1950

Science and Supposition in Evolution, Geology, and Astronomy

D. A. Sommer

Science and Supposition in Evolution Geology and Astronomy

By
D. A. Sommer

Science *and* Supposition
in
Evolution
Geology
and
Astronomy

By D. A. SOMMER

Six Indictments against the Theory of Evolution:

1. As a connected theory it is Supposition and not Science.

2. It destroys belief in the Mosaic account of the origin of man, hence destroys belief in the Bible.

3. It destroys faith in the miracles in the Bible. hence destroys faith in the Bible.

4. It makes man an irresponsible animal, with no future judgment for his evil acts here.

5. By destroying responsibility, it is doing much to destroy civilization.

6. It is partly responsible for the World War.

Read this booklet with care and see if we have proven these indictments so momentous to Christianity and civilization. **30 cents each, $1 for 4.**

Apostolic Review, Indianapolis, Ind., 904 Udell Street

Science and Supposition in Evolution, Geology and Astronomy

I. SCIENCE AND SUPPOSITION.

Importance of the Discussion.—If the theories of Evolution be true concerning man and the universe, then God is practically out of it; man is a well-developed brute, entirely a creature of circumstances; there is no Judgment where he will have to answer for the evils in his life here; and this earth will become a hell, as it is fast becoming now, with the spread of these suppositions; and our civilization will go to pieces, as it surely is doing now as these theories come to be believed. So I ask you to read patiently this discussion of so momentous a question.

What Science Is and What It has Done.—The word "Science" comes from the Latin "scire" meaning "to know"; and the Standard Dictionary says that Science is "knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking, especially as methodically formulated and arranged in a rational system." "Knowledge obtained by exact observation and correct thinking", has done much for the world. It has harnessed the electricity and brought it down from the skies and made it light much of the world and run cars, factories, and much of the machinery of the world. It has applied the power of steam to the engine and made the factory, the steam-car and the steamship the helpful servants of man in his onward progress. Science has made it possible for man to observe the movements of heavenly bodies with such accuracy that he can tell the exact minute when an eclipse of the sun or moon is to begin. It has enabled man practically to conquer some diseases and to do much to alleviate man's suffering. It has also enabled man to make instruments of destruction with which he has in the past few years destroyed millions of his fellow beings.

Knowledge obtained by "exact observation and correct thinking" has done much good and much harm to man, and no doubt will do much of the same in the future. **Yet there is much which goes under the name "Science" which is not science at all—not knowledge obtained by "exact observation and correct thinking" —but is mere guess-work.** Our fight is not against Science, but against this **guess-work** which is mixed in the Science.

Meaning of Words.—The words "theory," "hypothesis" and "supposition", all have in them the idea of uncertainty. "Hypothesis" comes from the Greek and means literally "putting under". "Supposition" comes from the Latin and means the same thing. Both words refer to that which we put under some things, or ideas, to hold them up, hence a supposition. The word "theory" comes from a root meaning "view" (the same root from which we get "theater", where things are "viewed"), and refers to the individual or standardized view which we take of certain powers or relations.

Details of What "Theory" Is and What It Has Done.—Webster says that "theory" is "a general principle offered to explain phenomena; as the **theory** of Evolution." The human mind dislikes to consider things it sees as isolated things, but desires immediately to put such in a class with others with which it is acquainted. If a man is out hunting and kills some strange-appearing animal, immediately he says, "What is it?" If he catches a strange-appearing fish, he says the same. If he sees a peculiar-appearing man, he inquires what nationality he is of. Oftentimes, man puts things in a certain class **without** "exact observation and correct thinking", and only for the time being; and he uses such classification simply as a working basis. A murder occurs in a community. Different men gather what evidence is at hand, and form different "theories" concerning the events which led to the murder, etc. One of the theories may turn out to be nearly correct, and thus that theory may be of value, while the others will be worthless, or all of them may be worthless, or most of them may have some truth in them.

Men form theories concerning the origin of the earth, the origin of plant and animal life, the origin of the books of the Bible, etc., and probably all of these theories have some isolated truths in them; but, like the theories concerning a murder, they may all turn out to be worthless. Science is "knowledge obtained by **exact observation**", and much in these theories is not obtained by "exact observation"; and this knowledge must be systematized by "correct thinking", and many of these plans of explanation are not consistent with themselves at all. Hence, Evolution, Geology, Astronomy, Higher Criticism and Philosophy, though they all have truths in them, as systems they are simply **theories** and not Science, and he is gullible who accepts much of what is presented in such branches of study.

Many Theories in Science, Exploded.—Many theories in Science which have been hailed as great truths by many in one generation, have been relegated to the junk-pile of exploded ideas by the next generation. In the Nebular Hypothesis, scientists used to say that the original atoms from which the universe came were red-hot, and now LeConte says they were ice-cold. Geologists used to say that all the interior of the earth is liquid, now Le Conte and Young (geologist and astronomer) say that it could not be so. For centuries. doctors bled people very frequently, but not so now. Dentists used to kill nerves of the teeth and fill the teeth, and we thought Science was helping man wonderfully; but now it is ascertained that pus often forms at the base of the nerveless tooth, that no extracted nerve can then give warning to the person of danger, and that this poison goes through the system bringing disease and sometimes death. A revolution is now going on in dentistry. "Dr. Simon Newcomb, the eminent scientist," says the Pathfinder, "**once proved mathematically** that it was impossible for man to fly in any heavier-than-air machine. He was an example of a **specialist who knew too much**; for the Wright boys who had only a common school education and didn't know it all, **went to work and proved that the thing could be done, by doing it.**" And so, on and on.

What are we poor, unlearned creatures to do? The scientists say, "Thumbs up"! and up go our thumbs,

when we are servilely following them; then they say, "Thumbs down", and we must change again. The common people have something to do besides trying to keep up with these theories. If they implicitly believe what so-called scientists tell them, they may soon find themselves on the junk-pile with the exploded theories.

Causes of Error in Theorizing.—One cause of these errors in theories is Haste. Men note a few examples and immediately form general conclusions. Science is knowledge obtained by "exact observation" while much of their observation is not "exact"; and Science brings the facts together by "correct thinking", while much of the present systematizing is not done correctly. Men take a jaw-bone, an ankle bone, or even a tooth of some extinct animal, and draw from that a picture of the whole animal, and expect the people to accept their animal just as they have constructed it "scientifically" **from their imagination.** Scientists accept without experiment what other scientists say that they have done or observed, etc., and add a few hasty experiments or observations of their own. Thus the hasty work goes on. In books of Geology, the word "restored" is found under many of the pre-historic animals pictured there, which simply means that the animal has been drawn nearly altogether from the imagination of the geologist.

But **Ambition** is perhaps the chief cause of errors in theories of Science. People desire to exalt themselves. A parent's love for his child often causes him to blind his eyes to the misdemeanors of the child. A politician's hatred of the other party causes him to denounce the good the same as the bad in that party. Many religious people formerly permitted their prejudice to see no good in other religious people, and their sentimentality now called "love" often causes them to see none of the departures from God's word. The Bereans heard Paul preach and "searched the Scriptures daily to see whether those things were so", and we should do the same in religion, and we should sound every doctrine in Science carefully, lest we permit it to shake our faith in that Book which has done more for mankind than all the other books combined.

Many scientists delight in drawing attention to themselves by tearing down old "traditions", as they call the Bible, and by presenting something new. A Scientist is just as proud of his theory as any mother is of her child, and just as determined as any mother to defend it. Scientists, as well as other people, often resent anything which detracts from themselves. When Harvey discovered the circulation of blood, there was not an old physician who accepted his theory. Prof. Hilprecht, of the University of Pennsylvania, in his great work, "Explorations in Bible Lands," p. 23, tells of how a young German scholar solved problems of translation of the Assyrian tablets which had baffled the great Oriental scholars, "but when he was far enough advanced to announce to the Academy of Science in Gottingen the epoch-making discovery which established his fame and reputation forever, that learned body, though comprising men of eminent mental training and intelligence, **strange to say, declined to publish the Latin memoirs of this little-known college teacher, who did not belong to the University circle proper, nor was even an Orientalist by profession.** It was not till ninety years later (1893) that his original papers were rediscovered and published." These illustrations, with others we might mention, show that scientists have been tarred over with the same stick of self-esteem with many of their less pretentious brethren.

Thomas Edison on the Errors of Scientists.—Any one who has followed Thomas Edison closely has seen that he is not a worshiper of the scientific training put out by the schools of our country. More than forty years ago, he said (as published in N. Y. Herald, Dec. 31, 1879):

"They [the text-books] are mostly misleading. I get mad with myself when I think I have believed what was so learnedly set out in them. THERE ARE MORE FRAUDS IN SCIENCE THAN ANYWHERE ELSE. . . Take a whole pile of them that I can name and you will find uncertainty IF NOT IMPOSITION in half of what they state as scientific truth. They have time and again set down EXPERIMENTS AS DONE BY THEM, curious, out-of-the-way experiments, THAT THEY NEVER DID, and on which they have founded so-called scientific truths. I have been thrown off my track often by them, and for months at a time. Try the experiment yourself, and you

find the result altogether different. . . . I tell you I'd rather know nothing about a thing in science, nine times out of ten, than what the books would tell me—for practical purposes, for applied science, the best science, the only science, I'd rather take the thing up and go through with it myself. I'd find out more about it than any one could tell me and I'd be sure of what I knew. That's the thing. Prof. This or That will controvert you out of the books, that it can't be so, though you have it right in the hollow of your hand all the time, and could break his spectacles with it.''

Causes of the Spread of These Erroneous Theories.—We may wonder why it is that erroneous theories in Science become so widespread. It is this way. Noted scientists who are ambitious to distinguish themselves through haste or ambition, or both, present certain new ideas; and as their names carry weight with the theories, many soon adopt them. Millions of people today who believe in the Evolution of man have never heard complete arguments on the other side of the question. Soon the advocates of the new ideas ridicule those who do not accept them, as ''out-of-date'', ''old fogies,'' etc.; and as so few people now can stand it to be called ''behind-the-times'', they become ashamed and fall in line. Then they all sing together, ''We are the learned ones—the scientific ones; we have found great truths which the rest of you do not know; you must accept them or be behind the times; wisdom will die with us; we have 'assured results' in our theories; you are out of date; we are 'IT'.''

And Freshmen often follow Juniors and Seniors and their teachers, as sheep going to the slaughter.

Another reason why some of these theories are readily believed is because it soothes the conscience in evil-doing. If man is nothing more than a well-developed brute, and if the universe was evolved without the aid of God, then man is entirely a creature of circumstances and there is no God, and will be no Judgment where he must answer for his sins here. We can then do as we please and we need not worry. This is a nice doctrine, so far as the flesh is concerned, but if carried out would soon destroy the bodies and souls of men. Many people believe anything which overthrows the Bible because they know that if the Bible is true they are doomed for their sins. They believe erroneous

theories, no matter how inconsistent and ridiculous, simply because they wish to believe them.

II. SCIENCE AND SUPPOSITION IN EVOLUTION

Some of the Science in Evolution.—The theory of Evolution is like every system of error—it has some truths connected with it. Every one knows that man can take horses, cows, sheep, hogs, etc., and by selecting the best and breeding them he can develop better animals for service to himself. He can take fruit trees and do the same. Yes, he can take almost all kinds of plants and animals and by proper selection and breeding can make life easier for man and can thereby show his superiority over the monkey. It is also true that sometimes a child is born with six fingers or six toes, or that a flower sometimes grows up inside of another flower. It is true that fish in streams in caves have no eyes, for the lack of use has caused them to lose their eyes. It is said that boa constrictors have bones in the hind part of their bodies, and whales the same; but it is also true that the "science" that these bones were once legs is only an **inference.** There are other monstrosities in nature, but the **cause** of these monstrosities is quite a different thing from the fact itself. What the evolutionist proves, we accept; but what he guesses at, we lay aside.

The Suppositions Drawn From These Facts in Nature.—From these facts, and others, Darwin writes his book on "The Origin of Species." He says that by "Natural Selection" man has grown from the lower orders of creation. He tells of how there are far more plants and animals born than can subsist on the food in the world, and that, hence, there is a struggle for this food, and that then as a natural consequence the strongest prevail. Climate, too, has something to do with thinning out the weak and leaving the strong These strongest prevail because they have some advantages over the others, and hence those with these advantageous modifications, or variations, live while the others die. Little by little new organs have been developed from these useful variations; and thus, through millions of years, one species of plants or ani-

mals has developed into another. This is the Theory of Evolution in brief.

OBJECTIONS TO THE THEORY OF THE EVOLUTION OF MAN

1. How Did Organs NOT Useful to the Possessor Originate and Develop?—Here are quotations from Darwin's "Origin of Species" which show that these variations which developed new species must have been "useful" to the "owner," "possessor":

"Natural selection which acts **solely** by the preservation of **useful** modifications."—Chapter on Rudimentary Organs.

"In the case of any organ, if we know of a long series of gradations in complexity, **each good for its possessor**, then, under changing conditions of life, there is no logical impossibility in the acquirement of any conceivable degree of perfection through **natural selection.**"—Ch. on Summary.

"Natural selection . . . in **ALL cases at the same time useful to the owner.**"—Summary.

"The steady accumulation, **when beneficial to the individual,**" etc.—Summary.

"Nothing at first can appear more difficult to believe than that the more complex organs and instincts should have been perfected, not by means superior to, though analogous with, human reason, but by the accumulation of innumerable slight variations, **each good for its possessor.** . . There is a struggle for existence leading to the preservation of each **profitable** deviation of structure or instinct . . . each **good** of its kind."—Recapitulation.

Now if the statements above in **bold face** be true, **how did the breast of the mammal originate and develop?** The breast is practically necessary to the life of mammals, yet it is not "good," "profitable," "useful" nor "beneficial" "to the owner," the "possessor." It takes strength away from the mother and leaves her poor and depleted in energy and flesh. Now as "Natural Selection" "acts **solely** by the preservation of **useful** modifications"—"useful **to the owner**," —and as the whole theory of Evolution is founded on this supposition of Natural Selection, the undisputed fact that the breast of the mammal is **not** "useful to the owner," but only to the offspring or others—overthrows the whole system of the Evolution of animals. Something greater than Natural Selection originated this organ.

2. Why Have "Unfit" or "Unimproved" Species

Survived?—According to the doctrine of "the survival of the fittest," the unfit plants and animals should have all perished. When showing that some of the animals in the oldest rocks are the same we have today, and that "improved descendants" should "supplant and exterminate" the type from which it is descended, Darwin says:

"Some of the most ancient Silurian animals [those in the oldest rocks] as the Nautilus, Lingula, etc., **do not differ much from living species**. . . If, moreover, they had been the progenitors of these orders, **they would almost certainly have been long ago supplanted and exterminated by their numerous and improved descendants.**"—(Imperfection of Geological Record.)

The "missing link" between man and the monkey was better than the monkey, according to Evolution, and should have survived longer than the monkey; but, behold, the monkey is still here, apparently as strong as he ever was, while scientists have searched the world over for the "missing link" that is supposed to be the "improved descendant" over the monkey, in the struggle for existence! And so on down the line. Every new species had some modifications, according to this theory, which made it better than the one from which it was developed, and the inferior species should have passed away because of its want of "useful modifications," or because of its weakness. But, alas, with the exception of a comparative few species, they have all survived to the age of man, and tens of thousands of the missing links which were more "improved" than the species, have all passed away and left no trace! Even the little moneron, the one-celled creature in the bottom of the sea, from which they say man started a hundred million years ago—even he, in all his littleness and lack of "useful modifications," is **still** there, **and his very existence is fatal to the theory of the survival of the fittest,** the foundation stone of the theory of Evolution.

3. How Were Variations Kept Separated?—According to this theory, animals and plants came into existence with some slight useful variations from other plants and animals, and these variations were inherited by their offspring. Inheriting color of eyes, hair, complexion, and such things which are so common in the

whole species of man, is one thing; and inheriting some little freak variation, which perhaps is not found in one out of ten thousand plants and animals, is quite another thing. In probably ten thousand chances to one his little freak variation would not be inherited by the offspring; and even if some of these variations were inherited, they would soon be lost in the general type of plants and animals. If you turn your thoroughbred hogs out with a host of "scrubs," the offspring of your fine hogs may be some bigger for a few generations, but in a few years the bigness will soon be lost and all the hogs will be practically alike. Under domestication, man can take the best and breed new varieties; but as soon as the brain of man is taken out, and these varieties are turned together, they form a common type, and all are practically the same. In order to bridge over this unsurmountable difficulty, scientists have advanced the absurd doctrine that such plants and animals that have these slight variations become sterile with the parent stock and fertile with those with like variations, something which they cannot prove.

4. How Could a Variation in Plant or Animal Find a Mate With a Like Variation to Propagate the Variation?—When a plant or animal had some slight variation from the rest of the animals or plants, did that plant or animal become ambitious to perpetuate that variation in its offspring, and begin looking around among ten thousand other animals or plants to find one which had the same variation? When he found it, it might be of the same sex, and therefore the effort would have been in vain! And if the animal should find one with a slight variation, what evidence is there that that variation would be inherited by the offspring, seeing that modifications out of the ordinary are not easily inherited? If a snail should have some slight variation from the common type of snails, he would have some job, would he not, in searching among ten thousand other snails for a mate of like advancement?! Flowers with slight modifications would have quite an interesting chase running around among ten thousand other flowers, looking for some plants like themselves! Those must have been intelligent plants and animals in

those days, and more ambitious concerning noble descendants than most people and plants seem to be today.

5. How Did the Instinct of Bees and Birds and Chickens, etc., Originate?—Mr. Darwin fights hard for his theory when he comes to the great obstacle of "Instinct," but he is honest enough to make the following admission at the conclusion:

"I do not pretend that the facts given in this chapter strengthen IN ANY DEGREE **my theory**; but none of the cases of difficulty, to the best of my ability, annihilate it. . . **No instinct has been produced for the exclusive good of other animals."**—Ch. on Instinct.

As all animals have been evolved by "Natural Selection" from the little one-celled creature in the bottom of the sea, then all the organs and instincts of animals have been evolved. How did the instinct originate which causes the hen to turn her eggs over? Without it, they would not be hatched; and even man with his patent incubator must imitate the hen. Is the hen benefited by turning the eggs over? What is the benefit she derives? It is up to the evolutionist to show what "good" the hen derives from this instinct of turning her eggs over, or admit that the theory of evolution falls down, for the theory is built on the supposition that "only" variations which are **"useful to the owner,"** are perpetuated. Is it not much easier and more reasonable to believe that God implanted that instinct in the hen when He created her, than to rely on pretended facts which Darwin himself admits do **not** "strengthen my theory"?

And the little bee is a "stinger" for the evolutionist. Think of how the bees colonize, how they use the drones for their purpose and then cast them aside; how they have a queen who rules; how they make their cells in geometrical proportions, etc. Talk to a "bee man" about bees, if you know nothing of their habits, then ask yourself the solemn question, Did all this instinct of the bee originate by chance, as the evolutionist teaches? He that can believe so should not talk about the credulity of the one who believes in the Bible as the inspired Word of God.

6. How Did the Organs of Plants and Animals Originate?—Mr. Darwin says:

"That **many and serious objections** may be advanced against the theory of descent with modification through natural selection, I do not deny. I have endeavored to give them their full force. **Nothing at first can appear more difficult to believe than that the more complex organs and instincts should have been perfected, not by means superior to, though analogous with, human reason, but by the accumulation of innumerable slight variations,** each good for the individual possessor."—Ch. on Recapitulation.

"**Our ignorance of the laws of variation is profound. . . .** Habit in producing constitutional differences, and **use in strengthening and disuse in weakening and diminishing organs,** seem to have been more potent in their effects."—Summary.

Darwin stated the truth when he said that "our ignorance of the laws of variations is profound." Perhaps I can save his followers some time and trouble by calling their attention to the fact that guess-work does not have any laws.

Darwin seems to think that because some changes can be wrought in organs through use and that through disuse organs will dwindle, new organs can originate on the same principle. But there is every difference in the world between developing an organ already in existence, and originating that organ. Will the evolutionist please tell us how the **hand and foot** originated from the one-celled creature in the sea, smaller than a pin-head? Don't tell me about how hands and feet have changed through use or disuse, or about the difference in such in different animals. **I wish to know where the first hand and foot came from, how their muscles, etc., originated?** You may say they were evolved from the fin of the fish. Yes, but where did the first fin come from, and whence came the first muscles which controlled the first fin? Until you can answer these questions, you should not expect us to swallow on your "ipse dixit" that of which Darwin himself says "Our ignorance of the laws of variation is profound." **The whole system of Evolution is built on Variation as perpetuated by Natural Selection, and of the laws of this Variation Darwin says, "Our ignorance . . . is profound."** "Ignorance" is a poor foundation for such a pretentious system.

Will the evolutionist please tell us how the **stinging apparatus** of the bee, serpent and spider originated? It did not originate all at once, for Darwin says that

all these organs originated by "slight variations". And it could not have originated gradually, for only variations were preserved which were "useful to the owner", and none of these stingers were "useful to the owner" till they could sting with them, and they could not sting with them till they were fully developed or full-grown. The stinger of the bee is alone sufficient to sting the evolutionist to death!

On the **electric organs and luminous organs** in some creatures, Darwin says:

"The electric organs of fishes offer another case of special difficulty; **it is impossible to conceive by what steps these wondrous organs have been produced**"—Ch. on Difficulties on Theory.

"The presence of luminous organs in a few insects, belonging to **different** families and orders, **offers a parallel case of difficulty. . . In many cases it is most difficult to conjecture by what transitions organs could have arrived at their present state.**"—Ch. on Difficulties on Theory.

Walking on the sea-shore I have taken up fish seen there and have received an electric shock from them. All of us have wondered at the light of the "lightning bug". Now here are creatures which have developed wonderful organs, and yet they are low in the scale of Evolution. No wonder Darwin was puzzled. He and his followers could say, "It is impossible to conceive by what steps these wondrous organs have been produced." The lightning bug gives a little light (if he would receive it) to the blinded evolutionist's eyes, and the electric fish gives him a shock from which he can not recover!

On **the eye** Darwin says:

"Although **the belief that an organ so perfect as the eye could have been formed by natural selection, is more than enough to stagger any one**; yet in the case of any organ, if we know of a long series of gradations in complexity, each good for its possessor, then, under changing conditions of life, there is no logical impossibility in the acquirement of any conceivable degree of perfection through natural selection."—Ch. on Difficulties on Theory.

"Amongst **existing** Vertebrata, we find but a small amount of gradation in the structure of the eye, . . . and **from fossil species we can learn nothing on this head. In this great class we should probably have to descend** FAR BENEATH THE LOWEST KNOWN FOSSILIFEROUS STRATUM **to discover the earlier stages, by which the eye has been perfected**"—Ch. on Difficulties.

The eye is perhaps the most delicately-constructed and scientifically-arranged organ in the body; and, according to Evolution, the perfect eye should be found far down the stream of development. But, behold, it is found at the beginning! The fossils which the geologists think are the oldest contain the eye in a perfected state, as Darwin states above, and you will have to go "**far beneath the lowest known fossiliferous stratum to discover the earlier stages by which the eye has been perfected.**" This is fatal to the theory.

Darwin says again:

"I can see no very great difficulty (not more than in the case of many other structures) in believing that natural selection has converted the simple apparatus of an **optic nerve** merely coated with pigment and invested by transparent membrane, into an optical instrument as perfect as is possessed by any member of the great Articulate class."—Ch. on Difficulties on Theory.

In the first place, we shall have to be shown that these pigment spots are incipient eyes; and in the second place, we shall have to be shown where some of the pigment spots are in the process of developing into eyes; and in the third place, we demand that Mr. Darwin's followers show us whence came the first "optic nerve". No doubt, different kinds of animals have different kinds of eyes—but where did the **first** "optic nerve" come from? The moneron in the bottom of the sea did not have an optic nerve, for it had only the one cell. Tell us, please, where the first "optic nerve" came from? When you tell us where the first optic nerve came from, you have solved the riddle of animal life.

How does it come that **the ear** has a funnel to it to catch the sound? Why did not the eye have such a funnel? Did some little creatures have a break in the skin where the hole for their inner ear was, and did they say to themselves, "I wonder if we can perpetuate that somehow, so that we can hear better?" And did they continue to work with that little break then hunt around for some other little creature which had such a break and a like ambition to perpetuate it; and did they tell their children to keep up the same performance; and did this go on for thousands of years till the outer ear was developed? But how did the muscles

originate which control that protuberance? This outer ear must have developed in some such way, for Mr. Darwin says that all these changes came gradually; and he says too that only useful variations could be perpetuated, and the protuberance could not be perpetuated till it was useful. His "Natural Selection" cannot account for its development. And where did the first auditory nerve come from, for the one-celled creature had none? And how does it come that there are two ears instead of one, and that they are placed symmetrically on the head? How does it come that one of the ears is not on the lip and another on the back of the head? Did it just **happen** that ears stick out to catch sound, and the eyes are sunk in to protect them? He that can believe that all this is the result of "Natural Selection" can believe almost anything.

7. The Mind.—For centuries philosophers have been discussing the difference between mind and matter; but, according to Darwinism, mind is simply a form of matter, and man is not above the brute except in development. Monkeys may be taught to do many things like a man, but so can a dog or a horse which is so much lower in the scale of development. Why can not a monkey talk as well as a parrot which is so much lower in the scale? Man is the most helpless of all animals at birth, and is, perhaps, helpless the longest, and yet he can rise far above the brute. The fact that Darwin could take a few isolated facts and put them together into a system by the aid of his wonderful imagination, developing the doctrine that he came from the monkey—itself shows that he did not come from the monkey, for the monkey has no such power.

To the evolutionist who tries to cling to the Bible, I would ask, If there is no difference in kind between you and the monkey, will the good monkey go to heaven and be your companion through eternity?

The "Missing Links".—The theory of Evolution demands that there be scores and perhaps hundreds of variations between each species, but these intermediate forms are called "missing links" because they have never been found. Extinct species have been found in the rocks which some have thought are missing links. Darwin and LeConte say:

"Although geological research has undoubtedly revealed the former existence of many links, [how does Darwin know they are links and not extinct species?—D A S] bringing numerous forms of life much closer together, **it does not yield the infinitely many fine gradations between past and present species required on my theory; and this is the most obvious and forcible of the** MANY **objections which may be urged against it.**" —Recapitulation in "Origin of Species."

"The study of species, **as they now are,** would probably not suggest, certainly **could not prove,** the theory of their origin by derivation or transmutation."—LeConte's Compend of Geology, p. 111.

Now if Geology "does not yield the infinitely many fine gradations between past and present species" which Evolution demands, as Darwin admits; and if "the study of species, as they now are, would not suggest" the origin of species by Evolution—**it is evident, according to their own admission, that Evolution is not Science but Supposition.**

A lawyer who would try to prove his case in court almost entirely by witnesses who, the lawyer thought, would certainly know the facts and yet whom the lawyer never saw nor even ever heard of and hence who could not be produced in court, would be laughed to scorn by the judge; and yet that is exactly what the Evolutionist is trying to do. He can not prove his case by living species, for "species, as they now are, would probably not suggest, certainly could not prove" this theory; and Geology "does not yield the infinitely many fine gradations" which the theory demands; and so he calls upon his unknown and absent witness, yet star witness—**the "lost geological ages",** of which **not a trace is found in all creation**—and says that if these witnesses were here they could prove Evolution!!! What fools some people permit theories to make of them!

The "Lost" First Half of the Geological Ages.—In the oldest rocks where life has been discovered, the fossils (remains of animals) are of well-developed forms of life, when, according to Evolution, only the simplest forms of life should be found. In order to account for this, Geologists and Evolutionists say that the first half of the geological rocks have been **"lost," and left no trace of themselves anywhere!** Darwin says:

"On the sudden Appearance of Groups of allied Species in

the LOWEST known fossiliferous strata.—There is another and allied **difficulty**, which is much graver. I allude to the manner in which **numbers** of species of the same group **suddenly appear** in the **lowest known** fossiliferous rocks. . . Some of the **most ancient** Silurian [oldest rocks] animals, as the Nautilus, Lingula, etc., **do not differ much from living species**; and it **cannot** on my theory be supposed, that these old species were the progenitors of all the species of the orders to which they belong, for they do not present characters in any degree intermediate between them. If, moreover, they had been the progenitors of these orders, they would almost certainly have been **long ago supplanted and exterminated** by their numerous and **improved descendants.** Consequently, if my theory be true, it is indisputable that **before** the lowest Silurian stratum [oldest rocks with animals in them]was deposited, **long periods elapsed,** as long as, or probably **far longer than the whole interval from the Silurian age to the present day**; and that during these vast, yet quite **unknown,** periods of time, the world swarmed with living creatures. To the question why we **do not find** records of these vast primodial periods, **I can give no satisfactory answer.** . . .The **difficulty** of understanding the **absence** of vast piles of fossiliferous strata, which on my theory no doubt were somewhere accumulated **before** the Silurian epoch, **is very great.** If these most ancient beds had been wholly worn away by denudation [exposure to rain, etc.] or obliterated by metamorphic action, we **ought to find only small remnants of the formations** NEXT SUCCEEDING **them in age,** and these ought to be generally in a metamorphosed [changed] condition. **But** the descriptions which we now possess of the Silurian deposits over immense territories in Russia and North America **do not support the view. . . . The case at present must remain inexplicable; and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained.''**—Imperfection of the Geological Record.

When a theory demands, as Evolution does, that the first half of the geological rocks, formed through fifty or a hundred million years, were entirely destroyed **and left no trace of their existence,** it has no right even to the name Supposition,—it is the fabrication of an unreasonable mind obsessed with its own wanderings. And men who believe such unreasonable stuff as this ridicule those who believe the Bible!!

Darwin's Doubts.—Many of the satellites of Darwin seem to think that a man is a fool who will not accept all that is said on Evolution, but Darwin himself admitted that many serious objections could be urged against his theory. He said:

''We are often **wholly unable to conjecture** how this could have been effected.''—Recapitulation.

''It cannot be denied that we are as yet very ignorant of the

full extent of the various climatal and geological changes which have affected the earth during modern periods.''--Recapitulation.

''We are as yet **profoundly ignorant** of the many occasional means of transport.''—Recapitulation.

''It [geology] does not yield the infinitely many fine gradations between past and present species required on my theory; and this is the most obvious and forcible of the **many** objections which may be urged against it.''—Recapitulation.

''That many and serious objections may be advanced against the theory of descent with modifications through natural selection, I do not deny. . . Nothing at first can appear more difficult to believe than that the more complex organs and instincts should have been perfected, not by means superior to, though analogous with, human reason, but by the accumulation of innumerable slight variations, each good for the individual possessor.''—Recapitulation.

''That our palaeontological collections **are very imperfect, is admitted by every one.** The remark of that admirable palaeontologist, the late Edward Forbes, should not be forgotten, namely, that **numbers of our fossil species are known and named from SINGLE AND OFTEN BROKEN specimens,** or from a few specimens collected on some one spot.''—Imperfection of the Geological Record.

''Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? **Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely-graduated organic chain;** and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against my theory. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record.'' —Imperfection of the Geological Record.

''There are **very many other correlations** of growth, the nature of which **we are utterly unable to understand.**''—Laws of Variation.

''Our ignorance of the laws of variation is profound.''—Laws of Variation.

''I do not pretend that the facts given in this chapter strengthen in any degree my theory, but none of the cases of difficulty, to the best of my judgment, annihilate it.''—Instinct.

''No one ought to feel surprise at **much remaining as yet unexplained in regard to the origin of species** and varieties, if he makes due allowance for **our profound ignorance** in regard to the mutual relations of all the beings which live around us. . . . **Still less do we know of the mutual relations of the innumerable inhabitants of the world during the past geological epochs in its history.**''—Introduction.

Can Christians, or any one else, accept, in the place of the Bible, a theory about which the author himself expressed so many doubts? It is not Science, but Supposition—its chief witness being the **''lost geological record'' which no one** KNOWS **has ever existed.**

The Theory Fails.—This whole theory assumes that

there was a one-celled creature to begin with. But the question arises, Where did the one-celled creature come from? This none of them can tell us. Some have talked of Spontaneous Generation, but this has been tried over and over again, yet has never been proven. He that made the first germ which puzzles the atheist could have made the universe as Moses says he did. And it is easier to believe the Mosaic account than to believe the guess of Evolution that life started—no one knows how—with the little moneron, and through millions of years finally developed into man, **leaving no trace either in the living "species as they now are", or in the dead species in the rocks, of the "transmutation of one species into another" through "infinitely many fine gradations. . . . required by my [Darwin's] theory"**. "If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?"

How refreshing to turn from all these theories, speculations, suppositions, guesses, opinions, etc., and read the account of the origin of man from that Book which has done more to elevate man than all the rest of the books in the world combined:

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. . . And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over cattle, and over the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."—Gen. 1.

The Evil Fruit of Evolution.—If men wish to theorize and speculate, that is all right as long as their theorizing does not injure mankind, but this theory of Evolution has done untold harm to the human race. They have tried to apply the same reasoning to the Bible, to the material universe, etc.

1. Evolution has broken down faith in the Mosaic account of creation, hence in Christ who endorsed Moses.

2. It has destroyed faith in miracles, hence in the virgin birth of Christ and his resurrection, hence it has destroyed Christian faith in many hearts.

3. If man is a product of "Natural Selection", or "the survival of the fittest", and not a descendant of God but a descendant of the brute, then he is entirely a creature of circumstances, and is not responsible for his condition nor his acts, and will not appear before a final Judge to be tried according to the deeds done in the body whether they be good or bad, and man can do as he pleases.

4. Evolution has made very many of the college professors in our land practically atheists, has done the same with many of the students, has demoralized the theological schools to that extent that the students who go out have very little faith in the Bible, is reaching to the high schools and even the common schools, has carried with it the side teachings of infidelity (free love, etc.) with their fruits, has helped much to deplete the churches, and, taking away moral restraint, has helped fill the maternity hospitals with the unmarried, and has done as much as any philosophy has done to destroy the Bible and the Christian civilization which has been built upon it. The bitter fruits of this doctrine are yet to be gathered in their fulness.

5. **Evolution, a Cause of the World War.**—And now we come to the most startling fact in this discussion, and perhaps the most startling in any discussion of so-called Science—**that the theory of Darwin on Evolution was a cause, perhaps the chief cause, of the world war.** You may think we are certainly magnifying greatly the subject, but hear me patiently. Darwin taught that through millions of years the strong, either in physical strength or advantageous modifications, have prevailed over the weak; and that these strong ones prevailed through the ages, till at last man emerged from the lower order of animals. But there he stopped. Nietzsche, a German professor and so-called philosopher, of Polish blood, took up the idea, mixed it with other false philosophies, and gave the world his "Superman." With Darwin's reasoning he taught that man would eventually develop into a superior race of beings called Supermen. The strong in society should prevail over the weak, just as Darwin said had been done among the lower animals. Those who are weak should be cast aside, and no effort should be made to keep them alive,

for in so doing the strong hinder their own advancement. The strong nations should rule over the weak ones. Christianity taught love toward enemies, but Nietzsche taught cruelty; it taught mercy to the weak, but he taught death to them; Christ taught love, but this philosopher taught hate; the Savior taught peace, but this mad man taught war. In other words, he simply taught that **might makes right**; and as Christ taught just the opposite, he bent his energies in trying to pluck up Christianity by the roots. That you may know that these things are true, I quote to you from "The Philosophy of Nietzsche, by Mencken," a believer in his doctrines:

The foregoing makes it patent that Nietzsche was a thorough-going and uncompromising biological monist. That is to say, he believed that man, while superior to all other animals because of his greater development, was, after all, **merely an animal** like the rest of them; **that the struggle for existence went on among human beings exactly as it went on among the lions in the jungle and the sea protozoa**, and that the law of **natural selection** ruled all of animated nature—**mind** and matter—**alike**. . . To understand all of this, it is necessary to go back to Darwin and his first statement of the law of **natural selection**.—The Philosophy of Nietzsche, by Mencken, p. 138.

The fact remains that **he was a thorough Darwinian and that, without Darwin's works, his own philosophy would have been impossible**.—Note, p 142.

Nietzsche **got the law of natural selection from Darwin**, and with characteristic daring, gave it a universality from which Darwin shrank . . The superman, indeed, is the crowning stone of the pyramid rising from the ultimate protoplasm, and truncated today at man.—p. 261.

There must be a complete surrender to **the law of natural selection**—that invariable natural law which ordains that the fit shall survive and the unfit shall perish. All growth must occur at the top. The strong must grow stronger; and that they may do so **they must waste no strength in the vain task of trying to lift the weak**.—p. 103.

Said Nietzsche, "I, teach you the Superman. Man is something that shall be surpassed. What, to man, is the ape? A joke or a shame. Man shall be the same to the Superman: a joke or a shame. . . **Man is a bridge connecting ape and Superman**. . . The Superman will be the final flower and ultimate expression of the earth."—p. 109.

Speaking of Strauss' attack on Christianity, Nietzsche said, "Strauss had no such courage. **Had he worked out the Darwinian doctrine to its last decimal**, he would have had the Philistines against him to a man. As it is, they are with him. He has wasted his time in combatting Christianity's non-essen-

tials. For the idea at the bottom of it he has proposed no substitute.''—pp. 30, 31.

He proposed, then, that before it was too late, humanity should reject Christianity, as the ''greatest of all imaginable corruptions,'' and admit fully and freely that the law of natural selection was universal and that the only way to make real progress was to conform to it.—p. 142.

One wonders that such doctrines could be believed, especially when coming from a mad man, a conceited specimen of the highest type, and a dope fiend, who spent his last days in outright insanity; yet Mencken, who wrote before the World War, announces the startling facts that:

The ideas of Nietzsche are dominant in the German universities, and have colored the WHOLE STREAM OF GERMAN THOUGHT.—p. 288.

HE REIGNS AS KING IN THE GERMAN UNIVERSITIES—where, since Luther's day, all the world's most painful thinking has been done—and his echoes tinkle, harshly or faintly, from Chicago to Mesopotamia.—Introduction.

From the facts which we have brought before you the following certainly can be logically presented:

1. Darwin taught in Evolution that through ''Natural Selection'' the strong prevailed over the weak through millions of years and produced man.

2. Nietzsche carried this principle to human society, and taught that the strong SHOULD **prevail over the weak and produce the Superman.**

3. This ''mad philosopher'' ''became king in the German universities'' and ''colored the whole stream of German thought'' with his doctrines.

4. The German people became imbued with the idea that they were the Supermen and should rule the weak —the rest of the world, and so they started out in the World War to do it.

5. Hence, the American boys who went over to France to fight the Germans—the Supermen, in their own eyes—simply went over to fight AGAINST DARWIN'S THEORY OF EVOLUTION WHEN CARRIED TO ITS FULL END!!

These truths are astounding when we meditate on them calmly and intelligently. The only hope for the world is to get rid of Evolution, and to get firmly planted in the minds of the people the religion of the Son of God in its original purity and simplicity, and separated

from the philosophies of fallible and sinful man.

Henry Watterson, noted editor and publisher of the Louisville Courier Journal, and no friend to Christianity through life, said this in his last days after the World War:

THE PARAMOUNT ISSUE

Surely the future looks black enough, yet it holds a hope, a single hope. **One, and one power only, can arrest the descent and save us. That is the Christian religion.** Democracy is but a side issue. The paramount issue is the religion of Christ and him crucified; the bed-rock of civilization; the source and resource of all that is worth having in the world that is, that gives promise in the world to come; not as an abstraction, but as a mighty force and principle of being. **If the world is to be saved from destruction—it will be saved alone by the Christian religion.**

It is time for Christians to arouse themselves and fight this doctrine which is undermining the faith of your boys and girls, and destroying our very civilization. Paul says, "**Beware** lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit." "Keep that which is committed to thy trust, **avoiding . . . oppositions of science falsely so-called.**" "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you **a reason of the hope that is in you.**" (Col. 2; 1 Tim. 6; 1 Peter 3.) You may help in this work by circulating this tract and such-like literature.

III. SCIENCE AND SUPPOSITION IN GEOLOGY

Science and Supposition.—Let me again call your attention to the difference between Science and Supposition, Hypothesis and Theory. Science is "Knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking." Hypothesis is only the Greek word for Supposition. Theory is the view, plan or scheme by which it is proposed to explain certain phenomena. Now let us see how much Science there is in Geology.

An Authority on Geology.—Joseph LeConte, "Professor of Geology and Natural History in the University of California", is as good authority as we can quote on this subject, and so this essay on Geology will be a review of some of the things in his book, "Compend of Geology", which has been used extensively in the high schools and colleges of America.

What Geology Is.—The word "Geology" means "discourse on the earth"; and the definition as given by LeConte is, "Geology is the science which treats of the **past** conditions of the **earth** and of **its inhabitants.**" Many of the rocks in the earth are in strata, or layers, and geologists tell us that these layers have been formed by water. In some of these rocks are fossils, (remains of animals, or plants,) which lived in ages past. In some of the rocks the fossils are of small animals, in other rocks they are of larger animals. These strata, or layers, of rocks with fossils in them, are found even up on the hills and mountains, which shows that these parts of the earth were once under water. Speaking of this stratification of the rocks, LeConte, a noted geologist, says, "Upon this very simple law **nearly the whole of geological reasoning is based.**" Now there is some Science in the books of Geology, and there is much **Supposition**; and it shall be the purpose of this essay to show the difference between the Supposition and Science in some points.

The Supposed "Ages" of Geology.—Men have studied the rocks and the fossils in them till they suppose they can give a very good connected history of the earth and its inhabitants from the very beginning of animal and vegetable life. They say that life began perhaps a hundred million years ago (geologists differ millions of years). The lowest rocks in which they think they have found forms of life, they have called Eozoic rocks, which means "dawn of life". Others, however, have contended that there is no form of life in these rocks, and so have called them Azoic rocks—those without life. In the Palaeozoic rocks, which they claim are next above these, they have found invertebrates (animals without a backbone), fishes and amphibians (animals that live on both land and water), and they say that through this period plants grew in abundance, from which coal was formed. The word Palaeozoic means "ancient life". In the rocks which they say are next higher, the Mesozoic (middle life), reptiles abounded. In the next higher rocks the Cenozoic (recent life), mammals (animals which suckle their young) appeared. And in the Psychozoic Era, (period of mind in life), man appeared. They tell us

that each of these periods when these rocks were being formed was millions of years in length, and that great revolutions of some kind in the earth appeared between each of these periods of formation. They say that these rocks indicate somewhat that animal and vegetable life on the earth have grown up gradually through millions of years. Between the first Era (the Eozoic) and the second (the Palaeozoic), geologists say that there is a "lost period" equal in length to all the rest of the geological periods put together—hence perhaps fifty millions of years in length. They make this guess because the rocks in the Palaeozoic Era show animals fully developed, which could only have been accomplished by the theory of Evolution through millions of years. In all these periods there is a great difference, they think, in the fossils in the rocks, as if the forms of life had come in suddenly and by creation; and Mr. Darwin himself had to confess that Geology "does not yield the infinitely many fine gradations between the past and present species required by my theory." The "missing links" between the species cannot be found, though of course there are found in the fossils species which have become extinct, just as we have relics of nations which have passed away.

The Supposition Concerning the Age of the Earth.—This is one of the important "facts" of Science which is urged against the Bible, and so we shall see what proof this geologist LeConte has to offer us in favor of the great age of the earth and its rocks. He says:

Chronology, Order of Superposition.—It is evident, from the manner in which sediments are formed, that, if they have not been greatly disturbed, their **relative position indicates their relative ages,** the uppermost of course being the youngest. If, therefore, we have a natural section of strata (an exposed sea-cliff or canyon-side), either horizontal or regularly inclined, it is easy to make out the relative ages. **But often the rocks are folded and crumbled, and pushed over beyond the vertical; they are broken and slipped, and a large part worn away by erosion; they are covered from soil and hidden from view;** so that to make an ideal section showing their **real** relation **is one of the hardest of geological problems.** Nevertheless, if this were all, we might still hope for perfect success. **But all the strata are not represented in any one place**—USUALLY ONLY A FRACTION. Thus, in New York, and all the States westward as far as the Plains, ONLY the older portion of the record is found; while in California we have ONLY **the later portion.** In **many**

places the record is **still fragmentary. The leaves of this book are scattered about**—here, perhaps, nearly a whole volume; there, one or two chapters; and yonder, **only a few leaves.** The geologist must gather these and arrange them **according to their paging; . . . To conclude that rocks are of the same age, because they are of similar grain, color, or composition, would almost certainly lead us astray.**

Comparison of Fossils.—This is the most universal and valuable means of comparison of rocks in all parts of the world. If we find a general similarity of species, we conclude that the rocks belong to the same age. But **we must make due allowance—1. For difference of conditions** of deposit. . . 2. We must also **make due allowance for geological diversity.** We must expect, in fossils of rocks in different continents, not absolute identity, but only general similarity. . . But **a really complete chronology cannot be expected until the whole surface of the earth has been studied, and perhaps not even then, for some missing links are probably concealed beneath the sea.**—PP. 192, 193, 194.

Let the reader notice carefully again the words above in bold face and then ask himself in the name of Common Sense whether men can take such a conglomeration as LeConte has just described and form an accurate history of the earth and its inhabitants, even dividing it into Eras, Ages, Periods and Epochs. Science is "knowledge gained and **verified** by **exact observation and correct thinking.**" Who will say that geologists can get Science out of what LeConte has described? **These Eras, Ages, Periods and Epochs are Supposition, pure and simple.**

The Supposition Concerning the Formation of Coral Reefs.—Geologists tell us that coral is made of little insects which cannot work under water more than a hundred feet, that they build on the sides of islands, etc. But they find coral islands in deep water, not being apparently on mountains in the ocean, and LeConte says:

These facts seem to violate the conditions of coral growth. How are they explained? The most **probable** explanation was first given by Mr. Darwin. According to Darwin, every reef began as a fringe, and would have remained so if the floor of the ocean had remained steady. But, in all the regions of barriers and atolls, the ocean-floor has slowly subsided, carrying all the volcanic islands with it downward. Now, if the subsidence [sinking] had been more rapid than the coral ground could rise by accumulations of debris of successive generations, then the corals would have been carried below the depth of one hundred feet and drowned. **But the subsidence was not**

faster than the coral ground could be built up. Therefore, the corals building upward, as it were, for their lives, kept their heads at or near the surface.—PP. 94, 95.

How kind it was in those islands—to subside, or sink down into the sea no faster than the coral could build up! Is this Science—"knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking"? Or is it only Supposition?

In the Pacific, barrier-reefs are **always** the result and the sign of subsidence. In Florida, **on the contrary**, we have barrier-reefs **where there has been no subsidence.**—P. 99.

The inquiring reader is apt to ask, Why have these coral reefs been formed in such a different way in the two oceans which at certain places are only a few miles apart? Of course, LeConte presents this only as a "theory," yet many professors of lesser fame will tell their students that that is exactly the way these things have been done.

The Science Concerning the Limited "Range" of Plants and Animals, Disproves Darwinism.—Plants and animals have a certain range—that is, they have certain climates and regions in which they prosper, and when you get out of that zone or part of a zone the animals or plants grow fewer and fewer till they disappear. But nowhere do they merge with other plants and animals, as Evolutionism would necessitate. If you would take the polar bear down to the equator, he would soon die; and if you took the alligator up to the polar regions, he would probably be dead by the time he reached there. Oranges and bananas grow in the South, while the apple prospers farther north. Snakes thrive in the South, but not in the frozen regions of the North. And so, on and on and on. Plants and animals seem to have been made for the regions or zones where they are, for they do not thrive when taken out; and if they are taken far from their zone they die. On this subject LeConte says this on plants, and says practically the same thing of animals:

But in specific character there is no such gradual passage of one species into another—**no evidence of transmutation of one species into another, nor of derivation of one species from an other.** From this point of view **species seem to come in at once in full perfection, remain substantially the same throughout their ranges, and pass out at once on the other border, other**

species taking their place AS IF BY SUBSTITUTION, NOT TRANSMUTATION. **It is as if one species originated,** no matter how, **somewhere in the region where we find them,** and then spread in all directions as far as physical conditions and struggle with other species would allow.

We can best make this plain by illustrations: The sweet-gum or liquid ambar-tree extends from the borders of Florida to the banks of the Ohio. It is most abundant and vigorous, indeed, in the middle regions, and dying out at the borders, where it is replaced by other species; **but it is everywhere the same species,** unmistakable by its five-starred leaf, winged bark, spinous burr, and fragrant gum. Again, the Red-wood (Sequoia) ranges from southern California to the borders of Oregon. It may be most vigorous in the middle region—it may decrease in vigor and number on its borders; but in all specific characters, wood, bark, leaf and burr, **it is the same throughout. The study of species, as they now are, would probably not suggest, certainly could not prove, the theory of their origin by derivation or transmutation**—by Evolution, in other words.

Animal species are limited by temperature, **like plants,** and therefore also exist in temperate zones. . . . In specific character they seem to remain substantially the same throughout their range, and do not change or transmute into other species on the borders. . . Here, again, **it is as if species originated,** no matter how, **in the places where we find them, and have spread in all directions as far as physical conditions and struggle with other species would allow.** . . It is, again, as if they originated **on the continents where we find them,** and have been prevented from spreading and intermingling by the impassible barrier of the ocean.—110-113.

Now this is Science, for it is "knowledge gained and verified through exact observation" and arranged by "correct thinking", and it is observable by most of us; and this is in harmony with the Bible. Moses says that God created everything according "to its kind", and so that it would produce according "to its kind"; but evolutionists teach that all animal life came from the one-celled creature in the bottom of the sea. **This fact of Science, that all plants and animals have a "range" north and south, and that they do not thrive far out of that range—shows that all plants and animals could not have originated from ONE plant or ONE animal in ONE climate on the earth.** But man, who was made, not in "swarms" as the other animals, but as a single pair, was formed so that he can live in **all** the zones of the earth, and thus he can obey the command to "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and **subdue it; and have dominion over the**

fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.'' (Gen. 1: 28.)

Now since LeConte, the eminent geologist, says: ''The study of species, **as they now are,** would probably not suggest, certainly could not prove, the theory of their origin by derivation or transmutation'',—by Evolution; and since Darwin himself says that the fossil in geology ''does not yield the infinitely many fine gradations between past and present species required on my theory''—since, in other words, **neither among the living plants and animals on the earth, nor among the fossil plants and animals in the rocks, can be found the ''infinitely many fine gradations between past and present species required by'' Evolution, it is evident that practically all of the** SYSTEM **of Evolution is Supposition and not Science, coming from the imagination of man rather than the facts in the case,** EVOLUTIONISTS THEMSELVES BEING THE WITNESSES.

The ''Science'' Concerning the Sudden Changes in the Fossils.—According to Evolution, there are ''infinitely many fine gradations'' between species, but Darwin himself admits that Geology does not show them. There are great gaps between what the geologists call Eras, Ages and Periods. In the Palaeozoic rocks, the first rocks which show unmistakable signs of life, fauna (animals) and flora (plants) are many and greatly different. In order to account for this great development at the very beginning of the testimony, they say that there is a ''lost period'' before the Palaeozoic which was longer than all the rest of the geological periods together. In order to uphold their theory, geologists have been compelled to invent ''lost periods'' between all the geological periods. LeConte says this:

''It certainly looks like a **sudden appearance** of somewhat **highly organized** animals, **without progenitors.** But we must not forget the lost interval. It is **probable** that during this period of rapid physical changes there were also **rapid changes in organic life.''**—p. 254.

''At a certain time **fishes seem suddenly to appear, as if they came without progenitors.''**—P. 282.

''So great is the change and the advance in plants at this

point, that if we were guided by plants alone, we would say that the Cenozoic era commenced with the Cretaceous. Here the present aspect of field and forest seems to begin . . . ordinary hard-wood trees. **The suddenness of their appearance,** however, is due, in part, at least, to a lost interval. . . There were then as now, **poplar, oaks, maples, willows, sassafras, dogwoods, hickory, beech, tulip-tree, walnut, sycamore, sweet-gum, laurels, myrtles, etc.** . . Chalk, as already said, is almost wholly made up of foraminifers, and sponges are also extremely abundant. Of the former, **some are identical with living species.** . . The highest echinoids are especially abundant. And, **what is remarkable, those from the chalk are very like those still living in deep seas.**''—Pp. 334-5.

''The bird-class had now fairly separated itself from the reptilian, **and the connecting links were ALL destroyed.**''—P. 354.

''**The Suddenness of their [Mammals'] Appearance is very remarkable.** In the very lowest Tertiary, **without warning and without apparent progenitors, true mammals appear in great numbers, in considerable diversity, and even of the highest order**—Primates, or monkey tribe. Now, in Europe, where there is a decided break and a **lost interval,** this is not surprising; but **even in America,** where the Laramie passes without break into the Tertiary, **the same is true.** At a certain level the great dinosaurs disappear, and the mammals take their place. A new dynasty and a new age in history commence. **It is impossible to account for this by NATURAL CAUSES, unless we admit times of rapid progress.**''—P. 355.

These ''lost intervals'' between the different eras are only Supposition, and are not Science, not being according to ''exact observation'' nor ''correct thinking.'' Is it not strange that far back in the geological ages, the same trees which we have today were fully developed? Why have they not developed into something better? **The fact** that mammals [animals that suckle their young], and that of ''the highest order,'' existed so early is enough to show that much of Geology is fiction. It is ''surprising'' to LeConte that mammals should come in ''without apparent progenitors,'' and he tries to explain it by the convenient ''lost interval'' which seems to be the ''goat'' for these suppositions of Geology; but when it comes to America he has to admit in substance the weakness of his theory. Geologists have suppositions, and exceptions to the suppositions, and exceptions to the exceptions of the suppositions, ad infinitum. And this they try to make us believe is ''Science.''

The Science of Modern Changes in the Earth's Sur-

face.—This earth is even now going through many changes, even as it has in the past. LeConte speaks thus on this subject:

Great earthquakes are oftener associated with bodily movements of extensive areas of the earth-crust. Thus, for example, in 1835, after a severe earthquake on the western coast of South America, it was found that the whole coast-line of Chili and Patagonia was raised from two to ten feet above sea level. Again, in 1822, the same phenomena was observed in the same region after a great earthquake. Again, in 1819, after a severe earthquake which shook the delta of the Indus, a tract of land fifty miles long and sixteen miles wide was raised ten feet, and an adjacent area of 2,000 square miles was sunk, and became a lagoon. . . Again, in 1811, a severe earthquake—perhaps the severest ever felt in the United States—shook the valley of the Mississippi. Coincidentally with the shock, large areas of the river-swamp sank bodily, and have ever since been covered with water. . . It is in this way that continents are elevated and mountain-ranges are formed.—PP. 145-6.

The most carefully observed example of gradual elevation is that of the Bay of Baiae near Naples. From the present shoreline there runs back a flat plain of stratified volcanic matter sloping gently to the sea, called the Starza; . . Now, there is abundant proof that this coast has slowly sunk and risen again at least twenty feet, and that this has all taken place certainly since Roman times, and probably **since 1200 A. D.** . . All this was done so quietly that it was unremarked by contemporaneous writers. . . Other evidences of movements up or down are found **all along** the coasts of the Mediterranean.—PP. 154-6.

Sweden and Norway.— . . Scandinavia is remarkably free from volcanism, and yet **the whole coast,** both on the Atlantic and Baltic side, **has been for a long time, and is still, rising out of the sea.** The rate is less in the southern part and increases northward, the average being about two to three feet per century.—P. 156.

The coast of Greenland, for 600 miles, is now subsiding, but at what rate is not known. The subsidence is proved by the fact that the houses built by the early Norwegian discoverers are now partially submerged. The fact is so well recognized by the Esquimaux that they never build near the sea level.—P. 157.

Cenozoic Era.—This is reckoned a primary division—an Era—because there is just here **a very general break in the rock-system,** and a **very great change** in the life-system. . . Enormous change of life-forms. It is impossible to account for this, unless we admit that the steps of progress were quicker at this time.—P. 344.

At the end of the Glacial epoch, . . there commenced a crust-movement in a contrary direction, by which the land in the same region was brought downward 100 to 500 or 1,000 feet below their present level, and **the lower parts of the continent [North America] became covered with the sea.** It was therefore a period of inland seas. . . Elevated sea-beaches are found in all countries affected with the Drift.—P. 369.

The west coast of South America went up suddenly from two to ten feet, while at the present time Norway and Sweden are going up slowly. From the latter fact, LeConte concludes that Norway has been going up for about 24,000 years, though he admits that one part of that country is going up faster than the other, and admits that other countries have gone up in a few moments higher than he thinks Norway has in several centuries. How does he know that Norway has not had earthquakes as South America, causing it to rise several feet in a few moments?

He says that parts of Italy and Greenland have sunk slowly, but admits that parts of India and the Mississippi Valley have sunk almost instantly, all in modern times. And inasmuch as geologists know no laws which govern earthquakes and this rising and sinking of the earth's surface, is it not certain that all the theories as to how long it took this or that to be done is Supposition, pure and simple? LeConte figures that it has taken the Niagara River from thirty to forty thousand years to eat its way through the gorge there, yet he figures this on the presumption that all the elements there have been in the past just the same as they are now, when he shows all through his book, as we have seen, that "sudden changes" from time to time are occurring, even in modern times, in the earth's surface. In order to make the theories in Geology come out right, they have nature making great changes in surface and plant and animal life rapidly at times. and making them very slowly at others; making very warm climate at times, and very cold at other times. With this broad field in uncertainties before him, the geologist with a free use of his imagination can build up almost anything; but the real thinking man sees Supposition in this whole system rather than Science.

The Science that the Earth has been Covered with Water.—Scientists and skeptics in general have ridiculed the Bible teaching that there was once a universal flood, and yet over and over again it is admitted by LeConte that the surface of the earth has been covered by water. Now when the earth itself shows, and geologists admit, that the surface of the earth has been covered with water, and when all nations have a tradition

of a flood, is it not reasonable to believe in such a doctrine? Besides, the flood and the many earthquakes and the falling and rising of lands and even continents, even in modern times, as we have seen, show that the formations of stratified rocks in the earth could all have been done in a few thousands of years, the facts presented by geologists themselves being the proof.

The Science Concerning "Great Changes" in the Earth's Surface, and the Climate and the Growth of Plants and Animals.—A few of these "great changes" are mentioned by LeConte in these words:

"It is true, **agencies may have acted then at a different rate from now**, but our estimate will be liberal."—P. 296.

"But now, at the end, **there occurred one of those great and rapid changes in physical geography and climate which mark the end of the eras, and a corresponding sweeping change in the forms of life.**"—P. 397.

"The steps of change here were only **more rapid**, and the general unconformity and loss of record which occur here make it seem sudden."—P. 308.

"It was a time of wide-spread oscillations, and, therefore, of **great changes in physical geography and climate**, marked by **universal** unconformity and by **sweeping changes in life-forms.**" —P. 308.

"Such great changes in physical geography imply corresponding changes in climate, and in fauna and flora. We ought to, and do, indeed, find the animals and plants **very different** in **the next age.**"—P. 342.

"Snakes seem a low type, and yet were introduced only in the Tertiary. But they are low in the sense of undeveloped. They have developed **backward**—they are an example of a degraded type."—P. 354.

Many other quotations we have made are along the same line in showing the "great changes" the earth and its inhabitants have gone through in the past. Now, since "upon this very simple law of stratification nearly the whole of geological reasoning is based", as LeConte says; and since the earth's surface where these strata are has gone through so many changes—some slow and some rapid; and since the climate which has had to do with the strata has had so many changes—now intensely cold, now excessively hot; and since the changes in animal and vegetable life have been so great —production being slow at times and very rapid at others;—since all these uncertain things, and many others, have affected the strata from which geological reasoning is taken, **it necessarily follows that a history**

of "past conditions of the earth and its inhabitants" based upon such uncertainties, must be Supposition rather than Science.

The Supposition about Mammals and Birds.—LeConte says of the Mesozoic Era:

"IT SEEMS STRANGE THAT MAMMALS SHOULD HAVE APPEARED BEFORE BIRDS."—P. 313.

Geologists have conceived the system that certain rocks, and hence the fossils in the rocks, were formed long before others, but according to this system of rocks mammals come before birds, while according to Evolution they ought to come long after them, being so much higher in the scale of development. The "explanation" which LeConte gives is only another particular Supposition to help the general Suppositions of Geology.

The Changes and Diversities in Opinions of Geologists Show that Much of Geology is Supposition, not Science.—The author under review says:

"In the deep sea of the intervening spaces, the bottom ooze is a fine coral mud, which, dried, looks much like chalk, and **by some has been supposed** to be indeed the modern representative of chalk; but, **more probably**, it hardens into a compact limestone."—P. 98.

"**At one time** the sediments were **supposed** to be mechanical sediments from the Gulf rivers, especially the Mississippi. But **now it is believed**," etc.—P. 103.

"Hence, **many persons have rashly concluded** that the earth is an incandescent, liquid mass, covered with a comparatively thin shell of thirty miles. . . A **little** reflection, however, suffices to show that **this condition of the interior is improbable.**" —P. 121.

"Continents and ocean-bottoms have not, **as some imagine**, frequently changed places. **On the contrary**," etc.—P. 165.

"Coal was **once** considered characteristic of a particular age, but **now** is known to occur in strata of many ages. Chalk was **once supposed** to be characteristic of the Cretaceous, but is **now** known to be forming at present in deep seas."—P. 193.

"It was **formerly supposed** that the igneous rocks in fused condition has pushed up and broken through the strata and appeared above them. But it is far more **probable**," etc.—P. 230.

"It may be difficult to put these propositions together and form a clear picture of the precise manner of accumulation, and therefore, there is **still** a large field for **the play of fancy.**" —P. 296.

"**We have not yet been able to find any transition forms or connecting links between man and the highest animals. The earliest known man, the river-drift man, though in a low state**

of civilization, was as thoroughly human as any of us.''—P. 390, (last page).

The reader, unused to the study of works on Geology, may not know that the word ''restored'' under the pictures of some fossil animal or plants, simply means that geologists take a few bones, or even one (perhaps a tooth), and build their pre-historic animals from a ''play of fancy''.

All these expressions in the above quotations—''hastily concluded'', ''rashly concluded'', ''imagine'', ''probable,'' ''still a large field for the play of fancy,'' etc., used with reference to the ''Science'' of former and even present geologists—show that some ''Science'' is only Supposition—''play of fancy.''

We have no objection to people enjoying a ''play of fancy'' except when such does harm, as this Evolution is doing by destroying the faith of students in the greatest Book of morals and religion in the world.

When we remember that Darwin himself said, **''It [Geology] does not yield the infinitely many fine gradations between past and present species required on my theory''**, and when we remember that Le Conte confirms this, as we have seen—**it is evident that not ''Science'' but only Supposition in Geology supports the theory of Evolution.**

That is a true saying that **''no chain is stronger than its weakest link''**; and as Evolution not only has many very weak links **but has thousands of ''missing links,''** EVOLUTION IS NO CHAIN OF TRUTH AT ALL!!

IV. SCIENCE AND SUPPOSITION IN ASTRONOMY

The Science in Astronomy.—The word ''astronomy'' means ''law of the stars'', and men have indeed found out many laws of the heavenly bodies. They have discovered laws by which they can predict the exact moment when an eclipse of the sun or moon will begin. They have discovered the solar system and some laws pertaining thereto. They have learned facts about comets, meteors, etc. The Science in Astronomy is all right.

But we would have the reader know that not everything in a book on Astronomy is Science. There is

much hypothesis there, much Supposition. And since men have used Astronomy to try to overthrow the Bible, we call your attention to some of the Suppositions in this branch of study. There is nothing in the Science in Astronomy which contradicts the Bible—it is only the Supposition. The fact that early astronomers were persecuted by ignorant and bigoted Roman Catholics is no argument against the Bible, any more than the policy of some selfish American politicians is an argument against the Constitution of the United States. Nor can the argument that most Christians believed the world was flat before it was proven to be round, be an argument against the Bible and Christians, for all the world believed that; and for Jews or Christians to have contended that it was round when all the world believed it was flat and before it could be demonstrated, would have made them the laughing-stock of the world and hindered the progress of the truth of God. The inspired Paul said, "I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh", and God evidently did the same in ages before Paul. We do it ourselves, for we talk of the sun's "rising" and "setting", when we do not believe that it does. We accommodate ourselves to the speaking of men.

The chief trouble with Astronomy today is that astronomers present their Suppositions so many times that they soon come to believe that they have actually proven them, and many smaller professors present the Suppositions as facts, and the student is not clearly shown the difference between what is proven and what is merely supposed, and concludes that the whole study is Science. The same is true of Geology, Evolution, Higher Criticism and Philosophy.

An "Authority" on Astronomy.—In this essay, we shall consider some of the statements in the "Elements of Astronomy" by "Charles A Young, Ph. D., LL. D., Late Professor of Astronomy in Princeton University."

The Nebular Hypothesis.—For many decades the Nebular Hypothesis concerning the origin of the material universe has been taught in the schools by professors, and believed as the true account of the origin of things by many of the pupils. It says that originally all

material things were in the form of a nebula, or cloud, and that by a "fortuitous concourse of atoms" these red-hot atoms began to come together. Finally, in that part of the universe with which we are most familiar—the solar system—parts of this mass flew off, forming bodies which revolve around the original mass. This original mass is known to us as the sun, and the bodies thrown off are planets. There are eight of these planets, and they with the sun are called the solar system. The names of the planets beginning nearest the sun are: Mercury, Venus, the Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune. These bodies all revolve around the sun, and this revolving seems to make them wander in the sky, hence they are called "planets", which means "wanderers." The "morning" and "evening" stars are planets, but some of these planets are invisible to the naked eye because they are so far away from the sun around which they revolve. All the rest of the bodies called stars are fixed and are far, far beyond our solar system, and some astronomers think they may be suns like ours, but are so far away they appear small. The telescopes bring the planets closer so that they can learn some things about them, but the telescopes do not seem to do much with the fixed stars beyond our solar system. The chief foundation for the Nebular Hypothesis, or Supposition, that matter was once in a gaseous state and came together into a red-hot whirling mass, is the rings of supposed gas which astronomers see around the planet Saturn, which are duplicated nowhere else in the universe. While Young endorses this Hypothesis in general, he says:

On the whole, we may say that while in its main outlines the theory may perhaps be true, it certainly needs serious modifications in details. It is rather **more likely**, for instance, that the original nebula was a cloud of **ice-cold** meteoric **dust**, than an **incandescent gas, or a "fire-mist," to use a favorite expression**; and **it is likely** that planets and satellites were often separated from the mother-orb **otherwise** than in the form of rings. . . **A most serious difficulty** arises from the **apparently irreconcilable conflict** between the conclusions as to the age and duration of the system, which are based on the theory of heat and the length of time which would seem to be required by the nebular hypothesis for the evolution of our system.—P. 356.

Now the reader can take his choice respecting the original matter. LaPlace, who originated the Nebular

Hypothesis about a century ago, said original matter was "an intensely heated gas," while Young now says it was "more likely" an "ice-cold meteoric dust." In the hot weather you may take the "ice-cold" Supposition, and in the cold weather you may take the "intensely heated" Supposition; and on the principle of suggestion, the reader may derive some good from the theory!

Nebula.—In the heavens are nebula, or clouds, of something which astronomers have thought was gas, and some of the nebulæ seem to have lines in them. Young says:

At one time the brightest of the four lines was thought to be due to nitrogen, and **even yet** the statement that this is the case **is found in** MANY **books; but it is** NOW **certain** that whatever it may be, nitrogen is not the substance. Mr. Lockyer has ascribed this line to magnesium in connection with his "meteoric hypothesis"; but elaborate observations of Huggins and others show **conclusively** that this identification **also is incorrect.**—P. 347.

It seems that some of these men are doing some speculating on this subject.

Structure of the Stellar Universe.—On this subject Young says:

"Herschel, starting from **the unsound assumption** that the stars are all of about the same size and brightness, and separated by approximately equal distances, drew from his observations certain **untenable** conclusions as to the form and structure of the 'galactic cluster', to which the sun was **supposed** to belong,—**theories for a time widely accepted,** and **even yet more or less current, though in many points certainly incorrect.**"—P. 351.

The astronomer of one generation contradicts those of another!

Clusters of Stars.—Our authority says this:

"**Fifty years ago the** PREVALENT **view** was that these clusters are stellar universes, 'galaxies', like the group of stars to which **it was supposed** the sun belongs,—but so inconceivably remote that in appearance they dwindle to mere shreds of luminous clouds. **It is now, however,** QUITE CERTAIN that the **opposite view is correct.**"—P. 343.

Oh, dear, the college student of fifty years ago who is now alive and trying to "keep up with the times" in "Astronomy," will have to turn a complete somersault on this subject!

Temporary Stars.—Stars which have never appeared

before, come into sight, then disappear. Young says:

"In August, 1885, a sixth-magnitude star suddenly appeared in the great nebula of Andromeda, very near the nucleus. It began to fade almost immediately, and in a few months entirely disappeared."—P. 322.

Young mentions many of these strange phenomena. The Bible says that this world will be destroyed by fire some time. Can it be that these strange sights are worlds like ours, where the people have sinned away their day of grace, and that now the Lord is making "a new heaven and a new earth"? While the astronomers are speculating, we might do a little; and I do not see that there is as much foundation for their Suppositions as for the one we have just mentioned.

Age and Duration of the Solar System.—Young assumes several things concerning the past, and says:

"**Maintenance of the Solar Heat.**—One of the most interesting and important problems of modern science relates to the explanation of the method by which the sun's heat is maintained. . . The solar radiation can be accounted for on the hypothesis proposed by Helmholtz, that the sun is shrinking slowly but continuously. It is a matter of demonstration that an annual shrinkage of about 200 feet in the sun's diameter would liberate heat sufficient to keep up its radiation without any fall in its temperature. If the shrinkage were more than 200 feet, the sun would be hotter at the end of a year than it was at the beginning. . . We can only say that while no other theory yet proposed meets the condition of the problem, this appears to do so perfectly, and therefore has high probability in its favor."—P. 156.

"If we could assume these premises, it is easy to show that the sun's past history must cover about 15,000,000 or 20, 000,000 years. . . So far we have no decisive evidence whether the sun has passed its maximum of temperature or not. Mr. Lockyer **thinks** its spectrum proves that it is **now** on the downward grade and growing cooler; **but others do not** consider the evidence conclusive."—P. 359.

"Looking forward, on the other hand, from the present towards the future, **it is easy to conclude with certainty** that if the sun continues its present rate of radiation and contraction and receives no subsidies of energy from without, it must within 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 years become so dense that its constitution will be radically changed. Its temperature will fall and its function as a sun will end. **Life on the earth, as we know it, will be no longer possible** when the sun has become a dark, rigid, frozen globe."—P. 360.

Young seems to think that our solar system has been in existence only about fifteen or twenty million years, while certain **geologists and evolutionists say it must**

have been in existence from fifty to a hundred million years so that the different species would have time to develop by "slight variations" from the little one-celled creature in the sea. Young says that in five or ten million more years, the sun will be a "dark, rigid, frozen globe". If the sun in that time will lose heat so that "life as we know it, will be no longer possible", must it not follow on the same reasoning that less than five or ten million years ago, **the sun was so HOT that "life on the earth, as we know it", was not possible?** Even one or two million years ago the heat on the earth would have been much greater than it is now, and yet according to Evolution far back in the geological ages, from twenty-five to seventy-five million years ago, **their geological rocks show many of the same plants and animals we have today.** Even the moneron, the one-celled creature in the bottom of the sea, is still with us, through a hundred million years, according to Evolution, though Astronomy shows that "it is easy to conclude with **certainty**" that he would have been boiled hard, ready for the table, only a very few million years ago! The Evolutionists and Geologists and Astronomers would better get together and untangle this mess, or else the common people may not believe them in anything.

Sun Spots.—From time to time, spots have appeared on the sun. What does the Astronomer say they are?

"**Until recently** sun spots have been believed to be cavities in the photosphere, filled with gases and vapors cooler, and therefore darker, than the surrounding region. . . . This theory, however, **has lately been seriously called in question.**"—P. 126.

"**The Cause of the Sun Spots.**—As to this, very little can be said to be really known. **Numerous theories** more or less satisfactory have been proposed. On the whole, perhaps the most **probable** view is that they are the effect of eruptions. **Probably,** however, they are not the holes or 'craters' through which the eruptions break out, as Secchi **at one time** maintained, and as Mr. Proctor **did to the very last.** It is **more likely,** in accordance with Secchi's **later views,** that, when an eruption takes place, a hollow or 'sink' results in the photospheric cloud-surface somewhere near it, in which hollow the cooler gases and vapors collect. Mr. Lockyer is disposed to **revive an old theory** first suggested by Sir John Herschel, viz., that the spots are formed not by any action from within, but by cool matter descending from above,—matter very likely of meteoric origin; but **it is not easy to reconcile this** with the

peculiar distribution of the spots upon the sun's surface. Faye **considered** them to be solar cyclones somewhat analogous to terrestrial storms, and in 1894 E. Oppolzer of Vienna proposed a **still different meteorological theory.**''—P. 131.

Take your choice!—No extra charge!

Secular Perturbations.—Below we have the ''Science'' of a century ago, of two prominent astronomers, whose ''proof is not conclusive'' today:

''LaPlace and LaGrange a century ago **supposed that they had proved** that the major axes and periods of the orbits [of planets] will **never be changed** by these secular perturbations, but will remain, in the long run, **absolutely constant.** Poincare **has recently shown that their proof is not conclusive.** 'Never' and 'absolutely' are words too strong.''—pp. 212, 213.

Young is just as cocksure of some of his theories as LaPlace and LaGrange were of theirs, and who knows that his theories and those of other modern astronomers will not be as obsolete in another century as theirs are now? Now as Astronomy, says Young, is **''one of the most perfect''** (page 2) **of the sciences,** what may we expect from the others?

The Planet Mercury.—This planet is nearest the sun. Young says this about it:

''Schroeter, a German astronomer, the contemporary of the elder Herschel, and, **to speak mildly, an imaginative man,** early in the century reported certain observations which would seem to indicate the existence of high mountains upon the planet, and he deduced from his observations a rotation period of 24 hours, 5 minutes. **Later observers,** with instruments certainly far more perfect, **have not been able to verify his results,** and they are **now** considered as of little weight.''—P. 222.

From the quotations I have been making, it seems that this ''German astronomer'' was not the only ''imaginative man''. When the future Astronomer has ''instruments far more perfect'' than those used by Young and others in this generation, who knows that some of the things they now ''observe'' will not be observed then?

Constitution of the Earth's Interior.—Astronomers differ on this. Young says:

''Whether the center of the earth is solid or fluid, it is difficult to say with certainty. Certain tidal phenomena, . . . have led Lord Kelvin to express the opinion that **the earth as a whole is solid throughout, and 'more rigid than glass',** volcanic centers being mere 'pustules', so to speak, in the general mass. **To this most geologists demur,** maintaining that at the

depth of not many hundred miles the materials of the earth **must** be fluid or at least semi-fluid.''—P. 66.

Changes on the Moon.—Young says that there are ''no clouds, no storms, no snow, and no spread of vegetation in the spring'' on the moon, then adds:

''At the same time, **it is constantly maintained by some observers** that here and there alterations **do take place** in the details of the lunar surface, while **others, notably** the younger Pickering, as **stoutly dispute it.**''—P. 111.

When Astronomers, Geologists and Evolutionists get to disputing as to which has the ''Science'' and which the Supposition, how are we poor ignorant fellows of the common herd to decide?

The Zodiacal Light.—After speaking of this, Young says:

''We emphasize this, because it has **often** been **mistakenly reported** that the line which characterizes the spectrum of the Aurora Borealis appears in the spectrum of the zodiacal light.'' —P. 242.

Who are the Astronomers who **''often'' ''mistakenly report''** that which is not true? Must we put each Astronomer through the mill to learn whether he is one?

Rotation of the Planet Mars.—Young tells us more of the unscientific ''Science'' of some of the Astronomers, in these words:

''Schroeter, early in the century, assigned a rotation period of 23 hours, 21 minutes, and the result was **partially confirmed** by some later observers, and **generally accepted until recently,** though not without misgivings. . . . The observations of Schiaparelli, **on the other hand,** while he did not consider them absolutely conclusive, indicate a very slow rotation, probably of **225 days,** identical with the planet's orbital period, as in the case of Mercury and the moon. Mr. Lowell considers that his observations **absolutely prove** the correctness of this conclusion.''—P. 228.

One Astronomer observes, and others ''partially confirm, and the rest generally accept'' the doctrine that Mars rotates in **''23 hours, 21 minutes''**, but a late astronomer **''absolutely proves''** that its rotation is about **''225** DAYS.'' **Several minutes' difference in their guesses, eh?** I wonder which is the Science and which the Supposition! Possibly **both** are Supposition.

Surface of Mars.—Much discussion has arisen among Astronomers as to whether Mars is inhabited, or inhab-

itable, etc. Young says:

"**The Canals and their Gemination.**—In addition to these three classes of markings, the Italian astronomer Schiaparelli in 1877 and 1879 reported the discovery of a great number of fine straight lines, or 'canals', as he called them. . . As to the real nature and office of the 'canals' **there is a wide difference of opinion,** and it is very doubtful if their true explanation has been reached. Indeed, it is possible that some of the peculiar phenomena reported are **illusions,** based on what the observers think they **ought** to see: **it is easy to be deceived** in attempting to interpret intelligibly what is barely visible."—Pp. 233, 234.

So Astronomers sometimes have "illusions" and see only what they "think they ought to see"! We shall have to be Astronomers ourselves in order to be able to tell which are the "illusions" and which are not, and then it seems we can't tell.

The Satellites of Mars.—It has been discovered that Mars, the next planet after the earth in distance from the sun, has two satellites, or moons; and these satellites are very small and close to the planet. One of them rises in the **west** and sets in the **east,** "completing its strange **backward** diurnal revolution in 11 hours." This is the only known case of this kind in the universe.

Error of the "Computed Orbit" of Neptune, the Farthest of the Planets from the Sun.—Young says:

"Both Adams and Leverrier, besides calculating the planet's position in the sky, had deduced elements of its orbit and a value for its mass, which **turned out to be seriously wrong.** The reason was that they assumed that the new planet's mean distance from the sun would follow **Bode's Law, a supposition** perfectly warranted by all the facts **then known,** but which, nevertheless, **is not even roughly true.** As a consequence their computed elements were **erroneous,** and that to an extent which has led **high authorities** to declare that the mathematically computed planet was not Neptune at all, and that the discovery of Neptune itself was simply a 'happy accident'. **This is not so, however.**"—P. 261.

Here was "Science" in Astronomy which was so certain that they called it "Bode's **Law**," yet it "is not even roughly true," though it led "high authorities" astray. Perhaps some of the "certain" "laws" they now boast about discovering will turn out about the same way.

And so the disputes between the Astronomers go on and on. And why? Simply because there is so much

Supposition in their so-called Science.

Now as Young says that Astronomy is "one of the most perfect" of the Sciences, the reader of these lines can see what we may expect from the others.

Scientists may try to rebut what we have said in this booklet by saying that religionists differ as well as scientists. True; and why? Because they, like scientists, have **guessed** at so many things, instead of simply taking God's word for it. Instead of permitting scripture to explain scripture, many theologians have tried to explain the Bible by their philosophies. Most of the differences in the Christian world are caused, not by what is in the Bible but by what is **not** there. Like scientists, many Christians have **supposed** that this is all right in religion and that that is all right, though the Lord has never endorsed it.

General Conclusion

Let me call your attention again to the definitions that Science is "knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking," and that Hypothesis, so often used, is only the Greek word for Supposition, and that Theory is simply "view" taken of certain phenomena. I do not in the least try to disparage **real** Science, and I do not believe that there is any conflict between **real** Science and the Bible; but I say, and I believe I have proven it, that **there is much that goes under the name "Science" that is not Science at all, but is only** SUPPOSITION.

If these **Suppositions** were harmless, we would say nothing against them; but when, under the dignified banner of "Science," they are used to destroy faith in the greatest Book of morals and religion in the world, and when they drive the people into materialism with all its evils, we must show the people the difference between facts and fictions. The Suppositions in Evolution, Geology, Astronomy, Higher Criticism and Philosophy, have broken down the faith of college professors, teachers in general, students and even preachers, in the Bible as the Word of God and hence as a book of authority on morals, **and much of the immorality today can be traced to this loss of faith in God and his Book of morals and religion.** Bryan says, "Ben-

jamin Kidd, an Englishman, in his book entitled, **'The Science of Power'**, made Darwinism the basis of the doctrine that 'might makes right'." And it is generally conceded by those who have studied causes and effects in society that it was Darwinism concerning the strong prevailing over the weak which stimulated Nietzsche to write his philosophy on the Superman which taught that the strong should rule the weak; and that this philosophy filled the Germans with the idea that they were the Supermen and should rule the world, and that **this spirit led to the World War with its rivers of blood!**

If Evolution of the universe and of man be true, then man is simply a well-developed brute, and **is entirely a creature of circumstances.** If he is entirely a creature of circumstances, then he is not responsible, **and there is no Judgment where he must answer for the deeds done in the body.** And if there is no Judgment where one must answer for the deeds done in the body, **then there is no incentive for a bad man to live right and to love his neighbor as himself.** And when this incentive is taken away, **then earth becomes a hell, as it rapidly is becoming, as Evolution with its consequent evils possesses the minds of the people.**

So, dear reader, when you circulate this tract or similar literature, especially among the young in high school and college, you are doing something to save your neighbor, your community, Christian civilization and the Church of God. Don't delay. Some of the greatest battles Christianity and civilization ever had are just before us, and the Lord needs **you.** Either do something or cease singing—

"Here am I,—O Lord, send me."