowned Lord of all; will come again; raise the dead; immortalize the obedient and dwell with them forever.

Evolution teaches that man, body, mind and soul, has been evolved by natural law from dead matter. The leading evolutionists emphatically deny: (a) Inspiration of the Bible. (b) The Creation of Man, (c) The virgin birth of Jesus, (d) That He ever performed any miracles, (e) That His death in any way atoned for sin, (f) That He was raised from the dead, (g) That He will come again to redeem the obedient, (h) Or that there will be a general judgment to reward man for the deeds done in the body. Destroy belief in these eight fundamentals and the foundation of all morals is removed. It is the belief of these that has lifted the so-called Christian nations above the level of the non-Christian nations. All that evolutionists have and are that is better than that enjoyed by non-Christian nations they owe to the belief in these fundamentals that they are now so zealously trying to destroy.

If the theory was applied to material things only, creationists would not be deeply concerned. But when it undermines morals, destroys hopes that are the only

"Anchor of the soul" when tempest tossed, appears as a mocking specter at the couch of the dying saint, and denies any reward for a life of service and holiness, then creationists enter a vigorous protest. Before surrendering these desires and expectations they demand not mere assumption but some tangible proof of the truth of evolution.

Creationists wage no war on either science or scientists. They rejoice in every achievement of science. It is against the unproved theory of the evolution of man from the lower brutes, as opposed to the creation of man in the moral image of God, that the irrepressible battle is waged. And on this point no quarter will be asked nor granted. A truce is impossible.

How best to meet the issue is the question of the hour. H. H. Newman, professor of Zoology, University of Chicago, in his recent book, "Evolution, Eugenics and Genetics," page 52, says, "Freedom of thought and freedom of speech, the inalienable rights of democracy, are attacked by proposed legislative acts, and teachers of science are to be classed among law-breakers if they attempt to disseminate their views about evolution." A strange conception of "freedom of thought," and "freedom of speech," indeed. Who proposes to regulate by law what Newman or any other man's "thoughts," and "speech" shall be? Every American citizen is perfectly willing that Mr. Newman and all others may enjoy as much "freedom of thought" and "freedom of speech" as they wish about evolution or any other subject. The whole question is this: Do citizens of states who tax themselves to

build schools and employ and pay teachers, have the right to say what their hired and paid employees shall teach their sons and daughters?

Why raise a false issue? Why try to hide behind a smoke screen? All know that it is not a question of what any man wishes to think and to teach, so long as he does his thinking and teaching at his own charges, or of those who voluntarily support him. The question is: Do citizens who hire and pay teachers have the right to say what their employees shall teach their own sons and daughters? It is neither a curtailment of personal liberty nor a violation of the fundamental principles of democracy. Does not the very heart of democracy imply that the majority shall rule? If, then, a state by majority vote decides what shall and what shall not be taught by its employees, is it any curtailment of their "freedom?" And does not ordinary honor decree that employees so directed shall obey their employers or get out on their own? That the state has every right to enact and enforce such laws, there is not a shade of doubt. But that it is the wise course to pursue, the writer has grave doubts. Truth has nothing to fear. And no new enemy has arisen. It is an old enemy—atheism—in a new dress. But it is true that it is powerfully entrenched. It is barricaded behind the walls of almost every high school, college and university, both church and state. It has the sympathetic ear of our entire youth. It marshals mighty forces and its leadership is adroit. It seeks to over-awe youth by its specious pleas of science and higher education. It must be fearlessly but fairly met. Neither ridicule nor unguided emo-

tionalism will triumph. The issues are great and the high plane of investigation must be in keeping. A few smooth stones of fact and logic are needed. With pick and shovel we must dig out its foundation so that it will topple. With shield and sword its vitals need to be run through. The creationist fears no discovered nor discoverable fact, nor shrinks from any sound theory. Misinterpreted facts and contradictory theories only need to be exposed to the light of reason.

Pilate, the Roman Governor, in order to appease the Jewish mob, ordered Jesus crucified between two thieves. Fifty days later, twelve illiterate men began to preach that Jesus was risen from the dead, was crowned King in heaven, and was able to save men from their sins. They later sealed their faith with their blood. The whole Jewish nation and their religion was arrayed against the teaching. All the higher education of the world scoffed at the idea. Later the pagan world and Roman empire brought their united influence and power together in an effort to stamp out this new doctrine. The Jews have been scattered among the nations for nearly two thousand years. Paganism has already disappeared from the earth. The mighty Roman empire fell, and is no longer known except on the pages of seldom read history. The simple story told by twelve illiterate men has lifted nations to a higher plane than ever before known. Its influence today is greater than ever before, and like the sun in mid-forenoon, is still increasing in brilliance and power. The smoky cloud of evolution has appeared on the horizon, but the rays of the Sun of Righteousness will penetrate its gloom. The light that has bright-

ened the pathway trod by the weary feet of pilgrims for nearly two thousand years cannot be obscured. To-day there are not twelve, but many millions who believe and proclaim the glad tidings of salvation which shall be to all people. "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

Chapter II

CREATION OR EVOLUTION

What Is Life?

Science has solved many riddles, unlocked nature's storehouse and brought many material blessings to man. But for the question—What is life, science has no answer. Earth, rivers, oceans and the lower strata of the atmosphere teem with life. The varied forms with which life clothes itself are innumerable. These range in size from the microscopic bacteria to the giant oak and massive elephant. The material garments that life has woven for itself are readily analyzed and separated into the elements of which they are composed. But the thing—life—that resides in these material forms can neither be seen under the microscope, weighed in the balance nor caught in the chemist's test tube. All efforts of scientists to see, weigh or analyze life are as fruitless and empty as the outstretched hand of the infant grasping a sunbeam. We know much about the laws by which life is governed. Working in harmony with these laws we are able to make both plants and animals serve better our purpose.

A watermelon seed weighs one-four-thousandth of a pound. Plant it in the inanimate soil. In one hundred days it is able to reproduce itself three thousand times and to multiply its weight five hundred thousand times. The thing that wrought this wonder was life. Science is humbled to the dust before that something that can

not be seen, weighed nor analyzed that resided in that tiny seed.

Walk through the forest in autumn and observe the acorn as it falls to the ground. God back in six months and a tiny plant has appeared above the ground. Four hundred years of rain and sunshine; of summer temperature and chilling frost; of storm and calm, elapse and a man of the sixteenth generation walks over the same ground. There stands a giant oak, with outspreading branches, a mighty trunk and firmly rooted in the earth. What was in that ounce of acorn four hundred years ago, that was able literally to eat, drink and breathe; to weave for itself so wonderful a garment; to endure heat and cold; to withstand storms and bear countless numbers of acorns like unto the one from which this tree sprung? We call it plant life.

An elephant moves its massive body and draws as much more weight as its load. Send an ounce ball into its brain. Instantly the tons of body and load becomes a mass of inert matter. The same amount of material remains. On the scientist's scales and in the chemist's laboratory it weighs and tests the same. The body and limbs have the same amount of strength. But the power that seized the muscles, moved the limbs, body and load has gone out. As that power went out the scientist could neither see it under his microscope, weigh it in his balance nor catch it in his test tube. It was life.

A steam engine is equipped with pistons, rods and wheels. These have strength but no power. Engine

and train of cars stand motionless on the track, many tons of inert matter. The engineer opens the throttle, steam presses against the pistons, the rods rush forward, the wheels revolve and an hundred heavy loaded cars rush over the rails. The power is not in the pistons, rods and wheels, but in the steam.

In some unknown way life as definitely seized the muscles of the elephant and moved the tons of body and load, as the steam pressed against the pistons, pushed the rods, revolved the wheels and moved the train. Steam is a material substance and can be seen, weighed and analyzed. We can only see and feel the manifestations of life.

Man has life that moves his body similar to animals. And man has far more than animals. Directing the steam that pulls the train and guides the elephant as it draws its load is a superior power. It is the intelligence and will of man. These are inherent attributes of life. The intelligence and volition of man has built cities, ships and planes that have conquered sea and air, and filled the earth with many other mechanical wonders.

Rising above the mere animal life, yet in some way attached to it, is intelligence and volition. But above all, ruling and guiding all, is the moral mind, consciousness of right and wrong, the soul. The moral mind determines whether the whole man shall be a Nero or a Pål; a Benedict Arnold or a Washington; a slave trader or a Lincoln. It leads nations in the way of justice and peace, or of war and conquest. The pleasure or sorrow, the happiness or misery of the race

largely depends, not on material things but on which dominates, the fleshly animal passions or the moral and spiritual attributes.

Life in man is far more than the mysterious power that seizes the muscles and moves the body about. These are but the servants of the intelligence, volition and soul. The material body in which this complex life for a time dwells can be seen, weighed, analyzed and separated into its various elements. More than this, its origin is well known. It is material and comes from a material source, earth, water and air. When dissolved each element returns to its original source.

Whatever resides in a mass may be brought out of it. That which is not in a mass cannot be brought out of it. A block of granite is not quarried from a limestone ledge. Minerals and precious stones are mined from their source, the earth. Life can only come from where life is,—its source. What is the source of this wonderful something — life? Is the fountain of all life discoverable?

Chapter 3

ORIGIN OF LIFE

There was a time when there was not life on the earth. It had a beginning. It came from some source and was produced by some process. Unless the supply of life was exhausted or the process suspended, life would still be originated. So far as the knowledge of man extends, all life now on the earth is inherited from parentage like itself.

Only two theories have been advanced as to how life first came on the earth. That natural law spontaneously quickened dead matter into life, is the bedrock on which is builded the whole superstructure of evolution. To admit divine intervention would wreck the whole theory.

That God breathed life into the first life-forms and endowed each with the power to transmit life to its descendants, is the foundation of the creationist. Evidences of spontaneous generation will be discussed in this chapter. Evidences of creation will be considered in later chapters.

It is an axiomatic truth that nothing can be extracted from a mass that is not first present therein. The chemist can extract from a mass of coal the various elements in the coal. If no radium is in the coal, it is impossible to extract radium from it. The smelter can extract from the lump of ore each element present therein. If it contains gold and silver, these can be separated from the dross. If there is no iron in the ore, then no iron can be brought out of it.

Life on the earth had a source of origin. It existed somewhere. To say that life came on the earth from a source where no life existed, is contrary to all reason; is to deny self-evident truth. And unless the supply was exhausted, there still remains life in its original source. The same process that first produced life, if still in operation, will still produce life. Like causes produce like effects. If life originated by spontaneous generation, that is, by natural law acting on dead matter, then the original source of life was dead matter, that is, earth, water and air. If evolution be true, natural law either quickened dead matter into life, or breathed some life-essence into dead matter. If the same natural law was present, and the life-essence not exhausted, life would still be spontaneously generated. Life is not now being spontaneously generated. Was the original source of life exhausted? Or has the natural law been suspended? That either has occurred, none are so bold as to affirm. There remains but one logical conclusion, namely that life came from another source than dead matter, and by another process than natural law. Human life is far more than animal activity. Its higher attributes are intelligence, volition and soul. Whence came these spiritual attributes that, when they have full sway, make men God-like? Came they forth from the womb of lifeless material? Were these spiritual attributes begotten by unreasoning, unfeeling, spiritless natural law? Evolutionists are strong contenders for heredity—that the child shall bear the likeness of the parent. Where is there any likeness between the soul, and natural law and

dead matter, the parents from which evolutionists teach it was born? We know that the garment with which this life clothes itself is woven from material substance. But the child, the soul, that wears this garment—was it begotten by natural law, conceived and brought forth from the womb of dead matter? Is such a conclusion conceivable? Yet this conclusion is the whole sum of the theory of evolution.

All men have intelligence, volition and moral mind in a greater or less degree. When the moral attributes are very much weakened, man sinks into savagery. Mere intelligence, reason and volition do not and cannot lead upward to sublime good. Nero and Napoleon had these in an eminent degree. But when these are guided by the moral attributes, we have a Lincoln or a Paul. And these are as specifically a part of life as is the animal life that moves the body. It is the moral mind that determines whether the path leads downward into evil, or upward into good.

The trinket of pure gold was not forged from the baser metal of iron. The chip of pure granite was not broken from the low-grade shale. Each element comes from a source of qualities like itself. The soul was not quarried by natural law from shale, limestone, clay and granite of the earth. These have not qualities in common with those of the soul. The soul is a spiritual entity. And only from a spirit having attributes like itself could it originate.

What do evolutionists say as to the origin of life on the earth? Darwin says, "It is no valid objection that science as yet throws no light on the far higher prob-

le mos of the essence, or origin, of life. Who can explain the essence of the attraction of gravity?" (*Origin of Species*, p. 496.)

Darwin frankly admits that science "throws no light on the origin of life." To excuse the entire lack of light on the origin of life, he confuses the issue by assuming a parallelism between gravity and the origin of life. No parallel exists. We see and feel the operation of gravity every hour. We see no manifestation of the origin of life.

Darwin's theories as to the causes of evolution have been so nearly all discarded that I will quote but little from him. The leading evolutionists of the present have almost entirely discarded the former theories as to how man has been evolved. Of course all still cling to the idea that man has been evolved, but as to how life originated and the causes that wrought this evolution scarcely any two agree. H. F. Osborn, who is professor of Zoology, Columbia university, and who has degrees from Princeton, Trinity, Columbia, Cambridge, and Christiana, and now president of the world assembly of scientists, undoubtedly stands at the head of evolutionists today. He says: "It may be said that Darwin's law of selection as a natural explanation of the origin of all fitness in form and function has also lost its prestige at the present time, and all of Darwinism which now meets with universal acceptance is the law of the survival of the fittest, a limited application of Darwin's idea as expressed by Herbert Spencer." (*The Origin and Evolution of Life*, preface XV.) Again Osborn says: "The mode of the origin of life is pure speculation, in which we have as yet little obser-

vation or uniformitarian reasoning to guide us, for all the experiments of Butschli and others to imitate the original life process have proved fruitless." (The Origin and Evolution of Life, p. 67). Tyndall says: "From the beginning to the end of the inquiry, there is not, as you have seen, a shadow of evidence in favor of the doctrine of spontaneous generation. In the lowest as in the highest of organized creatures, the method of nature is, that life shall be the antecedent of life." Huxley said: "The doctrine that life can only come from life is victorious all along the line." Professor Conn said: "There is not the slightest evidence that living matter could arise from non-living matter. Spontaneous generation is universally given up." (Evolution of Today, p. 26). Pages of like quotations could be given, but these are sufficient. Osborn says: "The mode of the origin of life is pure speculation," and with this unqualified statement all evolutionists agree. If they should affirm spontaneous generation, then we would demand some evidence. We would also inquire as to why natural law is not now producing life from dead matter. Evolutionists touch the question of the origin of life with the finger tips. They offer no specific theory as to how any existing natural law could possibly have brought life out of any present existing dead matter. They well know life is not now appearing except as it is transmitted from living organisms to offspring. They do not intimate that any material substance has disappeared, or that any natural law has been suspended. And if material substances and natural laws are now as at the beginning, then they know not how to explain why new life is not still

appearing. The question of the beginning of life must be met. This evolutionists fail to do. The creationist has no such difficulties. He knows full well that natural laws do not now produce life from dead matter. He has no evidence that either natural law or material substances have been exhausted or suspended. From this he reasons that life originated by miracle in contravention of natural law. The evolutionists reject creation. Then they must account for the origin of life. Spontaneous generation is the only alternative. Without spontaneous generation evolutionists have not one stone on which to build their theory.?

A theory to be creditable must explain the facts to which it is applied. A company of men find an automobile with the engine running, standing on the street. It is the first one any of them has ever seen. They divide into two companies and formulate two theories as to its origin. One company affirms that it was all assembled from material in a building across the street. The other company agrees that part of it was made out of material from the building across the street, but that the gasoline and ignition system came from a building over on another street. Both companies are equally confident. A thorough examination is made of the material in the building across the street. The parts that are found are put together and the automobile is complete, except the power to make it go. It lacks gasoline and ignition. Neither can be found in the building. But over in the building on the other street, gasoline and ignition are found, and the car runs.

Here is a man, body, mind and soul. Evolutionists teach that all that man is was evolved from earth,

water and air. Chemists have analyzed man's body and find that its elements are also found in the earth, water and air. Then man's body beyond question was assembled from the source of all such material elements. But with only these material elements assembled, you do not have man. That is but the house in which man dwells. Scientists have searched this source and no life is found to make man go. All the blendings and combinations of these materials have failed to produce life, and animate the material. Creationists readily agree that man's body was assembled from the earth, water and air. But the life-mind and soul—are not in dead matter. No formula of mixing or blending of these material elements has ever produced these spiritual attributes. Material elements come from material sources. Spiritual elements can only come from a spiritual source. It is known that life, mind and spirit are in God, and from no other source can these come. To affirm otherwise, is to affirm without proof, against all existing facts, and contrary to all sound logic and reason. Remains there then a doubt that human life miraculously sprang from the source of all life—God?

Can the Dead Create the Living?

Evolutionists confess that they do not know how life originated on the earth. They assume that some natural law in some unknown way quickened dead matter into life—plant life, intellectual life, and spirit. They have not even formed a coherent theory as to how this was brought about. The assumption is contrary to every observed fact of natural law. How is

it possible to reach a true conclusion by a process of reasoning that contradicts every known fact relating to the subject under consideration? Every known fact is that life comes not from the dead, but from the living. Life is perpetuated by the parent passing on power to appropriate the material elements and clothes, a part of its own life-essence, with a garment—the plant or animal body.

H. F. Osborn vaguely hints at some sort of a chemical process by which life came on the earth. He says: "We may express as our opinion, based upon the application of uniformitarian evolutionary principles, that when life appeared on the earth some energies pre-existing in the cosmos were brought into relation with chemical elements already existing." (The Origin and Evolution of Life, p 2). Here the opinion is clearly expressed that life was created (the word "create" is the only word that properly defines the bringing into existence of life) by "energies" "already" "present," coming in contact [with chemical elements already existing," "in the cosmos." If that were true, then life was chemically created by dead agents out of dead material.

From this conclusion there is no possible escape. Certain it is that before life appeared on the earth all material elements and energies were lifeless. Till life first appeared on the earth all that was on the earth either of material elements or "energies" were lifeless. That being true, if energies present in the cosmos produced life out of lifeless chemical elements then on the earth, then lifeless agencies produced life from lifeless material. The totally dead produced

from itself the living. These are fundamental difficulties that cut the very tap-root of the whole theory. Till they are cleared away not even the first stone for a foundation can be laid.

But admitting the assumption that some lifeless agency may have brought "energies" and "chemical elements into relation," is it logical to conclude that life could thus have been chemically produced? It is contrary to the facts of every known chemical process. Failure has been written over every effort of the greatest scientists of the world to produce life. Two or more of the ninety odd known elements can be mixed. Only a compound results. No distinctly new material substance is produced, much less a new entity equal to life. The compound never rises higher in refinement than the average of the elements mixed. Gold, silver and lead may be mixed in equal parts. The compound would be higher than lead but lower than gold. It would partake of the nature of each of all three of the elements of which it was made. But no distinctly new substance can chemically be produced. Yet the foundation of the theory of evolution is the assumption that lifeless natural law created life—plant life, animal life and spiritual life—from a mixing of lifeless chemical elements. Was any assumption ever made more directly contrary to all known facts and every element of sound reason?

We know that the essence of life now present in the living seed of both plants and animals is passed on by each parent to living seed. We know the life essence in these seed is able to take hold of the material elements in earth, air and water and build for itself a

habitation in the plant or the body of the animal. We know all life now on earth has in this way been inherited from parents, of plants and animals, and that these have the power to divide this life essence and transmit it to offspring. Since all life now comes by the parent plant or animal passing to offspring a part of its own life essence, creationists logically conclude that the first life forms received life from God by a miracle. The original supply of life in God was not exhausted, but the process, a miracle, was suspended. So life always as now, comes from life back to God in the beginning.

Chapter IV

VARIATION

The one fundamental question between evolutionists and creationists is: How did life first appear on the earth? In reality all other differences are rooted in this one. Logically, this one point should be settled before proceeding to other and minor questions. They make no attempt to prove spontaneous generation. H. F. Osborn says, "The mode of the origin of life is pure speculation." And with this statement all evolutionists agree. Yet Osborn assumes the most vital point at issue when he again says, "We know, for example, that there has existed a more or less complete chain of beings from monad to man—that man has descended from some ape-like form somewhere in the Tertiary." (The Origin and Evolution of Life, Preface X.) (Monad is here used in the sense of a single cell life form). It seems that reason would demand that at least a theory should be formulated that would in some degree explain the first and most vital point at issue, namely, the origin of life. No such attempt is made. But he starts with the monad, a single celled life form, by tacitly "assuming" its existence, with no theory as to how it came into being. Creationists can well afford to be generous, and so we will just grant to him his start without demanding proof as to how it originated. It is a long and perilous journey from the single celled life form to man. There are many as yet unexplained difficulties in order to get man over the yawning gaps. The first one is this: we have man

and we still have countless millions of single cell life forms. Evolutionists estimate that the two are at least sixty million years apart in development. The ancestors of man and of the present living single cell life forms, began life and lived under exactly the same natural laws and environment. Natural law held the descendants of one monad stationary and natural law seized the descendants of the twin monad and advanced its offspring forward sixty million years to man. The original twins lived under exactly the same environment, were acted upon by the same natural laws. Their descendants are sixty million years apart. Where there are reverse effects there must of necessity be reverse causes. According to evolutionists we have the descendants of the first single cell life forms sixty million years apart in their development. Reverse effects here are clearly seen. Where are the reverse causes? Cause as certainly precedes effect as light precedes darkness. What caused natural law to single out one family and evolve it to man, while some reverse natural law held the twin's descendants stationary for sixty million years? Who will arise and discover and explain the reverse natural laws?

The distance from monad to man is almost infinity itself. Yet after having assumed the one cell life form as his Adam, he must in some way make man out of it. Was the complex body of man latent in the monad, only waiting to evolve or unfold, like the tree in the acorn? Or the chick in the shell? Were the mental and spiritual attributes of human life waiting simply to be evolved or unfolded? If so, that would simplify the theory. But if that were true, from

whence did it acquire them? Man's complex body is a material fact. Man's intelligence, volition and soul are just as definitely spiritual entities. That these have all been inherited by man from ancestors both creationists and evolutionists agree. Creationists affirm that the first man was miraculously created as he now is, and transmitted all these attributes to his posterity down to man now living. Evolutionists affirm that all that man now is, has been inherited from ancestors. But they also affirm that man's first progenitor was a single cell life form. Did man inherit all he now is in body and mind from the monad, the single cell life form? If these were not latent in miniature in the single cell life form, they had to be acquired somewhere along the road. Had not the miniature tree been latent in the acorn it would have had to be acquired. Even so must the single cell life form get from without itself all that man is more than what was in the original single cell life form. Of course evolutionists have been in heated discussion for more than fifty years as to how man's body members have been acquired. What progress have they made in learning how, even theoretically, man has gotten his wonderful body? Let H. F. Osborn tell us, "Thus the long period of observation experiment and reasoning which began with the French natural philosopher, Buffon, one hundred and fifty years ago, ends in 1916 with the general feeling that our research for causes, far from near completion, has only just begun." (The Origin and Evolution of Life, Preface X).

One hundred and fifty years of scientific searching

for the "causes" of the evolution of man's material body cast aside as worthless, and with the "general feeling" that the search "has only just begun." Then he proposes "a starting-point for new and untried paths of exploration which may be followed during the present century." Even evolutionists' theories as to the "causes" of evolution are as evanescent as the morning mist. Yet they are prolix about "variation", "natural selection", and "mutation" with reference to members of the natural body. But as to how the far more important attributes of man have been acquired, they are profoundly silent. Yet the body is only the house in which the man dwells; the flimsy garment that life has woven for its temporary adornment.

If a man starts to his office with only a business suit on, and arrives with a top coat, handbag, cane and typewriter, then he acquired these on the road. There was both a How and a Where he acquired them. If the whole man, body and soul was latent in miniature in the single cell life form, and was gradually unfolded or evolved, then a rational theory as to How and from What source it acquired these qualities, should be formulated. Will any evolutionist affirm that the spiritual attributes of man were all present in the single cell life form from which they teach man has descended? If so are the same spiritual attributes present in the single cell life forms that have made no advancement, according to evolutionists, for sixty million years? Or were the mind and soul of man only present in the family of monads from which Osborn affirms man has descended? But if these spiritual qualities that make man, were not latent in the

parent—the monad, then these had to be acquired along the route to man. How many generations of invertebrates are listed in man's pedigree, I have no idea, but the number is considerable. Above the invertebrates' then come the Limbless Vertebrates, Primitive Fishes, Bony Fishes, Amphibians, Earliest Reptiles, Mammal-Like Reptiles, Primitive Mammals, Placenta Mammals, Apes and Man. Evolutionists teach that man acquired all that he is in body more than the monad, in small variations or mutations as he passed from one order of animal to one a little higher. If the improved form and size of man's body was thus acquired, we know of course the source from which it was acquired. His body is material, like that of the monad, and both are from the earth, water and air. The same elements compose both; the difference is in form and size. But our present inquiry is in regard to something that man has that is not present in the monad—the mind and soul. Were these acquired a little at a time as the ascent was made upward from each ancestor? If so, were these spiritual qualities injected into the animals from without by the environment, or were they created within each animal by the food and climate? These questions strike at the very heart of the whole theory of evolution. They cannot be ignored. Such insurmountable difficulties must be fairly considered.

It is impossible for parents to transmit to offspring any element of body, or attribute of mind and soul that they do not possess.

This law of heredity is as universal as life, and as fixed and unchangeable as gravity. No record exists

of any child of man or of animal, whose body contained material elements not also found present in the bodies of their parents. What would be thought of the scientist who affirmed that a child had been born whose bones were partly pure gold? Parents transmit to the bodies of their offspring only the elements of which their own bodies are composed, and only the life qualities and spiritual attributes that they themselves possess. Man has a material body and animal life in common with the lower animals, but man has spiritual attributes—soul—not possessed by the lower animals in any degree or measure. It is something entirely different from any quality in animals. No other earthly being except man has a soul. To affirm that the animal creation transmitted to man that which it does not have—a soul—is to deny every law of heredity and to disregard every known fact of natural law. Since time began, no case is known where offspring ever inherited anything not possessed in some measure by the parent. This being true, it is not within the bounds of possibility that man has descended from reptiles and apes. These do not have a moral mind—soul—and what they do not possess, it is impossible for them to transmit to their offspring. Of all the creatures of earth, man alone has a soul. This proves as strong as demonstration itself that man's only ancestor is man.

It matters not from what angle the theory of evolution is approached, difficulties like granite walls stretch across its path. Evolutionists themselves keenly realize the barrenness of their facts and the weakness of their logic in support of their theory.

They are constantly changing base. Different schools of evolutionists not only use different arguments to support their theory, but directly contradictory reasoning. The lack of facts and argument satisfying even to evolutionists, is certainly not due to any lack of intelligence and learning in their ranks. Perhaps no other theory has been supported by a greater array of natural and acquired talent. The weakness is not found in its advocates but in the cause they plead. As proof of these statements we will now hear what H. F. Osborn, certainly one of the brightest lights in the whole constellation, has to say: "Moreover, all the explanations of evolution which have been offered by three generations of evolutionists align themselves under two main heads only. The first is the idea that the causes of evolution are chiefly from without inward, namely: Beginning in the environment of the body and extending into the germ; this idea is centripetal. The second idea is the reverse: It is centrifugal, namely, that the causes begin in the germ and extend outward into the body and into the environment" (Origin and Evolution of Life, Preface XIII). These two diverse theories of the causes of evolution are held by the two leading schools of evolutionists, the Darwinians and the Lamarkians. Osborn repudiates both theories and offers a new one of his own that he calls the Energy Concept. But as it seems very few have as yet embraced his theory it will be passed for the present.

One of these theories is that the causes of evolution take place in the germ and changes the body form. The other is that the cause is from without,

that is, environment, chiefly food and climate and changes the form of body. If the Darwinian school could produce a single case where environment ever produced enough change in any animal so as to develop new body organs to originate a new and distinct species, that of itself would disprove the Lamarckian theory. Or if the Lamarckian school could produce a single instance where any material change ever occurred within the germ so as to produce a new species, that would disprove the Darwinian theory. But no such instance has ever been produced. Hence the controversy between the two schools, and therefore, the lack of any substantial proof of the creation of new species. But in the total absence of any proof whatever that any change ever took place in the germ and worked out into the body to produce a new species, let us just for the present grant the assumption that changes may take place in the germ. Then by some cause not named even in theory, some radical change takes place in the germ cell. The theory says it must "work outward into the body", in order to produce new body organs, and finally a new species. But this single cell life form has but one cell. One cell is its all. There is no "body" to work outward into in order to make the changes resulting in new species. Evolutionists apply this theory to the germs of highly organized plants and animals. It is a very beautiful theory when applied to many-celled animals, but just remember that they begin life by assuming as the first of the race as Osborn says? "From 'monad—a one-cell life form' to man." The single cell life form is their start to man. One

school says that the changes take place in the "germ and work outward into the body." They have but one cell to begin with. If a million changes should take place in the single germ, their theory utterly fails, because there is no "body to work outward into." Of course if they could start with a many-celled animal their theory would sound more plausible. It is very much like the man who argued that he could weigh the earth if he had something on which to set his scales. Their theory cannot get them out of the single cell life form.

As we advance, the difficulties multiply. Contradictions meet us at every turn. In some way, from within or from without, the one-celled life form must begin to acquire head, eyes, feet and legs, or it will never become a man. It must also evolve sex, male and female. Some evolutionists say that "variation to be of service must be long leaps forward." Others that very minute variations will be seized by the law of Natural Selection and preserved and then "heredity" passes these on to the next generation. Thus we have the three processes (a) "Variation"—the appearance of improved body-form. (b) Natural Selection, or the "Survival of the Fittest," comes forward and preserves alive these improved individuals. (c) "Heredity" reproduces these improvements in the next generation. A beautiful theory, isn't it? But how will it work in actual test? A theory must at least be workable when applied to the existing conditions. Well, suppose that a large number of these one-cell life-forms should vary so as to acquire a good start toward getting head, eyes, feet and legs, and

also as must necessarily be, toward becoming sex—male and female. A fine start. In rushes "Survival of the fittest," and saves these improved individuals alive. But it requires "heredity" to pass these improvements on to the next generation. But to do this, they must produce offspring. And how do they reproduce their kind? By dividing into equal halves. And what would the halves be like? How would it be possible to make the least advancement when every gain would be lost in the first offspring? The Quarterly Review of Biology, issued at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. says: "A single cell cannot increase in size beyond a certain point without serious interference with the chemical and physical interchanges on which life depends. On reaching the maximum size permitted by the chemical and physical restrictions, the animal cell divides into two; later these two divide each into two, becoming four, these four eight, these eight sixteen, these sixteen thirty-two, and so on indefinitely."

It is readily seen that any variation appearing in any one cell-life form would be utterly lost in the division, for the two new cells are like the parent cell. Some evolutionists are asking geologists for at least a billion years of time since the earth began, in order to meet the requirements of time required by their theory. And they will need every year of the billion, and unless they can formulate a more logical theory, they will still be in the one-cell life-form at the end of the billion years. One would as well try to cross the continent by running in a perfect circle.

Chapter 5

EVOLUTION AGAINST EVOLUTION

It has already been stated that evolutionists are agreed on but one idea, namely, that man was evolved from the brute creation. In every other particular they are at war. A very interesting volume, and as large as desired, could be prepared by quoting one theory of the causes of evolution, then introducing other evolutionists of equal rank who have disproved the theory of causes advanced by their opponents. Each one is intensely zealous of his own personal theory or of that of the School of evolutionists to which he is joined, and is ready to attack with great penetration of thought and keenness of logic the theories of other Schools. When an evolutionist gets through with some theory of the causes of evolution of another school, there is not much left. He must utterly refute the opposing theory before his own will be accepted.

H. F. Osborn, as already quoted at length, says that "All explanations of evolution which have been offered by three generations of evolutionists are two, namely: 'Beginning in the environment of the body and extending into the germ, and second is just the reverse—that the causes begin in the germ and extend outward into the body and into the environment.'" (Origin and Evolution of Life, Preface XIII). These two theories contradict each other. Both cannot be right and both may be wrong, as contended by creationists. And in this contention creationists are not

alone. H. F. Osborn is probably the most outstanding evolutionist of the present day. He repudiates both these theories and proposes an entirely new theory of his own that he calls the Energy Concept. But he says this gives only "a new starting-point for new and untried paths of exploration which may be followed during the present century." (Origin and Evolution of Life, XVII).

The two schools, the Darwinian and the Lamarckian, have been in battle-array for three generations with no sign of either victory or truce. "After one hundred and fifty years of observation, experiment and reasoning," says Osborn, "the very general feeling among evolutionists is 'that our search for causes' has only begun." So the opinion of Osborn at this writing was that the combined efforts of evolutionists during the entire past one hundred and fifty years ended in failure. And he declares this was the "very general feeling" among evolutionists. It is not strange that he keenly felt the great need of some new theory, and so formulated his "Energy Concept." But before doing so, he cleared the way of all old and disappointing theories. He says, "The essential idea of the Lamarkian was refined and extended by Herbert Spencer, by Darwin himself, by Cope and many others. But it has thus far failed of the crucial test of observation and experiment, and has far fewer adherents today than it had forty years ago." "Again, despite the powerful advocacy of pure Darwinism by Weismann and DeVries, in the new turn that has been given to our search for causes by the rediscovery of the law of Mendel and the heredity doctrines

that group under Mendelism, it may be said that Darwin's law of selection as a natural explanation of the origin of all fitness in form and function has also lost its prestige at the present time, and all of Darwinism which now meets with universal acceptance is the law of the survival of the fittest, a limited application of Darwin's great idea as expressed by Herbert Spencer. "But, as Cope points out, the survival of fitness and the origin of fitness are two very different phenomena. Between the appearance of the *Origin of the Species*, in 1869, and the present time there have been great waves of faith in one explanation and then in another; each of these waves of confidence has ended in disappointment, until finally we have reached a stage of very general skepticism. Thus the period of observation, experiment and reasoning which began with the French philosopher, Buffon, one hundred and fifty years ago, ends in 1916, with the general feeling that our search for causes, far from being complete, has only begun." "This confession of failure is a part of the essential honesty of scientific thought." "Chance is the very essence of the original Darwinian selection hypothesis of evolution. William James and many other eminent philosophers have adopted the 'chance' view as if it had been actually demonstrated."

Again, to quote the opinion of a recent biological writer: "And why not? Nature has always preferred to work by the hit-or-miss methods of chance." If so, then how can natural law be valid? How can science predict? "I have long maintained", continues Osborn, "That this opinion is a biological dogma; it

is one of the string of hypotheses upon which Darwin hung his theory of the origin of adaptations and of species, a hypothesis which has gained credence through constant reiteration, for I do not know what it has ever demonstrated through the actual observation of any evolutionary series." (Origin and Evolution of Life, pages 6-10).

Here is the vital center of the whole controversy.

1. Did chance originate life, produce and preserve improved variation till man was made? If yes, that eliminates both natural law and miracle. And there would be no certainty in the universe. Law regulates and produces order.

2. Did natural law originate life, produce and preserve improved variation till man was made? If yes, how is it conceivable that the nonliving could beget and bring forth from itself life? For if evolution be true, then intellectual and spiritual life was begotten by unthinking, unreasoning, unfeeling natural law, conceived and born from the womb of dead matter. Creationists are unable to believe this theory.

3. Did God by miracle create the first forms, impart to them life, and empower them by natural law to reproduce their kind? To the creationist this is the more easily believed.

These are astounding declarations to be made by an evolutionist of the rank of Osborn. He unhesitatingly declares that the theories of "three generations of evolutionists" failed when tested by true science, "reasoning, observation and experiment." He also says that the appearance of Darwin's Origin of Species, purporting to explain man's origin gave

rise to "great waves of faith in one explanation then another," only to end in "disappointments, until finally we have reached a stage of general skepticism."

How different from the faith inspired in creationists by the simple story of man's origin as told in Genesis! That simple story gave rise to a great wave of faith that has never ended in disappointment. Those who have built their hopes on it as a foundation have never felt a tremor of doubt. Creationists who walk in its paths do not feel any need of repudiating it, even after two thousand years, and proposing a new theory, as a "starting-point for new and untried paths of exploration, that may be followed during the present century." The fact that the history in Genesis has sustained a "great wave of faith" that has not faltered for two thousand years, and still satisfies every aspiration of the soul of man, is proof irrefutable of its eternal truth. The luster of that faith cannot be dimmed by the evanescent clouds of doubt cast by evolution. The foundation of the creationist's hope is laid, not on mere assumption, but on the Rock of Inspired Revelation.

The confessed failure to discover the "causes" of evolution cannot be due to lack of intelligent search. Many of the greatest minds of the entire one hundred and fifty years have been intensely engaged in the search. Surely the failure must be due to the barrenness of evidence of any causes at all of evolution. If evolution were a fact, why are its "causes" so obscure? Is there another universal fact, the causes of which have so completely eluded the search of so many great minds? Would it not rather be more reasonable for

a time to try to establish the fact of evolution before wasting so much time in a fruitless search for its causes? Let evolutionists first prove that natural law produced the first life from dead matter. When this is done then how the monad-single-cell life-form evolved into a man, will be in order. Till they show at least a reasonable way in which life originated, without a miracle of creation, all their talk about "causes" as to how one species evolved into a higher species till man was reached, is like trying to build the house before the first stone is laid for a foundation. The foundation of creationists is, that man was created as he now is. Evolutionists must start life, and that without a miracle. Spontaneous generation is as certainly the foundation of evolution as that creation is the foundation of fundamentalists. And till they establish spontaneous generation their whole theory is suspended in mid-air. It has not a theory of the beginning of life on which to rest.

Science is not theory but knowledge. Yet the theory of evolution is piously labeled science. The theories of its causes are as unstable as the waves of the sea. The faith it inspires comes and goes as the tide. The light that it sheds on the pathway of weary and sin-sick souls is as dim and flickering as that of the fire-fly by night. The food it dishes out to the hungry soul is as unpalatable and devoid of nourishment as the dead husks of unripe fruit. It inspires no abiding faith and points to no star of hope. Indeed, it is faithless, joyless, hopeless, as cheerless as the miasma of death, and its theories as unsettled as the sands of the windswept desert.

Chapter 6

HEREDITY

The theory of evolution begins with the single cell life-form. How the first life began, they do not offer even a theory to explain. But starting by assuming the existence of a single cell life-form, they offer three theoretical processes by which to evolve man. Variation is supposed to produce in some unknown way an improvement in one or more members of a species. Natural Selection steps in and preserves these alive to bring forth offspring, while tending to destroy the ones not so favored. Now, Heredity comes forward and passes these improvements on to succeeding generations. And thus the three-fold process is supposed to be repeated in perhaps millions of generations till man is completed. Heredity, or the law that each family of plants and animals shall 'bring forth after their kind', is a fundamental of creationists. This universal law that like shall produce its like, is a perpetual and irrefutable proof of the credibility of the history in Genesis. God said, concerning each family of plants and animals, "Let them bring forth after their kind."

Evolutionists have a theory of heredity. It is the key in their arch: the middle link in their chain. But their idea of heredity is very different from that of the creationist. Horatio Hackett Newman, Professor of Zoology in the University of Chicago, and author of several widely used text books, starts out on heredity thus: "One of the truisms of biology is the

familiar fact that like produces like. How surprised one would be if sparrows had anything but sparrows for offspring, or if two Caucasian parents should have a negro child." So far there is perfect agreement in the fixed law of heredity between evolutionists and creationists. One would indeed be surprised if "Caucasian parents should have a Negro child." It would be contrary to all reason and to all known facts of heredity. And that is just why creationists cannot possibly believe that a beautiful woman, with intelligence and a soul, is the child of two reptiles. If evolution be true, then man is as certainly the child of insects, fishes, reptiles and beasts of the jungle, as not the Negro child, but as the white child is of white parents. Evolutionists list all these, and many other loathsome beasts as man's ancestral parents. The negro child would be like white parents in everything but color of skin and hair. But according to evolutionists the number of insects, fish, reptiles and other loathsome beasts of the jungle that are ancestral parents of man, is limited only by the sixty million years or more that it has taken to evolve man. The fact that, according to their theory, man in his descent, is removed millions of years from these loathsome beasts, makes them no less his blood parents. Their pedigree of man makes the blood-stream unbroken.

After mentioning the above well known and universally accepted law of heredity, Newman glides over and assumes the very opposite effect as true of the law of heredity. To quote further: "Now, a careful survey of the situation reveals the fact that the

only assumption the evolutionist makes is no more nor less than a logical extension of what the layman considers a truism or a self-evident fact, namely: That fundamental structural resemblance signifies genetic relationship; that, generally speaking, the degree of structural resemblance runs essentially parallel with the closeness of kinship. If it were proven that man and animals have descended from the same ancestral parents, then this might be regarded as a logical conclusion. But the very basis is not proved, that is, that both man and beast have descended from the same original parents. Till the basic idea of one common parentage is established the "structural resemblance" argument is but a second assumption to prove the main proposition. Given such liberty almost any proposition that the mind can invent can be established.

But suppose we admit the principle of a "resemblance in structural form, showing kinship." Would that prove that a pair of jelly-fish were ancestral parents of a beautiful woman? Or that man is descended from serpents? Creationists are entirely willing to rest the whole controversy on the argument of "structural resemblance in form proving kinship," or lack of relationship. Where in all the world is there any animal whose body bears more than a slight resemblance to the wonderful body of man? Some slight resemblance to be sure in some of the ape family, but certainly an unbridged gulf intervenes. But the comparison should be on the whole man and animal. What of the intelligence, volition and soul of man? In these attributes man stands alone, removed by al-

most infinity above all the animal creation. In these there is not the slightest resemblance between man and any animal on earth. No animal has ever showed the faintest sign of a conscience of moral right and wrong, or any attribute leading it to worship a deity. If Mr. Newman wants to argue "kinship proved by a resemblance" then creationists are ready to rest the whole controversy on this point. When he can prove that any animal has a moral mind, a soul, conscience, and worships a deity, then he will have won the battle. It is not so much the 165 pounds of earth, water and air that make man's body, nor even so much the form of his body, but the soul that dwells in that body that removes man from any possibility of kinship with any animal on earth. If evolutionists wish to rest the case on "resemblance" proving or disproving man's kinship with animals, then creationists will agree. But the comparison must be with that which dwells in the body of man and of animals, as well as the garment which the indwelling life has woven for itself. The soul separates man by an impassable gulf from all other creatures of earth.

But creationists deny that the facts show the least "kinship" even in body between man and beast. How much are a serpent and a man alike? Well, the serpent has a backbone, and so has man. Both have eyes but very unlike. Man has feet, legs, hands, hair. Not much proof of kinship. If heredity transmits likeness, as is universally known, how did heredity make man's body from the serpent? So it is clearly seen that Newman has heredity transmitting the very reverse of likeness. The facts are not altered in the

least, even though millions of years intervene. Man's body is not only unlike the body of the serpent or beast of the jungle, but the very reverse. In order to evolve this opposite form of body the great reverse in form had to be produced. Divide the change up into sixty million years if you wish, yet the stubborn fact remains that heredity transmitted to offspring not like but unlike; not agreement in form but the opposite in form.

How does Newman try to prove this reverse theory of heredity? He makes not the least effort to prove it, either by logic or example. The evidence that heredity uniformly "brings forth after its kind," is so abundant that he says, "One of the truisms of biology is the familiar fact that like produces like." Indeed this is the universally observed law of heredity. How, then, can it be summoned to prove that like produces the unlike as in the case of fish, reptiles and jungle beasts producing man? Listen to Mr. Newman while he tells you: "If we cannot rely upon this assumption, which may be called the principle of homology, we can make no sure progress in any attempt to establish the principles of evolution." "The principle of heredity, and its necessary implications, is the only assumption that is necessary for the evolutionist to make, in order to go ahead on a sound basis with a presentation of the evidences of evolution. Give him this one point and he asks no further concessions." (Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics. Pages 83-85).

Given one "assumption and its necessary implications," and perhaps any proposition can be proved.

For example, we "assume" that all nature is in a state of deterioration. We "imply" that some man, somewhere, some time, lost his legs, arms and began to crawl on the ground. We "assume" that this change was transmitted to offspring till the serpent was evolved from man. And why not? Evolutionists teach that the process works backward as well as forward. They now "assume" that man was made from fish and reptiles. Then start evolution backward, and they say it works backward as well as forward, and the serpent is made from man. This is not treating the subject lightly but in all seriousness. They say evolution works both ways. If it transmits the unlike from serpent to man, then make the same "assumption" and grant the "necessary implication," and man produces the serpent.

"If," says Mr. Newman, "we cannot rely upon this assumption—we can make no sure progress in any attempt to establish the validity of the principles of evolution." Well, is not this the heart of all the griefs of all evolutionists during the last one hundred and fifty years? Osborn says that one hundred and fifty years of "searching to find causes of evolution have so utterly failed that a general feeling of skepticism prevails" and that "a new start" must be made which "may be followed during the present century."

What sort of a "sound basis" is a mere "assumption" on which to build so momentous a theory? If the "assumption" and its "necessary implications" ran parallel with the known facts of heredity, it might possibly be accepted as the "basis" for some theory, provided it did no special harm to faiths, hopes and morals of

life. But when, as in this case, the "assumption" contradicts every known fact of the law of heredity, destroys beliefs, blasts hopes, and poisons the fountain of joys, the basis of which has needed no revising for many generations, then creationists demand, not mere assumption, but evidence that the unchangeable law of heredity has ever made the reptile into man. The law of heredity always producing its like is as fixed as the law of gravity.

"Give him this one point," pleads Mr. Newman, "and he asks no further concession." No, Mr. Newman, creationists will neither give evolutionists "this one point," nor make to them one single "concession." You must prove every point by fact, reason or logic. Wherever fact and logic lead, creationists will follow. But not one step will they take on your "new and untried paths of exploration" proposed by Osborn. Nor will creationists carry one hod of mortar nor lay one brick on your "basis" of mere "assumption." Creationists serve due notice that the mighty battle is on. Evolutionists are the invaders. For two thousand years creationists have confidently rested in the full and unwavering belief that God created man in his own moral likeness; that Jesus died and rose again that man might have a future and a better life. They have relied on the full assurance that the Bible in which these hopes are recorded was inspired from heaven and worthy of all acceptance. Every statement you have denied. Yet you would have creationists tax themselves, build schools, hire you and entrust their sons and daughters to your guidance. This trust you have shamelessly abused. You have sneered at, ridiculed

in the presence of these sons and daughters the faith and hopes of their parents whose money has housed, clothed and fed you. And when a protest has been made, you have piteously cried out that your liberties were being curtailed. Yet with unblushing face and atrophied conscience, you have gone on undermining the faith of the youth, which faith was and is the foundation of all morals and the wellspring of all good. Evolutionists, you have thrown down the gauntlet; you have unsheathed the sword. And creationists gladly accept the gage of battle. We warn you here and now that there will neither be sent nor received any flag of truce. With the shield of faith, girded about with the truth of the Bible, evading no fact, and granting neither "assumption" nor "concession," we welcome the test. The fortress of truth that has stood the test throughout the ages is impregnable. With full confidence we anticipate victory.

Chapter VII

UNBRIDGED CHASMS

The traveler who crosses a wide expanse of country will arrive at a number of rivers that must be crossed, usually by bridges. The evolutionists in their theoretical journey from dead matter to man, arrive at a number of broad chasms that are as yet unbridged. In fact no architect has yet submitted blue prints for these bridges. Even a coherent theory of how man's ancestral parents may have gotten over these gaps is still lacking.

The first chasm is that between dead matter and life; between the living and the non-living. The theory of creationists gives a complete explanation of how this chasm was crossed. It teaches that God "breathed the breath of life into man and he became a living soul." Creationists accept this statement by their faith in the inspiration of the Bible. How do evolutionists explain the first uniting between dead matter and life? This chasm had to be crossed, but evolutionists are destitute of bridge or boat and ferryman. Osborn says, "The mode of the origin of life is pure speculation—for all the experiments of Butschli and others to imitate the original life process have proven fruitless." (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, p. 67). Rollin T. Chamberlin says, "But how did life start on this globe? That is a difficult question which cannot yet be adequately answered." "The actual beginning of life remains unsolved." H. H. Newman says, "In all frankness it must be admitted that the problem of the origin

of life has not been solved." (The Nature and Origin of the Word and of Man. pages 52, 52, 191). With this sweeping declaration that evolutionists are destitute of even a theory as to how life first united with dead matter, all from Darwin down agree. There is not a single exception so far as the writer's information extends. Till this first chasm between life and dead matter is bridged, evolutionists cannot start even theoretically to evolve man, to say nothing of in reality.

Osborn says: "We know, for example, that there has existed a more or less complete chain of beings from monad to man." (Origin and Evolution of Life, Preface X.) Here Osborn assumes his start, the monad, which is a single cell life-form of the lowest order. Then we will allow them to assume that life in some unknown way made the first crossing and united with dead matter. The evolutionists must get his monad across the chasm that separates it from a higher order of life. And between the two not even a theoretical bridge has been proposed. It has already been seen as set forth in a previous chapter, the insurmountable obstacles in the way of crossing over the chasm into a higher life form. Should the microscopic one-cell life form start to acquire new body members all gain would be utterly lost by its self-division. When a single cell divides into two parts, in reproducing its kind, any possible change that may have taken place before the division would be totally lost. Some evolutionists are asking geologists for a billion years of time in which to evolve man. Even that is not enough time in which to get out of the single cell life form and into the bisexual—male and female—order of life.

Evolutionists are not entirely agreed in the pedigree they write from monad to man. But Osborn and Newman have prepared a chart of periodical groups supposed to run back some sixty million years. Beginning at the bottom, they give: Unicellular life; Invertebrates, Vertebrates, Fishes, Amphibians, Reptiles, Mammals, Man. (Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics, p 161). Here are six distinct classifications far more widely separated than species. There are many smaller chasms along the road caused by many species, but these are sufficient for our present purpose. These supposed periodical gaps are made by two of the leading evolutionists of the present generation. Each gap is supposed to represent a long period of time, the six estimated at sixty million years. Now here are at least six gaps or missing links in man's supposed pedigree, not made by species that are often not widely different, but whole geological periods. Can evolutionists bridge these chasms? Can they show how, even in theory, the journey from monad to man has been made over these unbridged casms? We are not now speaking of missing bridges between living species, but of the extinct life whose fossils remain. Unless some tangible evidence that these gaps have ever been crossed, why should any one affirm that it has occurred? Faith is a product of evidence. Here is what Mr. Newman says: "None of the animals or plants of the past (geological period of extinct animals) are identical with those of the present. The nearest relationship is between a few species of the past and some living species which have been placed in the same families." "The animals and plants of each

stratum are at least generically different from those of any other stratum, though belonging in some cases to the same families or orders." (Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics. P. 162-63).

Here are two unmodified statements by Newman that are revolutionary. When he says, "The animals and plants of each stratum are generically different from those of any other stratum," he affirms that the chasms between each of the geological periods, supposedly running back many millions of years, are unbridged. Plants and animals of each geological stratum are "generically different," from those of any other stratum. What of Osborn's "more or less complete chain of beings from monad to man?" Newman declares that the gaps between geological strata are unbridged. Later it will be seen that other scientists of the highest rank for ability and impartiality, are more specific that there is not the least proof that these gaps have ever been crossed. If these declarations be true, and without a doubt zealous evolutionists would be glad to find proof of crossing over, then it seems there is but one reasonable conclusion, namely, the earth was peopled with a low order of plant and animal life that disappeared, later to be re-peopled in like manner, again to disappear, and so on for a number of geological periods, each leaving fossils and each a little higher order than the preceding period, but each generically different from all preceding periods, and the present plant and animal life generically different from those of all other periods. If this be true, as evolutionists themselves affirm, then there is not the semblance of a contradiction between the Bible account of

creation recorded in Genesis, and the fossils found in the racks. The Bible account begins with the present order of plant and animal life now on earth. Were it proved that the earth was peopled with plant and animal life millions of years before the appearance of the present order, it would in no way conflict with the record in Genesis. But whatever interpretation may be made, certain it is that the chasms between all living and extinct species, and all geological periods are unbridged. This is the unmodified declaration of evolutionists themselves. The fact that there are complete breaks between all geological periods is as clear as demonstration itself that there is no connecting link between man and any form of animal. The bridges are all hopelessly missing, evolutionists themselves testifying.

Here we might rest the case till some tangible proof is offered. Yet I will cite some of the difficulties in the way of bridge-building across the abysmal spaces separating distinct species. How did the fish change from breathing water through its gills to breathing air into its lungs when it became a serpent? Here is a gap as wide as man can well imagine, with not the least evidence that it has ever been crossed, either in the living or extinct species. And the reptile must turn to a bird; must lose its scaly skin and get feathers, wings and legs. Evolutionists offer not the least evidence that such changes ever occurred. Yet they solemnly affirm that this is the true pedigree of man. They teach that variation, natural selection and heredity has made man from the fish, reptil and bird. Well, suppose now one or a multitude of reptiles should ac-

quire, or grow, a few feathers. That would be variation at work. Then Natural Selection must preserve these alive to propagate the improved strain. Very well, but they must multiply their kind. Their first generation of offspring will lose fifty per cent of the gain, the next generation fifty percent of what is left, reducing what was first gained to twenty-five per cent in the third generation. The fourth generation would show but one sixteenth of the first feathers left. When would the reptile become a full feathered bird? Don't think I am treating the matter with levity. This question of "swamping out" the supposed gain in succeeding generations, as it is called by evolutionists, has been the nightmare of all evolutionists from Darwin down. It has been one of the insurmountable barriers over which they never have been able to evolve man even in theory. Take another example in regard to some things that come under our own observation. The English sparrow is spread over all America at least from the Rocky mountains to the Atlantic. How many millions there are we have no idea. Now, just grant evolutionists the supposition that a whole million in the same season show distinct black feathers. This would be variation. These must reproduce their kind. Now, is it reasonable, or even conceivable that these with black feathers would not mate with those of the ordinary color of feathers as well as with those of black feathers. First generation only one half of gain would remain, till again in the fourth generation all but one-sixteenth would be lost. Once more I repeat that this "swamping out" is a difficulty that evolutionists have never been able to dispose of, even theo-

retically. They are not able to satisfy their own minds on the point. Till it is removed, it will continue to stand as an impassable barrier between Osborn's "monad and man."

Osborn says that man's immediate ancestor was "some unknown ape-like form somewhere in the Tertiary." Here is a statement the like of which would indeed be hard to find. If this beast is "unknown" how does Osborn know that it was "some ape-like form?" If it is "unknown" how does he know that it was in the "Tertiary?" If it is "unknown" how does he know that it is man's ancestor? He affirms that there existed an animal "somewhere in the Tertiary," "ape-like form," man's immediate ancestor, and yet it is "unknown." And that this supposed ancestor of man is "unknown" is proved by the fact that it has not left a trace of itself in the geological strata. Why, then, affirm that such an animal existed, and describe it as being "ape-like in form," when it is wholly "unknown?" Their theory that man was evolved from dead matter up through insects, fish, reptiles, birds and mammals, demands such an animal. And so the "ape-like form" is invented as a pure figment of the imagination. Not a trace of it exists even in fossils.

The whole theory of evolution deals only with man's body, the flimsy garment that the indwelling ego has woven for itself. Why spend years theorizing about where a lady purchased her dress and hat, and utterly ignore the woman who wears the garment for a while, soon to cast it away? Then why must our great scientists spend their lifetime theorizing as to where the one hundred and sixty-five pounds of water, a few

solids and air came from and utterly ignore the man the intelligence and soul that dwells for a short time in this house of material substance only soon to cast it off? Indeed the garment of flesh is really of less importance to the soul than would be a robe of sackcloth to the fastidious lady. Just for a while why should not our great scientists try to formulate a theory as to how man's soul came out of earth, air and water. That is the source of the garment his soul wears and will be the place of its ultimate repose. And it is the soul that exalts and lifts man as far above the plane of the body and animal life as the heavens are above the earth. Let evolutionists give us a theory of the "origin and evolution of the soul." From whence came the soul? Was it latent in the single cell life form, like the tree in the acorn, waiting for time to unfold it? If so, from whence did it receive it? If not, then at what station along the line of man's descent did man's ancestors obtain these spiritual attributes? Our present inquiry is to learn the origin of the mind and soul of man. From nothing comes nothing. Man's moral mind, conscience and desire to worship a Supreme Being are actualities. These were derived from some source. They are either a product of the mixing and blending by natural law of some material elements, or they were "breathed into man by a Creator." There remains no other possible conclusion. Neither the evolutionist nor creationists can prove by actual demonstration his position. Which theory best explains the facts of man? Each must accept his position by faith which is the most consistent and worthy of belief. Faith rests on facts of

theories, or on both. Facts may be rightly or wrongly interpreted. Theories to be true must explain and agree with the known facts. Theories may be true or false. Unless a theory explains all the known facts harmoniously it must be false. It rests on shifting sand. Creationists accept every discovered fact. The controversy is all about theories that evolutionists themselves frankly admit are not proved, and about the interpretation of facts, in which scarcely any two agree.

Chapter VIII

GROUP EVOLUTION

The primary meaning of the word Evolution, is "the act of unfolding or unrolling." There is no controversy about the word evolution when used to define the many changes and variations that occur within the major groups of plants and animals. The difference is as to whether man was created as he now is, or evolved from dead matter up through fishes, reptiles and apes. Creationists may readily agree that there have occurred, and are still occurring, considerable changes and modifications within all the major groups of plants and animals, and even man. To these changes the word, evolution may properly be applied. But creationists hold to the idea that there is no evidence of linear evolution, that is, of fish descending from one cell life forms or of mammals from fish, or of man being a descendant from any animal in the brute creation. In other words, there is nothing back of man as he is today, except man, creation and God. This is the vital point in the controversy.

In man, we have the three great racial groups of Caucasian, Mongolian and Negro. These vary greatly in color, size and habits. But their body-members are all alike and so are their mental and moral attributes. Of course the degree or strength of intelligence, volition and moral mind varies greatly. But the different races and individuals within each group are alike in body-members and spiritual attributes. It is easy to conceive how these all sprang from the same original

parentage. And the word evolution is properly applied to the changes within these groups.

In the great major group of animals that we in plain language call cattle, there certainly are very considerable variations. We have the extreme beef type as represented by the Hereford, Shorthorn and Polled breeds. Among the dairy type we have the Holsteins, Jerseys and several other breeds. Belonging in this same major group of animals are the bisons or buffaloes, and several others that need not be mentioned here. These vary greatly in type, size and color. And it is well known that by crossing, rejecting, preserving and feeding, really great changes can be brought about in color, type, size and the purpose that each will best serve. But whatever changes are secured, the individuals retain their characteristics that separate them from all other groups of animals. The same principle holds good in the bird group. Very great modifications are produced in size, type, color and utility or non-utility for man's purpose. Some are useful for food, some for their beauty and some in holding in check insect life, without which bird-aid man might perish from the earth.

The major group composed of dogs and wolves perhaps present as wide a range in variation as that of any other group of mammals. The range is from the tiny lap-dog to the shepherd, hound, bull-dog, and the many intervening types and sizes. There is no good reason why the patient, skillful dog breeder could not select individuals from the extremes, and by crossing, rejecting, selecting and in course of time bring the extreme types at least very closely to resemble each

other, and very likely to appear as offspring of the same immediate parents. These illustrations can be greatly multiplied, but these are sufficient for our present purpose. The changes within the major groups as above illustrated may properly be called evolution. The creationist readily agrees with the theory of evolution when applied to the great variations and modifications that have, and are still taking place within the major groups of animals. But they deny that there is any evidence of linear evolution, or that one major group has arisen from any other widely different group.

The first argument against the theory that major groups of animals have arisen from a lower order is this: If the higher order of animals, including man, was evolved from the lowest order of one-cell life forms, the advancement could have been made only in one of two ways, (a) by sudden leaps across each gap from one major group to the next higher in a single generation, or (b), by preserving very small improvements of variation from the lowest life form upward till man is produced. And I have never read of any other process proposed by evolutionists.

Evolutionists teach that there have been classified as different species, 600,000 invertebrates and 36,000 vertebrates. This being true, there are 636,000 unbridged gaps between distinct living species. I do not know the exact number of gaps in the supposed direct line from the one cell life-form to man, but it is considerable. Now even the most zealous evolutionists admit that these gaps had to be gotten across, and also that this is one of their biggest problems. How

were they crossed? By a sudden great leap in variation in which the improvement in the offspring was as great over the parents as the difference between two major groups? One such gap would be that separating between fish and reptiles, and the next highest between reptiles and birds, then followed by the gap between birds and mammals, next "some ape-like form," that Osborn says was man's immediate ancestor. I do not believe any evolutionist affirms that these wide gaps were crossed in one leap, that is in one generation. Rather, they teach a passing on to offspring small improvements till the sum of them is sufficient to make up the difference separating a lower from a higher major group such as that between reptiles and birds and apes and man. And undoubtedly this is the more plausible theory.

Since Huxley's Tree of Life, and imaginary pedigree of the descent of man, has fallen into such disrepute, evolutionists have been rather cautious in writing a pedigree of man. But occasionally one will formulate a pedigree representing geological periods of groups of animals in order to bolster up his theory. Alfred S. Romer begins with the lower Chordates and up as follows: Jawless and Limbless Fishes, Primitive Fishes, Bony Fishes, Amphibians, Earliest Reptiles, Mammal-like Reptiles, Primitive Mammals, Placenta Mammals, Man. (See *The Nature of the Word and of Man*. Page 305.) Between Placenta Mammals and Man, Romer does not name any animal. He has branches extending out from the stem on which he lists bats, insect-eaters, lemurs, monkeys and anthropoid apes. But he places no animal in a direct line from placenta mam-

mals to man. It is true Osborn says man's immediate ancestor was "some ape-like form," neither he nor Newman nor Romer will risk listing it in their pedigree trees. Here are eleven gaps listed in a direct line down to man. Here are eleven gaps without the semblance of a bridge, or a chain with eleven links missing. Were these gaps crossed in single leaps, that is, from parent to the immediate offspring? None are so bold as to affirm they were crossed in single leaps. All affirm they were crossed by minute improvements in many generations. **IN THIS CASE THERE WOULD NOT BE A SINGLE GAP BETWEEN THE ONE-CELL LIFE-FORM AND MAN.** The widest possible difference would be that which the offspring gained over its immediate parent. And all evolutionists affirm that these improvements were so small as to be almost undetectable in each single generation. They say that it required the summing up of many generations of improved variations to make up the difference between closely allied species, to say nothing of the wide gaps between major groups such as fishes to birds and birds to mammals. The change would be so gradual as to leave not a sign of difference separating these gaps. If it were affirmed that these gaps were crossed in single leaps, then evidence should be forthcoming. If the ascension up to man was by the summing up of many very small improvements, as evolutionists affirm, then we ask for an explanation as to why there should be any separating gaps wider than the very minute improvement that the offspring is able to make over its immediate parent? Here is a vital point. The whole theory of evolution is wrapped up in its

solution. If these great gaps from fish to reptile, from reptile to bird, from bird that lays an egg, to mammal that gives birth to and nurses its offspring—if these great gaps were crossed in great leaps from parent to its offspring, then let evolutionists so affirm, and produce evidence, or at least a theory as to how it was done. But if, as they affirm, all upward improvement was made by summing up very small improvements, then what caused the great gaps separating between the great groups? The gain that one generation made over the preceding generation was so little, evolution made over the preceding generation was so little, evolutionists say, that it required thousands of generations for these gains to sum up the difference even between species. But we have eleven gaps representing the separating differences between geological periods. As best I can figure the time supposed to have elapsed from the beginning of the lowest of these eleven groups to man, as indicated in chart by Newman and Osborn, it is about forty-five million years. This divided into eleven parts to represent the eleven great groups down to man, would give, say four million years for the evolution from one group to the next higher group. Allowing the wide margin of one generation for each year we find it required four million generations of improvement to sum up the difference between the higher and next lower group. As already stated, no evolutionist affirms these broad gaps were leaped in improvements in single generations. If the position were taken, then the question of evidence that such leaps had ever occurred. And also as to why the group should make so tremendous

a leap, then to take a four million year rest before taking another leap into the next higher group. On the other hand, if as evolutionists teach, the improvement came by summing up the gain in each generation, then what in the name of all reason became of the four million years of generations intervening? Why did they not leave fossils? Had they done so, the fossil record would be so gradual in improvement that the difference between the higher and next lower group would be divided into four millions parts. In such case no gaps would intervene between the higher and lower groups greater than that represented as divided into approximately four million parts. Were these eleven gaps between groups crossed in single leaps? If so, why the four million year rest before another leap upward was made? If the ascent from the one cell life form to man was by summing the gains made in each generation, then how did the eleven gaps appear? What became of all the intervening generations representing about four million years between each two groups that these utterly failed to leave any living descendants and not even any fossils? These are real difficulties that must be got rid of at least by some plausible theory. Till the present not even a theory to explain these vital questions has been formulated. Our great body of thinking youth that makes up our student body, and who will soon take the helm of school, church and state, are beginning to demand something more than the mere assumption in regard to the origin of man. These young folks are digging into things, and demand a reason for all they accept. And they will want some reasonable

explanation on these momentous questions. The writer is persuaded that they will reach a final conclusion on these matters that appeals alone to their reason as at last being consistent with itself. And they are going to demand something better than much that has been given them. They are going to demand to know how these gaps were crossed without bridges. And more important still, they are going to want to know how animals can transmit a soul to man, when it has no soul of its own.

The view that no major group of animals has ever arisen from any other group, but has always been as it now is in every fundamental, is also held by some of the most outstanding and impartial scientists of the present day. Austin H. Clark, Smithsonian Institution, United States Museum, Washington, D. C., is likely second to no other scientist in ability, and his position permits him to impartially and freely express his mature convictions. In a personal letter to the writer, January 29, 1929, he says: "Herewith I am sending you, under separate cover, a copy of the paper from which the press notice was taken—The trouble is that today evolution has lost its original status as a theory and has assumed the aspect of an inflexible dogma." "In order to illustrate what I mean, I am sending you an article on the American Wild Horses, all of which became extinct before America was discovered by Europeans.

"You will see from the first picture that there was a very great difference between the earliest (small) and latest (large) horses, and you will also see that

there is a very evident developmental line connecting the two. But this line is not continuous; it is broken by numerous gaps which detailed investigation has failed to fill." Signed, Austin H. Clark.

In the enclosure from Dr. Clark, which states clearly his position, he says: "While the idea of linear evolution involving a time element is in general quite valid within restricted groups, as for instance the horses, yet it must undergo a certain modification, for gaps are found in all of these evolutionary lines, and these gaps appear to be real—that is, they were never, so far as we have been able to learn, bridged by so-called, missing links."

"It is quite obvious that the gaps between cats and dogs is quite broad, and it remains broad throughout the fossil record. Cats never became dogs, nor dogs cats; but both are carnivorous animals."

"Between the backboned animals and the invertebrates, such as insects, the gaps are very wide, and those peculiar types which are intermediate between them are very widely different from either."

"Between the various invertebrate groups, as insects, mollusks, echinoderms, and so forth, the gaps are still wider. These gaps go back unchanged to the earliest fossils that we know, so that in so far as these creatures are concerned we have no justification in assuming a time element in the broader aspects of the evolutionary process."

"So wide are the gaps between these various types of humbler creatures that these cannot be arranged in any sort of evolutionary line. But they do seem

to fit perfectly well into a somewhat complicated diagram showing each to have affinities with several others, not merely with a single one."

In a bulletin written by Dr. Clark, and also enclosed to the writer, he says:

"The Fossil Record"

"If this is a true delineation of the facts, it would naturally follow that at its very first inception on the earth animal life assumed essentially the form in which we know it now, for the various re-adjustments leading from the radial type of animal to the re-combination of its characters in a seemingly wholly different form in the vertebrates would presumably be simultaneous, or very nearly so.

"What can we learn in regard to this from the fossil records? The earliest aquatic fauna that we know, that of the Cambrian rocks, was in its broader aspects singularly similar to the aquatic fauna of the present day. Every one of the numerous component species falls at once within a definite phylum as outlined by living, and in a definite class within that phylum. Many of the species can be recognized as members of the families still existing, while a few may be assigned even to recent genera."

"This long list of animal types represented by the fossils in the Cambrian and immediately succeeding rocks, can have only one meaning. It shows conclusively that as far back as Cambrian time in the state of the animal world, it was, in its broader features, just what it is today. So we see that the fossil record, the actual history of animal life upon the

earth, bears us out in the assumption that at its very first appearance animal life in its broader features was in essentially the same form as that in which we know it now."

"Evolution Within The Major Groups"

"Thus so far as concerns the major groups of animals, the creationists seem to have the better of the argument. There is not the slightest evidence that any one of the Major groups arose from any other. Each is a special animal complex related, more or less closely, to all the rest, and appearing, therefore, as a special and distinct creation.

"But within each major group we see a very different picture. Here the fossil records show a constant change from one horizon to another. These successive variations are probably simply indications of a direct response to physical alteration in environment favoring, now one type or sub-type, now another."

"This continuous alteration in the elements within various groups is what is commonly known as evolution."

"In conclusion we may say that while in many of the numerous major groups of animals we can demonstrate a constant change from age to age, evidenced by an increase in diversity and a more delicate adjustment to environment, among these major groups themselves we can see no fundamental change whatever. Ever varying in the finer details of its manifestation, in its major features animal life has from the very first remained unchanged." (The Quarterly Review of Biology, Animal Evolution. PP 538-539-540).

Creationists heartily agree with every conclusion reached by Dr. Clark as set forth in the foregoing quotations. Creationists recognize the well known fact that really great changes and modifications have taken place, and still take place in all the major groups of animals. And they do not in the least object to defining such variations by the word evolution. Such variations have already been noted in the first part of this chapter. The examples could be greatly multiplied. We now close this chapter by re-quoting a few sentences with which Dr. Clark closed his masterful paper: "Thus so far as it concerns the major groups of animals, the creationists seem to have the better of the argument. There is not the slightest evidence that any one of the major groups arose from any other. Each is a special animal complex related, more or less closely, to all the rest, but appearing, therefore, as a special and distinct creation. Ever varying in the finer details of its manifestations, in its major features animal life has from the very first remained unchanged."

Chapter IX

MISSING LINKS

Of all the phases of evolution the "Missing Links" has probably been the center of most interest. Of course their lack of even a coherent theory to explain how the first life began on the earth leaves the whole theory suspended in mid air. Just as it is impossible to establish evolution without first a reasonable theory as to how life originated, till they develop some tangible theory as to how natural law can create life from dead matter—how the non-living can create life out of itself—till this is done they have not a shadow on which to build.

The "missing link" so much sought is some brute creature to connect man with some still lower animal. But it is not just one "link" missing, but a score or more "links" entirely "missing" from their chain. In fact their "chain" is a score or more separate "links". Not even any two of their "links" are connected. They list more than 20 species or forms of animals through which they suppose man has passed in his development from a single cell life form into man. Among many other supposed ancestors of man they list fishes, reptiles, birds and various mammals till man is produced. They as greatly need "links" to connect the different species of animals all the way down to reptiles and below, as a "link" to join man to some animal that is supposed to be his immediate parent. What a task to find these "missing links" either among the living or among the fossils! And what a skilful

artist is needed to connect these undiscovered "links" and form a "chain" that will bear the light of reason!

But it is a "link" to connect man with his supposed immediate brute parent that has and still is causing so much worry and disturbance among evolutionists over the entire world. No one claims that any living creature will serve as that "missing link." The idea that man's immediate brute parent is among the living has long since been given up. For a number of years the search has been among the fossils, that is, the skeletons of extinct animals. What kind of a beast was man's immediate parent, that connected man with some lower animal, is the question that so disturbs evolutionists. Over-zealous evolutionists have often rushed into print with the declaration that the long sought "link" has been discovered. A few nights of undisturbed rest come to soothe many evolutionists. But soon the question has again been raised, and so the unrest goes on anew.

In 1916, Dr. Osborn boldly declared, "We know for example . . . that man has descended from some unknown ape-like form somewhere in the Tertiary." (*The Origin and Evolution of Life*. Preface, page 10). He does not state it as a matter of theory or of opinion but that "we know," a matter of knowledge, that "man has descended from some unknown ape-like form." One would think from Dr. Osborn's certainty that the matter had been settled. But not so, even with Dr. Osborn himself. In 1927 he just as positively denies his former assertion. Hear him as quoted by Dr. Gerrit S. Miller, in the volume presently to be named, "I am glad to be first to befriend the dawn man from the

long pre-stone age and to remove from his reputation the bar-sinister of his descent . . . The myth of ape ancestry lingers on the stage, in the movies, in certain scientific parlance, but the ape-ancestry hypothesis is entirely out of date and its place is taken by the recent demonstration that we are descended from "dawn men," and not from "ape-men" (page 419).

Who but Osborn has done so much to fasten on man's "reputation the bar sinister of ape-descent" that he is now so anxious to be the first to remove.

The writer in a preceding chapter dealt with Osborn's bald declaration that "we know that man has descended from some ape-like form. What Osborn said in 1916 "we know," in 1927 he calls a "myth." What he was so zealously trying to prove in 1916 man's ape-descent, in 1927 he is bending every effort to disprove. What will he say next year as to man's descent? How often will his books need to be revised and reversed in order to meet even his own approval? But before this volume could finally be prepared for the printer he appears in another publication boldly declaring that what we then knew, is nothing but a "myth."

What is the present status of opinion among the leading evolutionists of the world with reference to any fossil that might be regarded as a "missing link" to connect man with any other creature living or extinct? Dr. Gerrit S. Miller, Curator, Division of Mammals, United States National Museum, Washington, D. C., has brought together in one volume the opinions of the leading evolutionists of the world. Its title is "The Controversy Over Human Missing Links." It

was recently issued. It is a masterly assembling of facts and opinions deduced from those facts. Perhaps no other man is better qualified, or whose position enables and permits him to give a more scholarly, painstaking accurate, and above all, impartial condensation of the opinions of the leading evolutionists of the world, than Dr. Miller. It is a monumental work.

I shall now quote at length from the above named volume. Says Dr. Miller:

“Among recent subjects of animated scientific and popular controversy both in and out of print there is perhaps none that has aroused more widespread interest than the discussion of ‘human missing links.’ Is man a creature unconnected with the rest of animate nature? Or is he a direct descendent from ancestors which were not human? And in the latter event can we point to any links which actually connect him with a nonhuman ancestral stock and which are fairly unan- imously accepted by the genuine scientific world as undoubtedly such links? Around these questions as a center the controversy revolves, with no present indication that it is likely soon to come to rest. . . .

“If a human ‘missing link’ is to be found at all, it must be sought among the fossil remains of mammals long ago extinct, since there is no living animal known which possesses the required peculiarities. Investigators know this, and they have long been diligently searching in rocks, in caves, in gravel pits, and stream beds. As a result of 70 years of effort these tireless workers have made exactly two ‘finds’, known, respectively, from the places where they were unearthed, as the ‘Java’ ape man or ‘Trinil man’ (Pithecanthropus

erectus Dobois) and the 'Piltdown dawn man' (Eoanthropus dawsoni Smith and Woodward). The former was discovered in 1891-92 near Trinil, in Java, the later about 20 years afterward at Piltdown, Sussex, England."

After this paragraph, Dr. Miller quotes opinions from a number of men of very high standing who do not believe in evolution. These I shall omit, as it is the opinions of the strongest supporters of evolution I want the reader to see, so as to give the evolutionist every advantage to prove his point. Quoting again from Dr. Miller:

"Coming to thoroughgoing evolutionists, we find many of them believe that human missing links have been demonstrably discovered. This opinion is set forth in no unfaltering words by Sir Arthur Keith in his presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science given at Leeds, August 31, 1927. He says: 'We now know, that as Darwin sat in his study at Downs, there lay hidden at Piltdown in Sussex, not 30 miles distant from him, sealed up in a bed of gravel, a fossil human skull and jaw . . . The skull, although deeply mineralized and thick walled, might well have been the rude forerunner of a modern skull, but the lower jaw was so apelike that some experts denied that it went with the human fossil skull at all, and supposed it to be the lower jaw of some extinct chimpanzee.'" Next Dr. Miller quotes from Osborn, a part of which statements have just been cited and examined in this chapter. Again, hear Dr. Miller in his own words, then his quotations from evolutionists:

"Other convinced evolutionists take a different stand. They fully believe, for a variety of reasons, that man owes his present structure to a long and gradual process of development away from nonhuman ancestors, but they contend that we have not yet discovered fossils which furnish a direct evidence of this process. Prof. Martin Ramstrom, in a paper published 10 years ago in the bulletin of the Geological Institution of the University of Upsala, (Vo.. 16, pp. 261-304, November 22, 1919), clearly expounds this view. His conclusions I translate as follows:

"Theories and working hypotheses are clearly necessary in scientific work. But it seems to me not entirely right to 'reconstruct' unknown links in the chain of evolution according to these hypotheses and then to allow such a 'restoration' before the public in the literature and in museums. Without more certain premises and foundations paleontology and anthropology become a veritable land of babel—everything becomes unsteady! After a few years perhaps another investigator follows this same method of 'reconstruction.' He perhaps substitutes a contradictory opinion and discovers in his turn a 'proof' to support his way of thinking. And which of the two is right?

"Let me give just two examples: Pithecanthropus and Eoanthropus. Eugene Dobois' find, made in a river bed and put together out of a mixture of fossils of bones, consisted of: An ape-like skullcap, several ape-like teeth; a man-like thigh bone.

Out of this was put together the transition form Pithecanthropus (Haeckel). And it was accepted by many as a proof of the theory that in the process of

human development the upright gait was the primary factor and the high specialization of the brain was secondary phenomenon. Literally the reasoning was as follows: "The fact that the femur appears relatively more manlike than the skull merely confirms the idea (auffassung), supported from several directions, that in the morphogenetic transition from apes to man the adoption of the upright walking attitude led the way . . . (Zeitschr. fur Ethnologie, 1905, p. 748). That was the idea about 15 years ago.

Now: *Eoanthropus dawsoni*, likewise an assembled river bed find, includes—a human brain case; some 'human' teeth; an ape-like lower jaw.

Thus as an antithesis to *Pithecanthropus*, (*Java man*) and at present *Eoanthropus* (*Pitdown fossils*) is taken as the support for another idea about the course of human evolution. . . The deduction at present is as follows: "So far from being a combination of characters, this association of brain and simian features is precisely what I anticipated in my address . . . some months before I knew of the existence of the *Pitdown skull*, when I argued that in the evolution of man the development of the brain must have led the way. The growth in the intelligence and in the powers of discrimination no doubt led to a cultivation of the aesthetic sense which, operating through sexual selection, brought about a gradual refinement of features." (*Nature*, vol. 92, October 2, 1923, P. 131).

"Therefore, according to *Pithecanthropus*, the upright gait is the primary element in the process by which man has come to be man.

“According to Eoanthropus the development of the brain is the primary element.

“Who is right? Who stands on firm ground? Where are the definite proofs? As to our conduct toward the public I wish in closing to call attention to the memorable words of Professor Boule (*L’Anthropolgie*, 1915, p 184). Concerning certain reconstructions of fossil men he says: “Our duty is to protest. Four such attempts, however agreeable they may appear in certain respects, are of a nature to throw discredit on science which is still having so much difficulty in getting official recognition and which does not deserve to be thus travestied.”

The reader will bear in mind that the above quotation is from an evolutionist. But however anxious he may be to find a “missing link” candor compels him to admit facts. You will notice that he says the Piltdown man is interpreted to mean one thing, the Java man the reverse. But I again introduce Dr. Miller in his unbiased comments.

“The three points of view should now be easy to understand. First, Missing links can not be expected to exist. Second, Missing links have been found; beliefs that they have not arisen from ignorance. Third, Missing links have not been found; beliefs that they have arisen from misconceptions.

Is Any Agreement Possible?

“To the question whether or not reconciliation is possible among men whose opinions differ so radically the only answer seems to be that nothing can bring

agreement short of the discovery of evidence so convincing as to compel its general acceptance by the scientific world . . .”

SUMMARY OF OPINIONS ABOUT THE JAVA MAN (*Pithecanthropus*)

“There is only one point on which all writers agree, namely, that the skull cap is strangely different from the corresponding part of other known mammals, both recent and fossil. In striking contrast we find that there are not less than 15 points of disagreement.

1. The deposits in which the fossils were found are of Tertiary age (lower to upper Pliocene), therefore old enough to be reasonably expected to contain remains of a creature ancestral to man (Dubois, Dunbar, Hilber, Marsh).

“The deposits in which fossils were found are of Quaternary age (lower to middle Pleistocene), therefore not old enough to be reasonably expected to contain remains of a creature ancestral to man (Branca, Obermaier, Pervinquiere, Ramstrom, Schuster, Vols).

2. The way the bones were deposited in ancient stream beds counts against the reference of all these parts to one individual (Ramstrom, Virchow).

“The way the skull cap, teeth, and femur were deposited in the ancient stream beds at considerable distance from each other does not count against the reference of all these parts to one individual (Branca, Dubois, Jaekel, Marsh).

The remains came from one animal (Dubois, Nering, and many others).

The remains did not certainly come from one animal (Matschie).

The remains came from two kinds of animal—teeth and skull cap from a gibbon, and femur from a man (Kruse); skullcap and femur from a man, teeth from an orang (Topinard). Diagram 5, p. 426.

The remains came from two or perhaps three kinds of animal-skullcap, one ape (Pithecanthropus); teeth another ape, not yet named; and femur perhaps human (Obermaier).

(4)

The characters of the femur are those of ordinary man (Hepburn, Houze, Kolbe, Manouvrier, Martin, Turner, Vallois).

The characters of the femur are those of a peculiar man (Hrdlicka).

The character of the femur are those of a gibbon (Kollman, Virchow).

(5)

"The size of the femur is too great for the bone to have pertained to the same individual as the skullcap (Virchow).

The size of the femur is not too great for the bone to have pertained to the same individual as the skullcap (Nehring).

(6)

The condition of the skullcap shows that the surface of the bone was eaten away by acid after deposition (Dubois).

The condition of the skullcap shows that the sur-

face of the bone could not have been eaten away by acid, but that it must have been worn down by violent stream action along with waterworn pebbles before deposition (Houze).

[If the skullcap had been subjected to stream action, it probably had a different history from the femur, whose delicate abnormal, bony outgrowths show no evidence of rough treatment.]

(7)

"The characters of the skullcap are predominantly human (Cunningham, Martin, Matschie, Houze, Turner).

The characters of the skullcap are those of a microcephalous idiot (Lydekker).

The characters of the skullcap are those of a Neanderthal man (Topinard).

The characters of the skullcap are intermediate between those of the Neanderthal man and the higher apes. (Schwalbe).

The characters of the skullcap are intermediate between those of modern man and the higher apes (Nehring).

The characters of the skullcap are simian but with some features that resemble man (Obermaier).

The characters of the skullcap are those of a gibbon (Krause, Manouvrier).

The characters of the skullcap are not those of a gibbon (Schwalbe, Weinert).

The characters of the skullcap are predominantly chimpanzeelike (Eimer, in Branco, Ramstrom, Vignac).

The characters of the skullcap are not predominantly chimpanzeelike (Schwalbe).

(8)

"The size of the brain alone is insufficient to show that the animal approached man in structure (Dubois).

The size of the brain alone is not sufficient to show the animal approached man in structure (Ramstrom).

(9)

"The creature was an imbecile (Manouvrier).

The creature was a microcephalous idiot (Lydekker).

The brain structure indicated by the cast of the inner surface of the skullcap shows that the animal might have had some power of speech (Dubois).

The brain structure indicated by the cast of the inner surface of the skullcap shows that the animal probably spoke like as a man, although his vocabulary was limited (Osborn).

The brain structure indicated by the cast of the inner structure of the skullcap shows that the animal had actually learned to speak (Tilney).

The brain structure as indicated by the cast of the inner surface of the skullcap gives no positive information about the creature's mental capacities (Symington).

(10)

"The fact that the two teeth exhibit different degrees of wear counts against the reference of both to one individual (Krause, Virchow).

The fact that the two teeth exhibit different degrees

of wear does not count against the reference of both to one individual (Dubois, Paersall, Virchow, and later opinion).

(11)

"The unworn conditions of the wisdom tooth count against the association of this tooth with the apparently aged skullcap as parts of one individual (Krause, Martin, Virchow, Waldeyer).

The unworn condition of the wisdom tooth does not count against its association with the skullcap (Dubois).

(12)

"The character of the teeth are predominantly human (Houze, Martin).

The character of the teeth are predominantly simian (Kolbe, Nehring, Obermaier, Virchow).

The character of the teeth (apart from size) are gibbonlike (Manouvrier).

The character of the teeth are, with unimportant exceptions, within the limits of variation for the living orang (Miller, Topinard).

The character of the teeth are definite enough to permit of exact classification (Luschan, Ramstrom).

(13)

"On the assumption that the remains were all those of one animal: (a) The creature was a true transitional form between ape and man (Dames, Dubois, Haeckel, Jaekel, Manouvrier, Weilsen) Diagram 2, page 426

(b) The creature was human but with some definitely simian characteristics (Cunningham, Keith).

(c) The creature was human without definitely simian characteristics (House, Martin, Petit). Diagram 1, page 426.

(d) The creature has a structure which removes it from a position of direct human ancestry (Boule).

(e) The creature was essentially a gigantic gibbon or gibbonlike ape (Boule, Kollman, Volz). Diagram 4, page 426.

(14)

"The assumption that the animal was a gigantic gibbon or gibbonlike ape involves insuperable difficulties (Dubois).

"The assumption that the animal was a gigantic gibbon or gibbonlike ape involves no insuperable difficulties. It is, moreover, supported by the fact that gigantic forms are known to have existed in many groups of mammals during the Pleistocene and late Pliocene and by the circumstances that bones of a gigantic pangolin were found in the same Trinil deposits (Boule, Branco).

The assumption that the animal is a gigantic gibbon can only be made by persons ignorant of the principles of systematic zoology (Schlosser).

(15)

"The large size of the remains counts against their having pertained to a creature ancestral to man (Koolman).

The large size of the remains does not count against their having pertained to a creature ancestral to man (all writers who regard Pithecanthropus a transitional form).

THE PILTDOWN DAWN MAN
Eoanthropus Dawsoni Smith Woodward

“The original “find” consisted of four pieces (reconstructed from nine fragments) of a cranium and an imperfect lower jaw bearing two molar teeth. Afterward a pair of nasal bones and a canine tooth were found and described, while still later two more fragments of skull and a third molar tooth made their appearance. The specimens (except the supplementary skull fragments) are figured in Plate 5, and Plate 4, fig. 1.”

The Plates and Diagrams referred to in these quotations are found in the *Controversy Over Human Missing*, by Dr. Gerrit S. Miller, the work from which all these quotations are made.

Then Dr. Miller follows with nine pages of quotations from a number of leading evolutionists with regard to the “find” of a few fragments and teeth just mentioned. I will not give the summing up of the contradictory opinions as expressed by the most noted evolutionists of the world.

**“SUMMARY OF OPINIONS ABOUT THE PILT-
DOWN MAN”**

(Eoanthropus)

“There is only one point on which all authors agree—namely, that the fragments of the brain case and the nearly complete nasal bones pertain to man. In striking contrast we find that there are not less than 20 points of disagreement.”

(1)

The deposits in which the remains were found are of Pliocene age (Moir).

The deposits in which the remains were found are not of Pleistocene age (Dawkins, Fruedenberg, and others.)

(2)

The fact that the remains were found in stream-deposit material counts against the reference of all to the same individual (Miller, Ranstrom).

The fact that the remains were found in stream-deposit does not count against the reference of all to the same individual (Jaekel, Keith, Pycraft, Woodward, and others).

(3)

The fragments all pertain to one creature, a man (Broom, Keith, Pycraft, Smith, Underwood, Woodward, and others).

The fragments pertain to two creatures—the skull to a man, the jaw and teeth to an ape (Miller, Ramstrom, Wterson, and others).

The fragments pertain to two creatures—the skull and jaw to a man, the canine tooth to an ape (Lyne).

The fragments pertain to two individuals, each a particular kind of man (Hrdlicka, Puccioni).

(4)

The canine is a permanent tooth (Woodward and most writers).

The canine is a milk tooth (Lyne).

(5)

The degree of wear of the canine tooth is too great for the tooth to have been a milk tooth (Underwood).

The degree of wear of the canine tooth is not too great for the tooth to have been a milk tooth (Hopson).

(6)

The canine tooth came from the upper jaw and is most like the permanent upper tooth of a female chimpanzee (Miller).

The canine tooth came from the lower jaw and is most like the lower milk canine of men and great apes (Woodward).

(7)

The left lower molar pertaining to the third set of fragments is worn in the same manner and to the same degree as the corresponding tooth in the original jaw (Hrdlicka).

The left lower molar pertaining to the third set of fragments is worn in a different manner from the corresponding right tooth in the original jaw (Woodward).

The left lower molar pertaining to the third set of fragments is not worn at all (thus differing conspicuously from the worn corresponding tooth in the original jaw (Osborn).

(8)

The specimens pertaining to the third set of fragments give additional support to the belief that the association of the jaw with the skull is justified (Gregory, Hellman, Osborn, Woodward).

The specimens pertaining to the third set of fragments give no additional support to the belief that the association of the jaw with the skull is justified (Hrdlicka).

(9)

The jaw is horse-shoe shaped like that of man (Kleinschmidt).

(10)

The jaw more nearly resembles that of the Kaffir than that of the chimpanzee (Pycraft with approval of Broom, Keith and others).

The jaw more nearly resembles that of the chimpanzee than that of the Kaffir or any other race of man (Maller and many other writers).

(11)

The jaw was chinless (Woodward and most other writers).

The jaw may not have been completely chinless (Dixon).

(12)

The jaw appears to be almost precisely that of an ape (Wooward).

The jaw is that of a chimpanzee (Boule, Miller, Ramstrom).

The jaw is utterly unlike that of any chimpanzee (O'Donoghue).

The jaw has many characteristics which make it human in spite of the fact that it presents many points of likeness to that of a chimpanzee (Pycraft, with ap-

proval of Broom, Keith, Smith, Underwood, and Woodward).

The jaws is more like that of Neanderthal man than Chimpanzee (Puccioni).

The jaw is oranglike (Frassetto).

The jaw is essentially a human jaw (Broom).

(13)

The molar teeth in the jaw are simian and within the variation limits for the corresponding teeth of the great apes (Miller, Ramstrom and others).

The molar teeth in the jaw differ conspicuously from those of all the great apes (Pycraft).

The molar teeth in the jaw are definitely those of a chimpanzee (Miller, Ramstrom, and others).

The molar teeth in the jaw are as unlike chimpanzee teeth as teeth can well be (Keith).

The molar teeth in the jaw find their nearest analogy in the teeth of the extinct apes of the genus *Dryopithecus* (Hrdlicka).

The molar teeth in the jaw are human (Pycraft, Smith, and others).

(14)

The molar teeth in the jaw are ground down by a transverse movement which is physically impossible for any chimpanzee to accomplish (Broom).

The molar teeth in the jaw are ground down in the same manner as in a chimpanzee in the United States Museum (Miller, Pycraft, 1918).

(15)

Taking the jaw and its teeth together the characters are nearest those of the young orang (Frassetto).

Taking the jaw and its teeth together the characters are nearest those of a chimpanzee (Miller, Ramstrom, and others).

(16)

The chimpanzee represented by the jaw was different from the living African species (Miller).

The chimpanzee represented by the jaw can not be distinguished from living African species (Ramstrom).

(17)

The presence of a hitherto unknown ape in England in the Pleistocene period involves an upheaval of paleontological teaching (Smith).

The presence of a hitherto unknown ape in England in the Pleistocene would not be in any way extraordinary (Boule).

(18)

Admitting that all the parts pertain to one creature, this is—

- (a) A direct ancestor of modern man (Sutcliffe).
- (b) A direct ancestor of Neanderthal man (Pilgrim).
- (c) A representative of a line not leading to modern man or to Neanderthal man (Keith, Osborn, Smith).
- (d) A missing link between man and the higher apes (Dawkins, Lankester).

(19)

The brain case of which the original fragments form a part was essentially the same as that of modern man in both form and capacity, the latter about 1,400 cc, or more (Keith).

The brain case of which the original fragments form a part was in general similar to that of modern man, but was lower, broader, and with less capacity, the latter about 1,100 cc (Woodward).

The brain case of which the original fragments form a part was unlike that of modern man in its remarkable breadth and small capacity (about 1,170 cc.); it differed, moreover, in details of structure which make it fall into harmony with the chimpanzee-like jaw (Smith, Hunter).

(20)

Eoanthropus is a valid genus distinct from *Homo* (man) and the name is appropriate because the creature lived at humanity's dawn (Woodward and most other writers who accept the association of the fossils as parts of one individual).

Eoanthropus is not a valid genus distinct from *Homo* (man) and if it were the name would not be appropriate because a creature living so recently could not pertain to humanity's dawn (Boule and others).

Conclusion

"Having now reviewed the salient points in the controversy over human 'missing links,' we are probably in as good position as we are ever likely to be to form

a definite opinion about the lessons taught by the discoveries of Dubois and Dawson—that is to say, so long as the specimens which these men found mark the limit of our knowledge. For the intense scrutiny to which the fragments have been subjected seems to have wrung from them the last secrets which they can have held. Two facts, if no others, must be admitted to stand out from the maze of opinion which we have been trying to follow, namely, that these fossils have furnished an unparalleled stimulus to investigation, and that the things most needed now are more fossils and many of them. While awaiting these further discoveries we should not hesitate to confess that in place of demonstrable links between man and other mammals we now possess nothing more than some fossils so fragmentary that they are susceptible of being interpreted either as such links or as something else.”

Here I close quotations from “The Controversy About Human Missing Links.” No higher authority or more impartial is extant, perhaps, than Dr. Gerrit S. Miller. And let it be remembered that Dr. Miller is an evolutionist, as well as all others from whom these quotations are made. I have refrained from giving as authority the opinions of those who do not believe that man has been evolved from the brute family. I desire that the reader may see the best that it is possible to present as evidence that any “missing link” to connect man with reptiles, apes, and other creatures has been discovered. It has often been stated in the press, as quotations from some scientist, that “missing links” have been discovered, till some probably believe that evolutionists are a unit in such belief. The quo-

tations are all from those who believe that man was evolved from fish, reptiles, and finally had some parent of apelike form. Their great concern is to find the fossil of some such creature, on which a sufficient degree of opinion can be had so that the "link" will be accepted as evidence of man's brute parentage. The reader will first of all be impressed with the meagerness of the "fragments" of bones that has caused so much discussion. A skullcap and thigh bone, is the Java man. Nine small fragments make up the Pilt-down man. Out of these two sets of scraps of bone two imaginary men have been built, and heralded by some over zealous evolutionists as the accepted "missing links" that join man to the brute creation. But the reader will also be deeply impressed by the great disagreement among the leading scientists of the entire world. No two agree on but very few points. There are 15 disagreements in regard to the Java bone scraps, and at least 20 in regard to the Pilt-down fragments. Many of these are as direct contradictions as it is possible to make. There are six disagreements and contradictions in regard to three teeth alone. Yet each of the large number whose statements are herein quoted are the world's most noted scientists. Each one dogmatically asserts his opinion as right, and should be accepted as final. We revere science and scientists so long as they deal with facts. But when they enter the field of purest speculation, dogmatically advance opinions as contradictory as those herein quoted, we are constrained to hold them in no higher reverence than others who speculate about scraps of bone, and other such matters. And when their fantastic specu-

lations, as we may with all due regard call the quotations herein made, destroy the faith of our noble youth, and remove the very foundation of all morals, then we arise and enter a most solemn protest. These theories are poured into the minds of youthful students with all the dogmatic authority as though they were as fully proven and demonstrated as processes in chemistry. Dr. Miller truly declares, "While waiting these further discoveries we should not hesitate to confess that in place of demonstrable links between man and other mammals we now possess nothing more than some fossils so fragmentary that they are susceptible of being interpreted either as such links or as something else."

There are not fewer than 35 disagreements and contradictions among evolutionists as to the right "interpretation" of these few fragments of bone. Were all evolutionists as careful in assertions as Dr. Miller, the situation would be far different in regard to the tenseness of feeling between Creationists and Evolutionists.

After reviewing the quotations herein, one is moved to exclaim, what a slender thread on which to hang so momentous a theory! What a shifting foundation on which to base the origin and destiny of man.

Chapter X

THE TRUTH IN GENESIS

Each period in history is characterized by trends of thought and action peculiar to itself. The present is noted for the many new and deceptive attacks made on the Bible and Christianity. Higher criticism under the badge of scholarship attacks the authorship and credibility of the various books of the Old Testament. Evolution, labeled science, attacks every fundamental truth of the Bible and Christianity. Evolutionists deny Inspiration of the Bible; that man was created in the moral likeness of God; in short, every miracle, including the birth of Jesus, his resurrection, or man's redemption to a new life. Creation and Evolution are as opposite as truth and falsehood; faith and unbelief.

Let it be understood that creationists make no war on applied science. Nor do creationists concern themselves much about the wildest speculations in regard to the formation of the material world. But when the theory is applied to man, body, mind and soul, and the square repudiation of Christianity — the divine origin both of man and his salvation through Christ — only then do creationists become deeply interested.

While these attacks were made by avowed Agnostics, the battle line was clearly drawn. But since a very large percentage of clergymen, who are supposed to preach Christ, are the most zealous proclaimers of the insidious seeds of unbelief, we need to take careful heed. The enemies of Christ are boring from within. While wearing the livery of heaven, they hold com-

munion with the camp of the enemy. These traitor-clergymen wear the uniform of the hosts of heaven, but sit in the councils of material atheists. For every solemn declaration of unwavering faith in the divine inspiration of the Bible and its recorded miracles, they have but a jest. And when the most outspoken material atheists declare that man, body, mind and soul, was begotten by natural law, conceived and brought forth from the womb of dead matter, they applaud themselves hoarse. No other enemy can do so much harm as he who is wearing the uniform of the army for whose defeat he is bending his energies.

Believers in Christ have no need for alarm. In every conflict the Bible and Christianity have emerged more than victors, and girded with new strength.

It is argued by those who call themselves Christian evolutionists that the "Bible is not a text book on science." No, but it is largely a book of history. It not only records the history of the creation of the first man of the race, but gives the names of several of his children, and continues an unbroken line of descent down to Christ himself. One of the biographers of Jesus' life record his genealogy back to Adam, the first man. Every historical statement in the Bible is but an extension of the history of the creation of Adam. All other historical statements in the Bible are but as the tree to its root from which it grew. Without the history in Genesis, all the balance of the Bible is meaningless and useless. The story of creation is history on which rests all faith in Christ and all hope of heaven. Destroy faith in man's creation and fall, and you destroy all salvation from sin and all hope of re-

demption from the grave. Indeed if Adam did not sin, then there is no sin from which to be saved. More still, you remove all feeling of responsibility to God. The feeling that man came from God, is accountable to him and will return to him is the most inspiring and ennobling thought of the heart. The most powerful incentive to good and preventives of evil are the fear of retribution and hope of reward for the deeds done in the body. In these incentives all morals have their root.

“Without faith it is impossible to please God.” “These things are written that ye might believe, and that believing ye might have life through His name.” “If ye believe not his (Moses) writings how shall ye believe my words, for he wrote of me.” If the historical record of the Bible is not true, then all faith based on it is false and vain. Faith is but the acceptance as true, historical statements. No greater example of contradiction can be imagined than to preach and exalt the importance of faith in Christ, while declaring as untrue the historical record that produced that faith. It is sometimes declared that the history in Genesis is only an “allegory.” We do not believe allegory, we believe statements of facts. Allegory is a figure to illustrate an historical fact. If the supposed fact does not exist the allegory is meaningless. If the history in Genesis is taken as an allegory, simply an illustration to teach a reality, then what is the reality? By no possible turn of the imagination can it be made to fit the theory of evolution. It has to do with the origin of man on earth. It is impossible to twist it so as to describe the theory of evolution, and

creation is the only other theory advanced to explain the origin of man. And creationists not only must, but are willing to rest the whole issue on which is true, Creation or Evolution. The triumph or defeat of Evolution or Christianity rests as definitely on the story in Genesis as the fate of two armies turned on Goliath's sword and David's sling. If evolutionists can establish beyond question a single fact that clearly contradicts the history in Genesis, the victory belongs to them.

It is affirmed that fossils are found of extinct animals that lived on the earth millions of years earlier than the history of creation as recorded in Genesis. If that be true, it in no way disproves the history of creation as recorded in Genesis. The Bible history begins with the present order of plant and animal life now on the earth, of which man is the highest and last. What may have existed before this order of life was created, is not stated.

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." That is one part of creation, and how long ago that was measured in years, the Bible does not give a hint. "And the earth was waste and void; and darkness moved upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." No dry land had yet appeared, nor light to separate from darkness. No one believes that the present order of plant and animal life dates back to the beginning of the material earth. How much older the material world may be than man, is a matter of pure speculation. Nor does "creating the heavens and the earth" necessarily mean bringing these into existence out of

nothing. It simply means bringing order out of chaos; organizing material substances into an orderly system. Men are said to have created governments. Creating plants and animals simply means forming the first plants and bodies of the first animals, putting the life essence into each and enabling all life-forms to transmit life, that in turn clothes itself with a body. The mode or process of forming plants and bodies of animals is not stated. It matters not whether it was by a simple word of command or otherwise. The fact that the progenitors were fundamentally like all their offspring to the present day, is the idea involved. And if it be argued that the progenitors of the present order of plant and animal life now on earth were created a long period before man, I would not waste time controverting the contention. That man has no ancestors such as fishes, reptiles and apes, is the vital question at issue.

Every statement affirmed here is not only admitted but also affirmed by leading evolutionists. The remarkable statements by Dr. Austin H. Clark have already been given in a previous chapter. H. H. Newman who is one of the very highest rank and most extreme evolutionists, says: "None of the animals or plants of the past are identical with those of the present. The nearest relationship is between a few species of the past and some living species which have been placed in the same families." (Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics, p. 162). Here in the clearest possible language Newman affirms a complete gap separating man and the present order of plant and animal life from all pre-historic and extinct plant and animal life. And

on this solid foundation creationists build. Whatever may have existed that is now extinct does not affect in the least what now is. And evolutionists have found no trace of man antedating this affirmed gap between the living and the extinct. The unavoidable conclusion then is that back of this gap that Newman says separates the living from the extinct, no man existed. This being true, man has had neither reptile nor ape as ancestor. Evolutionists affirm themselves that there is no identity between the living and the extinct. And this is all that creationists contend for, namely, that man has had no ancestor except man.

But what of evolution of plants and animals antedating this gap? Again Newman says: "The animals and plants of each geological stratum are at least generically different from those of any other stratum, though belonging in some cases to the same families or orders." "The animals and plants of the newest (highest) geological strata are most like those of the present and help to link the present with the past." (Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics, P. 163). If evolutionists are right in their affirmation, and doubtless they would be glad to find it otherwise, then the extinct life-forms are not only not identical with those of the present, but also different from each former stratum. It would also prove that each "brought forth after its kind," in the past geological periods as it does now in living species. And if it were proven that the earth was peopled by plants and animals millions of years before the present order, it would not in the least affect the Bible account of the creation of man. There is no identity between the living and the extinct, evolutionists themselves be-

ing witness. Man belongs to the present order of life, and there is no trace of man antedating the gap separating the living present from the dead past. The Bible declares that God created the first plants, animals and man, and commanded them to "bring forth after their kind."

That this is true, not only does every living plant and animal, but also every fossil in the rock bear unimpeachable testimony. The bursting into new life from seeds of plants over the face of the whole earth "after their kind" of the parent are vocal in their testimony of the truth in Genesis. Indeed, wherever new life is born, from seed, shell or parent—there is a new witness that Genesis is true.

Chapter XI

GENESIS EXPLAINS THE FACTS

An hypothesis is a theory formulated to explain known facts. To be creditable it must explain at least all the major facts to which it is applied. If the theory not only fails to explain the facts, but is directly contrary to other well known facts, it must be recognized as untrue. For example, take the Laplacian hypothesis of the formation of the earth. Rollin T. Chamberlain says: "Throughout the nineteenth century the nebular hypothesis, launched by the French mathematician, Laplace, held almost universal sway and was confidently believed to be the true story of the development of the solar system—therefore it was a wonderful hypothesis and must perforce be true. Geology was confidently based upon it. For a hundred years it was not seriously questioned, but more recently many difficulties of a very grave nature have been brought to light. Let us look into some of these in order to understand why this time-honored theory, which has played such an important part in the development of the earth sciences, has finally had to be abandoned." (The Nature of the Word and of Man. pp 41-42).

Here is an example of an hypothesis confidently believed in for an hundred years. Very largely earth sciences were based on it. It was the starting point from which many scientific lines were run. Geology was confidently based upon it. But it was found to be untrue and geology had to be started all over again.

indeed, it was thought to be about as firmly settled as a starting-point from which to survey other sciences as the magnetic needle served the geographer in running his lines on plain and mountain. And in what condition would the map maker find himself should he find his compass had been pointing in another direction than the magnetic pole? His surveys would all have to be done over. Who would afterward trust surveyors using compasses made in the same factory? And this is just one reason why creationists are just a little slow to follow every trail surveyed with the use of compasses bearing the trade mark of atheism. They are so often found not pointing true to the magnetic pole of truth. Chamberlain says entirely new surveys must be made, and plates for entirely new maps made for earth sciences by reason of the fact that the Laplacian compass was found to be pointing way off from the magnetic pole of fact. It was found that many facts were contrary to the entire theory. Osborn declares, as already noted, that the entire survey of the "causes of evolution" made during the one hundred and fifty years would have to be discarded, and a new start made, using as compass, his "energy concept," "for new and untried paths of exploration" that "may be followed during the present century." Creationists rejoice in every discovered fact of science, but are a little skeptical about the certainty of some of the theories offered. Other instances could be cited of hypotheses that were confidently accepted for many years only at last to be discarded because they were found to be contrary to known facts. The theory of creation must now be rigidly tested. Will it explain

the known facts with regard to the order of life now on the earth? If it fails in a single important instance, its credibility will be impaired.

The earth is peopled with plants, animal and human life. These possess certain well-known attributes and are subject to certain natural laws. These all had a beginning on the earth. Only two theories are offered to explain their origin and characters—evolution and creation. The evidences of evolution have been in some measure examined. We must now rigidly examine the theory of creation.

“And God said, let the earth put forth grass, herbs yielding seed and fruit-trees bearing fruit after their kind, wherein is the seed thereof. And God said, Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth. And God said, Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind.” (Genesis 1st chapter). Here is a brief historical statement of the beginning of the present order of plant and animal life now on the earth. It is not stated whether a male and female of each kind of animal was formed from which all others are descended, or whether the command, “Let the earth bring forth,” caused the first generation of plants and animals suddenly to appear largely over the earth’s surface. On these ideas each one may “interpret” for himself. But the fundamental thought is that the first forms were by miracle, in contravention of any known natural law, and all now present have been “brought forth” after the original kind. It is an historical statement of what is declared to be a fact,

and can only be believed or disbelieved. It is as clear as it is possible to make it. The fundamental thought, that God specifically created families or major groups of plants and animals distinct from each other, and commanded them to "bring forth after their kind" must either be rejected as false or accepted as true. Creationists are willing to rest the whole issue on which will best stand the crucial test.

The countless numbers of plants, insects and animals that swarm in the oceans, rivers, air and on the earth bear irrefutable witness to the divine command, "Let them bring forth after their kind." From the tiniest microscopical plant to the giant oak; from the invisible disease germ to the leviathan of the deep and monster of the jungle—all are from parentage of "their kind." The line of descent from the first form of "their kind" is unbroken. Not even a bacteria but what was "brought forth after its kind." Evolutionists tell us "there are some 600,000 recorded species of living invertebrates and only 36,000 known species of vertebrate." (*The Nature of the World and of Man.* p. 261).

What a "cloud of witnesses?" There are full 636,000 families of witnesses and the number of individuals making up these families is innumerable. The gaps separating these 636,000 species are never crossed. The command, "Let them bring forth after their kind" is as immutable as the eternal verities.

There are variations in plenty, but all within the limits of each major group. There is no observed instance of the appearance of a single new species. No two plants are exactly alike, but the offspring are "after the kind" of the parents. We have the beef

and dairy types of cattle. By crossing, selecting and rejecting these can be greatly modified. But they are still cattle, with split hoof and other fundamental characteristics. So with all other plants and animals. But these variations never produce new species. The existence of 636,000 distant species, with separating gaps that are never crossed, bear witness that, within the knowledge of man, the command to "bring forth after their kind" has never been violated.

Evolutionists teach that natural law acting on plants and animals will eliminate the inferior and preserve the superior and thus improve both plants and animals. So far as the observation of man extends the reverse is true. We know that grasses, grains, fruits and animals are far superior to serve man's need today than one hundred years ago. How has this great improvement come about? By leaving nature to work alone? No. It was wholly by the toil of man in rejecting the inferior and preserving the superior that this great improvement has been made. Let man cease his mental and physical toil and leave Nature to work unguided, and the gain of an hundred years will quickly be lost. If left alone to Nature, the best plants and animals not only do not improve but rapidly deteriorate. Some three hundred years ago the Spanish turned loose some well bred horses on the plains of the Southwest. The small worthless range ponies are the result. The worthless wild hogs of the Southern States are the direct descendants of at least fairly well-bred domesticated swine. Doubtless in each case by long hard toil in feeding, breeding, rejecting and preserving the descendants of both ponies and swine could be made use-

ful to man's needs. Improvement in the products of nature is paid for in serious thought and physical toil. Cease to toil and all gain is quickly lost.

And what do these facts, plainly read and well known to all men, prove? The theory of evolution? Nay, verily, but creation. Listen: "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good." "Behold, I have given every herb yielding seed, which is upon the face of the earth, and every tree, yielding seed; to you it shall be for food." (Genesis 1st chapter). The declaration that these were "very good" and given to man for food, was made while man was yet sinless. But man sinned. What change took place? "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee: in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the ground; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return" (Gen. chapter 3). While man remained obedient he was promised food without the penalty of toil attached. When he transgressed, the earth was cursed and its products degraded. Henceforth the "sweat of his face" was to be the price of his bread. And it is well known that it is with great toil that man gains his food. Governments spend millions of dollars combatting insects and diseases that prey upon plants and animals to the end that men may eat bread. Scientists are often speculating as to which will most likely win—man or tiny insects. Scientists of the highest rank are constantly engaged in study and toil trying to improve the products of the earth for man's welfare. Every nook and corner of the earth is being searched.

From the interior of China and the plains of Persia have been brought a few bugs and wasps each costing many times its weight in gold, to combat injurious insects to the end that man may eat more and better fruit. Man throughout the habitable earth is engaged in a titanic struggle with harmful insects, fungus diseases of plants and noxious weeds, in fulfillment of the declaration, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." The curse placed upon the ground has so filled it with enemies to man's ease that by far the greater part of his arduous toil is to gain bread. And yet perhaps half the world goes to bed hungry. Every unquestioned fact here cited is proof incontestable of the truth of the creation and fall of man as recorded in Genesis. Because of man's transgression all the products of the ground were degraded. The duty of toil is the price of bread. By great toil of brain and muscle man can bring the products of the ground part way up to where they were when pronounced "very good," and given to man for food. Cease to pay the penalty; cease to toil and they quickly sink to their degraded level. The knowledge of these facts is almost universal. Their mute testimony is felt in every weary muscle, scintillates from every sweat-drop of toil and confronts man at every meal. It is an agreed axiom that they who eat honest bread shall have toiled for it in field, factory or some other worthy labor. These evidences of the truth of the history in Genesis are not buried deep in the rocks, and about the age and interpretation of which scarcely no two agree, but are present, seen and experienced universally. All

know and admit the facts. Creation makes plain these facts.

It is admitted that plants and animals as found in a state of nature do not well serve man's needs.

It is admitted that by extreme toil man can so improve plants and animals that they better serve his purposes.

It is well known that as soon as man ceases to toil plants and animals quickly return to their degraded state.

It must also be admitted that the story of creation as recorded in Genesis perfectly explains all these facts as we know them to exist.

Was Moses inspired to write what actually took place? Or did he unaided formulate a theory that perfectly explains the facts nearly four thousand years later? If he were not inspired to write what actually happened, then he was able unaided to formulate a theory that has perfectly explained the facts universally known. The theory of evolution not only does not explain the facts, but plainly contradicts the facts.

Evolution offers no explanation why plants and animals can be so rapidly improved by toil, and why all gain is so quickly lost when toil ceases. It teaches that plants and animals "bring forth" contrary to "their kind" to the extent that fish "bring forth" reptiles; and reptiles "bring forth" birds, and "some ape-like form" brings forth MAN.

Chapter XII

ORIGIN OF THE SOUL

It has several times been stated that evolutionists deal only with the shape or form of the body of plants and animals. Why spend so much time speculating about the garment and house, and ignore the wearer of the garment and the inmate of the house? The material plant is but the garment of the life-essence of the plant-life. The body of the animal is only the house in which the life dwells. And why be so concerned about the development of the body formed from earth, water and air, and utterly ignore the life that for only a short time dwells therein? And the indwelling life is of far more importance than the plant or body.

But far above all else is the soul of man. For without the soul man would be but an intellectual animal. He would be without moral restraint or spiritual aspiration. Why, then, are evolutionists as silent as the Sphinx as to the origin of the soul? The answer is their theory is SOULLESS. Their theory does not recognize a soul that will live after its house, the body, has returned to the dust. They do not believe the Bible doctrine, "Then shall the body return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to the God who gave it." Nor the declaration of Paul, "For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. 5:1). It is the robbing of our splendid youthful students of this hope, which

is the source of all joy as well as the basis of all morals, against which creationists enter their protest. If there be any who deny that evolution is a soulless, heavenless, materialistic theory, then I call for the names of any leaders among evolutionists who teach a future life for the soul. A few preachers who are crawling in the rear may try so to teach. But these neither exert influence nor command respect from either evolutionists or creationists.

The first article in the evolutionist's creed rules God entirely out. They admit no creative agencies except unthinking, unreasoning, unfeeling natural law acting on dead matter. The most ingenious and fertile imagination is unequal to the task even to formulate a theory as to how the soul of man can be begotten by natural law, conceived and brought forth from the womb of dead matter. Yet these are the only agencies recognized by evolutionists. Natural law and dead matter are evolutionists progenitors; their Adam and Eve of the whole race of life.

The material bodies of man and animals are very much alike in the elements of which they are composed. Their form or shape of body differs greatly. But the soul of man bears not the slightest resemblance to anything in any other creature on earth. Evolutionists teach that resemblance proves kinship; the closer the resemblance the closer the kinship. We cheerfully accept the test and call on evolutionists to prove the faintest resemblance between the soul of man and any attribute that dwells in any other creature known to man. When they show the least resemblance between the soul and any instinct, attribute or any other

something that dwells in any other creature on the earth, then creationists will discard the history in Genesis that says: "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

What is the soul? The question is as hard to answer as the question, what is life? In the absolute we cannot answer the question. We can see and feel the manifestations of life. And we can observe and feel the attributes and functions of the soul. All that man is, more than the animal goes to make up the soul. For it is the soul that removes man out of the real mof all other creatures of the earth. A comparison may aid in a clearer conception of the soul. A horse has a body of flesh and blood, animated in some way by life, in which is seated appetites, passions and propensities that cause it to secure nourishment, seek body comfort and reproduce its kind. Man has all these similar to the animal. The horse has some degree of memory and intelligence, and some attribute to animals a low degree of reasoning power. But certain it is that the animal here stops. And at this level the soul begins. From here upward are the attributes of the soul that lifts man as high as the heavens above the brute creation, and leaves him but little "lower than the angels."

One attribute of the soul is love. Love begets sympathy, kindness, benevolence, and inspires to the greatest service and sacrifice in behalf of the weak and suffering. Conscience, the monitor of behavior; that approves what is believed to be right and censures what is regarded as wrong, belongs alone to the soul of man. Remove from the mind of man a conscious sense of ac-

countability to God and you have only an intellectual beast. All morality would perish from the earth.

Faith is an attribute that dwells only in the soul of man. Hope, the desire and expectation of future good; the magnet that draws man onward and upward is rooted in the soul. A desire to worship a Deity is universal in man. And say what one may, all men do pay homage to some object. A desire to live again and in a better habitation is as inherent in the soul as the desire for food is in the body.

The elements of the body of man and of animals are substantially the same. The fleshly passions that reside in the body are also alike.

Material elements may be so mixed as to form compounds and alloys. But the result rises no higher than the elements. Base metals like iron and copper, when mixed, cannot result in gold. Limestone and shale cannot be so blended as to form diamonds. The alloy cannot be higher than the average of the elements used in forming the alloy.

It is inconceivable that the spiritual attributes of the soul could arise as a result of natural law blending dead matter. Yet Osborn says: "The more modern scientific opinion is that life arose from a re-combination of forces pre-existing in the cosmos." (*Origin and Evolution of Life*. P. 2).

Natural law is the controlling force throughout the universe. Whether natural law is thought of as one harmonious whole, of which each minor action is a part, or various minor laws harmoniously operating each in its sphere, the result is always uniform. What ever natural law once did with material elements, it will,

still, and does it with the same material elements. Natural law enables the germ in plant and animal to reproduce its kind. Or shall we say, that life calls to its aid natural law and weaves for itself a garment to wear or a body in which to make its temporary habitation? Is natural law greater than life and does it use life as a servant? Or rather is not life greater than natural law and so makes of it a servant?

Can the sightless create vision? Can the unfeeling produce tenderness, sympathy, love? Did the hope that springs eternal; that inspires to all effort; came that hope out of the clod? To put the whole two theories, creation and evolution, bluntly but tersely and clearly: the soul came down from God, or it came up from the clod. Are you startled at this statement? Do you feel it is putting it too strongly? Now listen to what H. F. Osborn, than whom there is no higher authority among evolutionists, says: "The more modern scientific opinion is that life arose from a recombination of forces pre-existing in the cosmos, that life does not represent the entrance either of a new form of energy or of a new series of laws—we may express our opinion—that when life appeared on the earth some energies—pre-existing in the cosmos were brought into relation with the chemical elements already existing." (Origin and Evolution of Life. P. 2). It is scarcely possible to make this statement any clearer, though it may be summed up in fewer words. He first states that no new "series of laws" appeared. Then he states, "When life appeared on the earth some energies pre-existing in the cosmos were brought into relation with the chemical elements already existing." Here is Os-

born's soul created by natural law "recombining forces pre-existing" and "were brought into relation with the chemical elements already existing." Here the issue is clearly drawn. The natural laws already in operation, out of the forces pre-existing, life was produced from "the chemical elements already existing." Divine intervention is ruled out, and leaves nothing but Osborn's natural laws, forces and chemical elements out of which man was made, body, mind and soul.

But his type of reasoning is certainly not often used. He says, "No new form of energy or of a new series of laws," yet there occurred a "recombination of forces pre-existing in the cosmos," from which arose life, something never before known on the earth. There was no change, either of "laws" or of "forces," yet two effects appeared (a) "A recombination of forces," (b) Life appeared. There is no formula in logic more definitely settled than that there can be no effect except when produced by a cause. Every logician will freely assent to the proposition that it is mechanically impossible for a new effect to appear except when produced by a corresponding new cause. Yet Osborn boldly affirms that "we may express as our own opinion—that when life appeared on the earth some energies pre-existing in the cosmos were brought into relation with the chemical elements already existing" and that all without any "new series of laws." How is it possible to "recombine forces," clearly a new effect, and produce life, the greatest new effect ever to occur on the earth, all without the introduction of a single new cause? The writer is strongly persuaded that the

thinking student of today will demand more convincing reasoning than this before they believe that man's soul was chemically produced from material elements.

We can logically reason only from the known to the unknown. Starting with the known we may reason to a conclusion in agreement with the known facts. But to assume a theory about the unknown as a premise that is directly contrary to all that is known on the subject, it seems not conceivably possible to reach a true conclusion. Yet that is condensed evolution. All that is known about the operation of natural law is that co-operating with life-essence now on the earth, it aids life-essence to clothe itself with a material body, and reproduce its kind. But to assume that natural law ever produced life, is to assume that which is not only unknown to man, but is directly contrary to all man does know about the operation of natural law. Each divisional agency of natural law, (I do not know how better to express the idea) always works uniformly to produce the same results. It is not only contrary to all known facts, but logically inconceivable that it would act otherwise. Natural law does not now produce the soul of man from dead matter. Therefore we reason from the known to the unknown and conclude that it never did, but that man's soul came on the earth from another source than dead matter, and by another agency than natural law. It came from God, the source of all life and the fountain of all moral attributes. And while here, like the homesick traveler, it yearns for home. And as the dutiful child that reverences the wise and good parent who has tenderly

loved and cared for it, so that soul pours out itself in praise, thanksgiving and worship to its Father of love. It came from God and yearns to return to God.

This explanation of the coming on the earth of the soul meets every requirement of reason and of fact. It fully reveals man to himself in body, mind and soul. It explains the origin of the soul and points the way to satisfy its every desire so as to elevate man to the noblest heights of morality and spirituality. It is the sun of righteousness that has illumined the pathway of the noblest characters since the dawn of time down to the present day.

Evolution has no explanation as to the origin of the soul. And not one of the aspirations of the soul does it satisfy. It offers nothing higher as the object of the universal attribute of worship than the clod of clay. It neither sheds a beam of light in the rock-tomb, nor points to one flickering star of hope. Like a mocking specter, it stands by the couch of the dying saint, and whispers not a word of cheer. Evolution teaches that the soul was begotten by natural law, conceived and brought forth from the womb of dead matter, and it must return to the clod of clay. Shall we here close this chapter with a few words uttered by illustrious representatives of each theory, creation and evolution? Is it not well to pause in the morning of youth and interrogate the masters seeking our service, and ask: When my life-day of service shall have been faithfully given, what shall be my wage? Herbert Spencer was great both in intellect and opportunity. His life-day of service given to evolution's cause was long

and faithful. What fruit had he as a reward for his service? In his eighty-third year he wrote: "The intellectual man, who occupies the same tenement with me, tells me that I am a piece of clay equipped with a nervous system and in some mysterious way connected with the big dynamo called the world; but that very soon now the current will be cut and I will fall into unconsciousness and nothingness. Yes, I am sad, unutterably sad, and I wish in my heart I had never heard of the intellectual man with his science, philosophy and logic." (The Other Side of Evolution. P. 14.) Spencer's soul cried out in bitter anguish because of the lack of any reward at the end of his life-day of faithful service in the cause of evolution. The theory of materialistic evolution at last overwhelmed him with unutterable sadness. He regarded himself as "but a piece of animated clay," he would return to "nothingness."

The mariner after having sailed tempestuous seas, as he returns to his home port, gives a shout of joy because he visions safety and rest. The soul came from the Father of Spirits, voyages tempestuous seas of trial and sorrow, and as it draws near the home port, like David, the creationist, it breaks out in ecstasy. "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." And like Paul, "Death is swallowed up in victory, O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

Reader, is it possible that believing and serving truth, (if evolution be the truth) that it would desert

its faithful servant at the end of fourscore years, and leave his soul in despair? Is it conceivable that a falsehood, (if creation be false) could fill its servant with ecstasy when ready to go out into the unseen world? "By their fruits ye shall know them," is as true as the eternal verities.

Chapter XIII

HARMONY OF THE BIBLE

The truth of a proposition may be argued from several different points, but in the final analysis it is found to rest on a single proposition. This is especially true of the theories of creation and evolution. The proposition is: Was the Bible inspired? In other words, did the Holy Spirit dictate to the writers of the Bible the things that they wrote? If the answer be yes, then the Bible as originally given was not only true but infallible. And insofar as it has been correctly transcribed and translated it is still true and infallible. The evidences of its inspiration must be sought chiefly in the Bible itself. The fruits that it bears in the lives of men are sound arguments, but are secondary to the internal evidences. That Moses, all the Old Testament prophets and the writers of the New Testament represent God by the agency of the Holy Spirit as speaking through them, is well known. If a painting is exhibited and claimed to be the work of one of the world-famed artists, the painting itself will be the chief source of proof. If it is in every way sufficient in high character of workmanship to be worthy of the famed painter, it argues strongly for its genuineness. But if it is only the work of an ordinary artist, it could never pass as the work of a master-artist. Now, if man, unaided by divine power, could have written such a book as the Bible, then it must be regarded as the work of men not aided by divine power. But if on examination the Bible is entirely

above and beyond the combined work of men unaided, then what other conclusion is possible except that those who wrote the first copies were guided by a supernatural power? And if the Bible was inspired then its history of creation as recorded in Genesis must be accepted as true.

Starting with Moses who wrote the first five books, beginning with Genesis (if as higher critics claim, Moses did not write them, the point is unchanged. Some one wrote them) and ending with John and Revelation, about forty men took part in the writing. The time from the first writings to its completion was about one thousand and six hundred years.

Very few of the writers were, or even could have been known to each other. The writing was done in many different countries, under different forms of civil governments, surrounded by many different forms of religions, varying greatly in their ideals and ceremonies, and constantly changing from one epoch to a later period. And it is well known that in the countries and the fifteen hundred years that the Bible was in process of being written that the ideas and ideals of the masses of people underwent great changes. And every idea and ideal held by all the rest of the world than the writers of the Bible was not only different from those recorded in the Bible, but unalterably opposed to them. Even in our own time almost a revolution of thought has occurred during the last quarter of a century. The writings of uninspired men are highly colored by the thought of the period in which they write. The form of civil government, the religious ideas, social customs—all creep into the writings

of historians, moralists, and other writers. No man unaided by divine power has yet been able to throw off the effects of his immediate environment. These influences crop out in the writings of great minds left behind them. And no two men, outside the Bible, have ever been able to write on history doctrine or morals without many disagreements and often contradictions. More than this, every man who has written voluminously over a period of years, has left discrepancies in his history, and modifications in his philosophy. And not at all infrequently writers have abandoned views held in early life and adopted other views quite different. That these statements are true is abundantly witnessed by the writings of all men who have left writings behind them. It has never been within the bounds of possibility for a number of men, or even one man, to entirely agree so that their writings are harmonious. As much as it is desired, men do not entirely agree in their application of Bible teaching and practice. And it is often true that men who write on Bible subjects, modify their ideas later in life. Variation, change, fallibility, is written large on all that man does.

The Bible is composed of sixty-six smaller books, written by about forty different men, covering a period of about one thousand six hundred years, transcribed many times, translated from one language to another by religious partizans, and yet there is not a contradiction in it, and but few seeming discrepancies. It begins with one historical fact, that man was created complete in the moral likeness of God, without any ancestors, as the head of the race. The second is that

man sinned. Out of these two thoughts the Bible to its end grew. The one and only purpose held in view was to redeem man, bring him back again into spiritual union with his Creator, and at last, as Revelation describes as accomplished, to the habitation of God himself. There is not an historical contradiction and not even the semblance of a discrepancy in its moral teaching. The moral standards were raised as the plan unfolded from the Patriarchial into the Mosaic and finally into the fullness of the spiritual teachings of the gospel of Christ. Forty men contributed to its pages. The most of them were unknown to each other. Sixteen hundred years elapsed from its beginning to its completion. The different writers lived in different countries, and during many changes, politically, socially and religiously. The practice of the religion the Bible teaches, has often been greatly perverted in practice, but the teaching as originally revealed has remained uncorrupted. It has been about thirty-five hundred years since its beginning and nearly two thousand years since its completion. How often it has been transcribed since the original copies, we know not. Part of it has been carried to foreign and hostile lands, yet it returned. It has often been in the custody of those who at heart were its enemies. The Jews to whom most of it was first given, shamelessly perverted its doctrine and reduced its holy services to the level of idolatry.

For nearly two thousand years Gentiles have been the custodians of the Bible. And it has often fared no better at their hands than with the Jews. They have likewise perverted its practices. Yet the purity

of its matchless doctrine, its unity of purpose—the salvation of man—and the harmony of its history remains unharmed. What has protected the text of the Bible from corruption through all the many evil hands it has passed in being transcribed; preserved it for thousands of years, and translated by men whose practices it did not command? Why did not those who transcribed the ancient copies pervert the text so as to harmonize with their personal views? What power overshadowed it that prevented those who transcribed and translated it from one language to another from perverting its text to suit their own views? The presence that dictated the first copies has guarded its truth. Not that those who transcribed and translated it were inspired. But if God inspired the first copies, certainly He would see that it was preserved to accomplish His purpose. “So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the things whereunto I sent it” (Isa. 55:11). His protecting power will dwell in His word till it “shall accomplish the thing whereunto He sent it.” The harmony of its history; the oneness of its purpose—man’s salvation—the purity and perfect agreement of its moral teaching; wrought by forty men covering a period of one thousand six hundred years, proves that it was inspired, or that these forty men unaided by divine guidance performed a feat amounting to as great a miracle as inspiration. The supernatural and superhuman was accomplished. The miraculous was attained. Since these forty men accomplished a unity

and harmony never before or since achieved by any other company of men or any one man with himself, who can doubt that the original copies were inspired by the Holy Spirit?

Chapter XIV

IMPARTIALITY OF THE BIBLE

Histories of nations and biographies of men make up a large part of our literature. Partiality is without a doubt the most outstanding characteristic of their contents. National historians magnify the virtues, and ignore or minimize the faults of their favorite, and magnify the faults and ignore or minimize the virtues of those toward whom they do not feel favorable. Biographers of Napoleon were all frank partizans. His enemies traduced him and would have him appear as the very incarnation of evil itself. His friends praised him above the deserts of man. Both creationists and evolutionists are partizans. No one in either company is able to rise to a plane of impartiality when writing concerning men of the opposite party. H. H. Newman, Professor of Zoology in the University of Chicago, was the most noted evolutionist who attended the famous Scopes trial at Dayton, Tennessee. The two outstanding men at the trial were Clarence Darrow, the nationally known and avowed agnostic, and W. J. Bryan, one of the purest characters and most unwavering believers in creation, of the last century. Referring to Mr. Darrow, Newman says, "Though he has brought upon himself the scorn of fundamentalists by classing himself as an agnostic, he has a personality and character that made such an appeal to the scientists associated with him in the trial that they presented him with a memorandum testifying to their respect for his ability, integrity, high-

mindfulness, and moral sensitiveness." (Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics. P. 48). This was indeed very high praise of Mr. Darrow. Was the great and spiritually-minded Bryan, Darrow's equal in high character? Yet evolutionists gave him no "memorandum" attesting such esteem for him. On the other hand, Newman has in his book enough slurs against Bryan to make a fairly long chapter. Some will now ask if creationists are any less partial toward those of their own faith. I sincerely doubt that creationists are one whit less partial. And try as hard as he may, the writer cannot free himself of partiality. I have tried to respect those who differ from me. With what success the reader must judge. But to rise to the height of strict impartiality—where in all the earth is there a striking example outside the Bible?

The history in the Bible is impartial beyond the power of man unguided to attain. Naturally the good and bad is told in a simple, unadorned manner, with neither praise nor blame. The sin of Adam and Cain are simply told and the penalties pronounced. Jacob's deception to obtain his father's blessing, and the deception his own sons used to account for Joseph's absence, are simple recitals of facts. No tirade of abuse nor effort to excuse appears in the record. David's weakness, sin, bitter repentance, and confession are recorded just as impartially as though he were a bond-servant. The sins and idolatry of a long line of kings are recorded with neither acrimonious censure nor explanatory excuses. The historians of no other nation have approached the degree of impartiality shown in the history of the Jews as a nation written about them-

selves. The rivalry among the twelve while Jesus was with them is recorded. Peter's denial of Jesus and penitence is not shielded nor excused. The contention between Peter and Paul, the two leading apostles, stands in the record as superhuman examples of impartiality. The strife and parties in the church at Corinth and their degrading the communion to the level of revelry is recorded by Paul. Here stands a record of impartiality unapproached and incomparable in all the world.

The Bible is not the work of one man, but of forty; it is not a record of a short period of time, and isolated persons and happenings, but in many countries and for a period of one thousand and six hundred years. And the writers in every instance were as fair and impartial to persons and nations that were their enemies as they were to their own nation and personal friends. How can this impartiality, nowhere else ever attained, be explained? I leave the answer with the reader.

Chapter XV

FULFILLED PROPHECY

Many miracles are recorded in the Bible. The most of the miracles are simply historical records of what occurred. Those who reject the miracle of creation declare that they see no evidence of any miracle having ever been performed; that natural law has never been superseded by miraculous intervention. These say if there was any undoubted evidence of any miracle at the present time, that they could believe the others recorded in the Bible.

Suppose that man should appear today and accurately describe what would happen one hundred years in the future. And suppose a strictly historical record should be kept of that prediction. In one hundred years from now the very things he foretold are fulfilled. Would that prove the man was aided by some power greater than man? I think all will so agree. Have we any such evidence of the divine inspiration of those who wrote the Bible? Many of the writers declared that the things they wrote were to be fulfilled long in the future. Surely we should now be able to know whether these predictions are now being fulfilled in our presence.

Nearly four thousand years ago God called Abraham and said: "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house—I will bless thee, and make thy name great—and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed—and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (Gen. 12:1-3;

22:18). Here it is plainly predicted nearly four thousand years ago that all nations should be "blessed" through the descendants of Abraham. If this promise was, and still is being fulfilled, it is unquestioned proof that the promise was divinely inspired.

In the third generation seventy of the descendants of Abraham went into Egypt, later to be made slaves. Moses was born of slave parents; brought up in the royal court of Egypt; and educated in all their wisdom and customs. Not only Egypt but the whole world worshipped gods of their own invention; lived in a polygamous marriage state and morality was almost unknown.

Moses left the court of Egypt; served for a time as a shepherd in a foreign country; returned and led the Jewish slaves into the wilderness. He established the Jewish religion based on the following fundamentals:

(1). There is only one God who is the creator of all things.

(2). That one God created Adam and Eve, the first of their race; joined them together as husband and wife and commanded them to keep the marriage state in chastity. And thus the monogamous family was established.

(3). He wrote the decalogue, the ten commandments.

(4). He said to the Jews: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee: and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him" (Deut. 18:17-18). This promise refers to Christ and the Gospel. All that is worthwhile in our modern civilization grows out of the fulfillment of the promise to

Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." In fact the present civilization, or the good that is in it, grows out of the four ideas in that promise. The basic idea is (a), one God of holy attributes, (b), the family of one husband and one wife, true to each other, (c), the moral power in the ten commandments, (d), Christ and the gospel. Remove the idea of the one true God that gave Abraham the promise and that Moses revealed, and that Jesus "manifested in the flesh" and no worthy, uplifting object of worship is left. There would be no perfect example of wisdom, love and holiness for the soul to reverence and be fashioned in its likeness. Destroy the monogamous family—one wife, one husband, in chaste union—and the very pillars of civilization are gone. It began in the morning of creation and was taught by Moses and commanded by Christ. The monogamous family has been the foundation of all good and stability in people and nations since history began. Just to the extent that the family has been kept pure, to that extent have peoples and nations advanced. And I think when I say that the cause of the decline and fall of all nations in past history was almost entirely due to a violation of the family and its chastity, that the statement will be applauded. And were it possible to mate chaste, virgin young men and young women in marriage, and have them keep this union in fidelity for three generations—without doubt if all the sexual unions were thus made and kept, the larger part of human sorrows and fleshly ills, would disappear. That more sorrows grow out of sexual sins, in wedlock and out of wedlock, than any other

cause, I think all will agree. That many of the ills of the flesh are a result of the same cause, any physician will testify. Destroy the knowledge of the ten commandments and even modern business would collapse. Remove from the earth the record of the life of Jesus, the sermon on the mount and the rest of the gospel, and mercy would perish from the earth. What nation not under the strong influence of these four ideas ever engaged in works of human sympathy and service? Where did any people ever give their money and service to relieve suffering and sorrow except those in whose hearts Jesus had first been enshrined as an ideal? Even hospitals are unknown except as established by those who are largely influenced by these four ideas. Where did political liberty ever exist except where the "nations" were blessed by the four ideas already mentioned that came in fulfillment of the promise, "In thy seed shall all the nations of earth be blessed?" During the last two thousand years nearly all nations have been blessed by the ideas given through Abraham's seed. At the present time there is no nation and but very few people, who have not been benefitted by Moses and the law, Christ and the gospel. The promise made to Abraham nearly four thousand years ago is still being literally fulfilled in the presence of the most highly civilized people of the world. It is not a theory, but a literal demonstration of fact.

The promise was made to Abraham. Out of the promise came Moses who revealed one God, who created the first of the race in his moral likeness; joined them in chaste wedlock that established the

monogamous family; the moral law; Christ and the gospel. From these come all that makes life on earth worth living. Destroy these and evolutionists themselves would wish to migrate to another planet, or at least to get away from the conditions that would prevail. We enjoy the "blessings" growing out of that promise. Why accept the blessings and deny the Divine inspiration of the promise?

1930.

Chapter XVI.

Nineteen hundred and thirty. Four simple characters written in the order, 1-9-3-0. The number of times these four characters will be written in this order today will doubtless run into billions. And the number of times so written during the present year will be very nearly innumerable. Arranged in any other order than 1-9-3-0, they could have but little general influence on the lives of perhaps twelve hundred million people. But written in this order they effect every phase of the lives of perhaps three fourths of the people of the whole world.

We are so familiar with their use that we do not stop and ask the great question: Written in this order what do these four simple characters signify? Primarily they mean date in time.

What influence does their use have on the daily lives of three-fourths of the people of the whole world? Erase from all printed and written documents that date, 1930, and all of its related dates, as 1929, 1917, 1884, and on back, and civilization itself would disintegrate. The thought of the consequences is appalling. Letters of correspondence are appreciated largely by reason of date. Newspapers and other periodicals would lose their interest. When the incidents happened that are related therein would be unknown.

Erase this and all related dates and every contract, agreement and obligation between persons, firms and

corporations would be void, for without date no agreement in business is enforceable. Without date no criminal can be prosecuted, and no prisoner held behind bars. Date of crime and date of indictment must precede trial. Date of conviction, and date of expiration of sentence must be present else no prisoner can be held behind bars.

As appalling as it may seem yet it is true that if date as expressed in 1930, and its related dates were destroyed, by the same act law itself would be destroyed. Under civilization, unless dated, laws are not enforceable. Destroy 1930 and its related dates and all treaties between nations would be void. The orderly intercourse of nations would end.

Destroy the date of election or appointment of congressmen, senators, president and cabinet, and how could the government function? Would it be possible long to proceed orderly till in some way a date of time was re-established?

Go to your bank and present an undated check, and ask for cash? Take an undated hundred dollar bill to the United States treasury and ask for its payment in gold?

If the date 1930, and its related dates were erased from all printed and written documents, three fourths of the people of the world would be in the utmost confusion and disorder. All order in social life is based on date. All business transactions, agreements and laws are enforceable only when dated. The power of date binds the people together in every active phase of their lives. Its destruction would reduce them to

the degree of confusion of savages who live without date.

What event created this date? The birth of a child. Because of a lack of a better lodging place for his mother, he was born in a stable. The date, 1930, (probably more correct, 1934) and all its related dates point to the birth of that child in Bethlehem. The influence of that birth had within it the power so to influence men and nations that three-fourths of the most advanced people of the world date every important event of their lives pointing to that birth. No other event of time has ever so deeply interwoven itself into the very fabric of the daily lives of so many people.

In the most advanced nations of the world are many men of great intellect, ripe education, large wealth and influence, who scoff at the name and claim of Jesus. Yet in every letter they write they sign his birth certificate. In every important business transaction: execution of deed to real estate, or conveyance of wealth they must sign his birth certificate. Otherwise they can neither own nor convey wealth of importance.

Without this date history would be practically meaningless. The birth in Bethlehem is the center of recorded time. All history is written as B. C. or A. C. That is, before Christ's birth, or after Christ's birth. All recorded time is reckoned from that birth. It is so many years before that birth, or so many years after that birth. It is the center from which time is recorded by about three-fourths of the people of the

world. How long till all people of the whole world will in every important transaction of life sign his birth certificate?

Was he only man? Or was he God manifested in the flesh? How can we account for the influence of his birth otherwise than that he still lives and reigns from his throne in heaven?

Chapter XVII.

CAN ONE BELIEVE BOTH?

The importance of the whole controversy between creationists and evolutionists turns on the answer to the question so often asked, Can one believe in both evolution and Christianity? If yes, then there is much wasted effort. But if the answer be no, then the importance of the issue is just as great as the value of Christianity to the world. In that case the happiness of the human race in both this world and the world to come is involved.

I am well aware of the fact that a few evolutionists talk about a god and a religion. But I think in every case it will be found to be a far different conception of God than the God revealed in the Bible, and a mere religious instinct rather than the miraculously revealed religion of Christ. Whatever religion one may be able to believe in while believing real evolution, must be a religion without the following fundamentals believed in by creationists: (a) that man was created in the moral likeness of God, (b) that man sinned, (c) that Christ was miraculously born of a virgin, (d) that his death in any way atoned for sin, (e) that Jesus was raised from the dead, (f) that he will come again, reward the faithful and dwell with them forever. Every one of these fundamentals evolutionists most strongly deny. Whatever religion one may embrace along with true evolution, will lack every one of these fundamentals. But if man did not sin, he does not need a Savior. And if man is not to be raised from

the dead and rewarded in a future life, than pray tell us why have any religion at all? Of what value can any religion be, if not to save him from sin and give him a better life in the world to come? Hear Paul: "But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised; and if Christ hat not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we witnessed of God that he raised up Christ: whom he hath not raised up, if s obe that the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, neither hath Christ been raised: and if Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins (1 Cor. 15:13-17). Paul here bases all value of Christianity in this life, and all hope for a future life on the declaration that Christ was Raised From the Deaad. He says if God did not raise up Jesus, then he and all other apostles were false witnesses. He further declares if Christ has not been raised, "then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ have perished," and closes with this conclusion: "If we have only hoped in Christ in this life we are of all men most pitiable." When one can believe both Christianity and evolution he can run east and west with the same strides.

The writer sent to several noted evolutionists who are the authors of several text books each, the following questions:

1. Do you hold the fundamentalist idea that the first five books of the Old and all of the New Testament are inspired?
2. Do you hold the fundamentalist idea that Jesus was miraculously born of a virgin?

3. Do you hold to the idea that his death on the cross in some way atoned for sin?

4. Do you hold the idea that he was raised from the dead; is now in heaven, and will return again to raise all the dead?

5. Do you hold to the idea that there is to be a general judgment in which people will receive a reward for the deeds done while in the body?

H. H. Newman, University of Chicago, wrote at bottom with pen, the following:

"I do not believe in any of these doctrines. In this I am in accord with most of the advanced students of theology with whom I am acquainted. These doctrines are, to me and them, not essential to true religion. They have come to be widely accepted by certain religious sects, but are not accepted by the real students of religion as anything more than symbolical."

In one of his text books, under heading: What the Fundamentalists Demand, he quotes with approval the following:

"They insist," says the Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, "That we must all believe in the historicity of certain special miracles, preeminently the virgin birth of our Lord; that we must believe in a special theory of inspiration—the original documents of Scriptures, which of course we no longer possess, were inerrantly dictated to men a good deal as a man might dictate to his stenographer; that we must believe in a special theory of the atonement—that the blood of our Lord, shed in a substitutionary death, placates an alienated Deity and makes possible welcome for the returned sinner; and that we must believe in a second coming

of our Lord upon the clouds of heaven to set up a millennium here as the only way God can bring history to a worthy denouement." (Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics. P. 62). Fosdick here attributes some things to creationists not held by most of them.

Mr. Newman I think was the most outstanding evolutionist who attended the Scopes trial at Dayton, Tennessee. After returning to Chicago, he propounded to himself a number of questions, among them the following: "Was it a fight to the death between Christianity and agnosticism with Bryan as champion of Christianity as opposed to Darrow the arch-agnostic?" Following his list of questions he comments as follows: "Since my return from the trial I have heard most of these questions propounded and have asked them of myself. The situation still remains indefinite in my mind after earnest reflection" (Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics. P. 47). I could fill a whole chapter of quotations similar to these just cited, but it would add nothing of importance. I have selected H. H. Newman, one of the leading evolutionists from the University of Chicago and Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick as easily the most outstanding evolutionist among preachers. Both these leaders among their respective associates talk of religion. But their religion is quite different from that of Christianity. They squarely deny the following fundamentals held by all creationists:

1. The inspiration of the Bible.
2. The creation of man in the moral likeness of God.
3. That man sinned and was lost.

4. That Jesus was born miraculously of a virgin.
5. That His death in any way atoned for sin.
6. That He was raised again.
7. That He will come again and raise all the dead.
8. That there will be any general judgment when the faithful will be rewarded.

Any religion without these eight fundamentals certainly cannot be called Christianity. And what salvation could a religion stripped of these bring to man? That question brings us to the heart of the whole theory of religion held by all leading evolutionists. They do not believe for a moment that man is lost. Then of course he needs no salvation. They squarely deny any future judgment and rewards. And Paul says, "If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable." Their idea is that man has inherited a religious sense or instinct from the brute creation similar to his esthetic tastes. If he is so disposed, let him exercise this instinct. But they hold that he is not lost, and hence no salvation from being lost in the world to come. And that there will be no resurrection and no future rewards, for they utterly deny any future life. Of course I know some will now be ready to affirm that some who call themselves evolutionists do believe in a future life, but the leaders—both preachers and University professors—deny all these fundamentals. The whole theory is diametrically opposed to every fundamental of Christianity.

This volume has been written in order to aid in some measure, our noble youth to reach a safe conclusion. The two theories, Creation and Evolution cannot be

harmonized. The choice must be made between them. Our creator has made us free moral agents. We are in His image. He favored man above all his creation. Man is the noblest work of God. And we should join David in saying: "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits: Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; Who healeth all thy diseases; Who satisfieth thy mouth with good things; so that thy yout is renewed like the eagle's" (Ps. 103).

I now close with a few sentences from Him in whose presence I firmly believe we will all one day appear. "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." "Jesus saith unto her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, ye shall he live." "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats—Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." "And the Spirit and the bride say Come. And let him that heareth, say Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely" (Matt. 11:28, 25:31-34; John 3:17; 11:25; Rev. 22:17).

Table of Contents

Preface	5
Introduction	7
Commendation	9
I Creation or Evolution—The Issue Defined	11
II Creation or Evolution—What is Life	17
III Origin of Life	21
IV Variation	31
V Evolution Against Evolution	41
VI Heredity	47
VII Unbridged Chasms	55
VIII Group Evolution	64
IX Missing Links	76
X The Truth in Genesis	100
XI Genesis Explains the Facts	107
XII Origin of the Soul	115
XIII Harmony of the Bible	125
XIV Impartiality of the Bible	131
XV Fulfilled Prophecy	134
XVI 1930	139
XVII Can One Believe Both	148

