

(Table of contents on page 7)

The Origin and Destiny of Man

The Origin and Destiny of Man

by

W. W. OTEY

Author of *Creation or Evolution* and other
publications.

Second Edition

Firm Foundation Publishing House

AUSTIN, TEXAS



THE ORIGIN AND DESTINY OF MAN

Copyright, 1938, by
W. W. Otey
All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

Commendation

- "I have read with much pleasure and profit the manuscript of Mr. W. W. Otey's book, *The Origin and Destiny of Man*. According to my judgment he has gone to the very basic difference between those who believe the Bible and those who reject or apologize for portions of it. He has met the arguments of the atheists and agnostics squarely, and with no apologies for the teachings of the Bible. He has been fair to the findings of science, the reasonings of philosophers and leading thinkers in the field of evolution today.

"The book should have a wide circulation and will do much good in strengthening the faith of any who may be swayed by the reasoning and theories of men. It will also be valuable in the classroom in colleges and universities in helping to answer questions that may arise in the minds of students as they read textbooks that are written from the viewpoint of the unbeliever.

"The style is argumentative and direct, and the thought is easy to grasp. It is my judgment that the book is a distinctive contribution to the cause of New Testament Christianity."

(Signed)JAS. F. COX

President, Abilene Christian College

- "It has been my pleasure to read the manuscript of Mr. W. W. Otey's new book, *The Origin and Destiny of Man*. I was more than pleased with the form and substance of this book. It is simple enough to be of interest to the average reader and yet deep enough to be profitable to the mature student. I consider the chapter, "What is Man," to be especially good. I unhesitatingly commend the work to students and readers everywhere."

(Signed)E. H. IJAMS,

President, David Lipscomb College

- "I have just read the manuscript, *The Origin and Destiny of Man*, by W. W. Otey. I am very much impressed with the character of this work. It is both simple and profound. The author has been able to express himself in a clear-cut manner. When this book comes from the press, it is my intention to use it as a text in a course for young preachers. I think there is a place for this book and I trust it may have a wide circulation."

(Signed) N. B. Hardeman,

President, Freed Hardeman College

- "I have read and carefully examined the manuscript of the book, *The Origin and Destiny of Man*, by W. W. Otey. I take pleasure in commending it as a very fine work. That a work of such merit can be offered by a faithful man of God, gives me inward joy. I wish for it careful reading by every Christian and by the hundreds of young people who are being subjected to destructive teaching in our great universities. It is my purpose to conduct a class in Harding College with this new book of Mr. Otey as the text."

(Signed) J. N. ARMSTRONG

President, Harding College

- "Concerning the origin and destiny of man, there is a great deal said and written nowadays that is false. A great deal of pernicious teaching, ranging all the way from atheism to pretended loyalty to the Bible, has been foisted upon the people."

"In this book, *The Origin and Destiny of Man*, the author, W. W. Otey, has gone to the roots of the matter and has done a great service in uprooting claims that have been used in an attempt to overthrow the Bible. The book deserves a careful reading and will do much good."

BATSELL BAXTER

President, George Pepperdine College

Preface

This book is the author's effort to assemble sufficient evidence to convince sincere seekers after truth that man was created by a miracle in the image of God; that Christ is the Son of God, and that the Bible is the inspired Word of God. To every one who sincerely believes these truths, this volume is dedicated.

W. W. OTEY

Contents

<u>I.</u>	<u>WHAT IS LIFE?</u>	13
<u>II.</u>	<u>WHAT IS MAN?</u>	19
<u>III.</u>	<u>THE ORIGIN OF LIFE</u>	40
<u>IV.</u>	<u>VARIATION</u>	50
<u>V.</u>	<u>NATURAL SELECTION</u>	59
<u>VI.</u>	<u>HEREDITY</u>	65
<u>VII.</u>	<u>UNBRIDGED CHASMS</u>	73
<u>VIII.</u>	<u>CONTRADICTORY THEORIES</u>	81
<u>IX.</u>	<u>GROUP EVOLUTION</u>	88
<u>X.</u>	<u>MISSING LINKS</u>	94
<u>XI.</u>	<u>THE ISSUE DEFINED</u>	112
<u>XII.</u>	<u>THE TRUTH IN GENESIS</u>	120
<u>XIII.</u>	<u>GENESIS EXPLAINS THE FACTS</u>	126
<u>XIV.</u>	<u>ORIGIN OF THE SOUL</u>	133
<u>XV.</u>	<u>FULFILLED PROPHECY</u>	142
<u>XVI.</u>	<u>HARMONY OF THE BIBLE</u>	149
<u>XVII.</u>	<u>IMPARTIALITY OF THE BIBLE</u>	154
<u>XVIII.</u>	<u>THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF JESUS</u>	158
<u>XIX.</u>	<u>ANNO DOMINI</u>	162
<u>XX.</u>	<u>CAN ONE BELIEVE BOTH?</u>	165
<u>XXI.</u>	<u>TWO MONUMENTS AND LIFE</u>	171

The Origin and Destiny of Man

CHAPTER I

What Is Life?

SCIENCE has solved many riddles, unlocked nature's storehouse and brought many material blessings to man. But for the question, "What is Life?" science has no answer. Many men of the keenest intellects have tried to define life only to leave it still unexplained. Yet we see the manifestation of life everywhere. It is around us, and in us. It is that which we are, and still unexplained.

Earth, rivers, oceans and the lower strata of air teem with life. The various forms with which life clothes itself are very nearly innumerable. These range in size from the microscopic bacteria to the giant oak and massive elephant. The material garments that life has woven for itself, in the plant and in the body of the animal, are readily analyzed and separated into the various elements of which they are composed. But the energizing power—life—that resides in these material forms can neither be seen under the microscope, weighed in the balance, nor caught in the chemist's test tube. All efforts of scientists to see, weigh or analyze life are as empty and fruitless as the outstretched hand of the infant grasping at a sunbeam.

The manifestation of the energy that resides in life is seen all about us and felt within us. In every sprouting seed, flowering plant, leafing bud and ripening harvest is seen the manifestation of life. Indeed, it is life that inspires the thought, clothes it in words and moves the hand that is now tracing it on paper. More still, it is life that performs every act that brings to the reader the printed page that is now being read. And it is life that enables the reader to understand the ideas that the writer

is trying to convey to the reader's mind. And still no one can define or explain life.

We know much about the laws by which life is governed. Working in harmony with these laws, we are able to make both plants and animals better to serve our needs.

A watermelon seed weighs one four-thousandth of a pound. When planted in inanimate soil, it is able in one hundred days to reproduce itself three thousand times and to multiply its weight five hundred thousand times. That which wrought this wonder was life. Science is humbled to the dust before that energizing entity that resided in that tiny seed. Yet it eludes every search of the scientist with his microscope, balance and chemical test.

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

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

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

stand on the track, so many tons of inert matter. The engineer pulls the throttle, steam presses against the pistons, the rods rush forward, the wheels revolve and a hundred heavy loaded cars rush over the rails. The power was not in the pistons, rods and wheels but in the steam.

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

Man has life that seizes his muscles and moves his body just as it moved the body of the animal. But man has far more than the power that moves his body. Directing the steam that moves the train and guides the elephant as it (haws its load is a superior power. It is the intelligence and will of man. These are as certainly inherent attributes of life as the power that moves the body of the elephant and the man. In fact, it is the higher attributes of life that we call intelligence and volition that control and direct the elements of life that move the body.

The intelligence and volition of man have built cities, ships and planes, by the use of which he has conquered sea and air, and filled the earth with many other mechanical wonders. Rising above animal life, yet in some way attached to it, is intelligence and volition. But above all, ruling and guiding all, in We normal man, is the moral mind—the consciousness of right and wrong—the soul. The moral mind determines whether the whole man shall be a Nero or a Paul; a Benedict Arnold or a Washington; a slave trader or a Lincoln. It leads nations in the way of justice and peace, or of war and conquest. The pleasure or sorrow, the happiness or the misery of the race of man depends, not on material things, but on which controls the fleshly animal passions or the moral and spiritual attributes of life.

The sprouting of the seed, the growth and flowering of the Plant, the development of the mighty oak, are but the visible signs of the element of life that was first in the tiny seed, later to dwell in the garment of its own fashioning. Plant life is greater than material substances. Were it not so, it could not appro-

priate material elements and form for itself a body through which to manifest itself.

Action, the manifestation of energy as observed in the growth of the plant and in the movement of the body of the animal and man, surely must arise from the element of life that appropriates and controls the material substances. In this view, life is greater than material substances, so much so, that it is this principle or element—life—that appropriates to its use material elements, fashions for itself a body through which to work and attain its objectives. It is the life-element, resulting from the union of egg and sperm of the male and female, that takes hold of lifeless material substances and builds the body of man. Through this body life, by the exercise of its attributes of intelligence and volition, lays hold of material substances and makes them its servants. Most assuredly, the master is the greater, and the servant the lesser in every sphere. And no other fact is more universally seen and known than that the intelligent element of life in man has mastered and made a servant of the material substances in earth and air. This is so universally known that it is equivalent to a mathematical demonstration that life is not a mere phenomenon produced by the chemical action resulting from the union of material substances, as affirmed by the mechanistic school of evolutionists, but is a distinct entity or element, 'embodying energy, activity, reason, intelligence, moral qualities and will; that it is in some way yet unknown infused into dead matter, quickens and animates it, and through this material body masters material substances, and attains intelligent, moral and spiritual objectives. Thus it is seen that life is the greater, is master, and makes of the lesser, i.e. material substances, a servant.

This view is sometimes called vitalism, or the vitalistic view of life. It affirms that life is greater than dead matter; that it dwells in material, animates it and makes of it a servant; manifests itself through matter—the body—in energy and intelligence and the attainment of its intellectual and moral objectives.

The mechanistic view of life reverses this order. It affirms that life is only a manifestation of the chemical action arising from the union of material elements or substances. Combustion

produces heat, which, when applied to water, results in the phenomenon of steam. This corresponds fairly well to the mechanistic view of that school of evolutionists who affirm that life is a phenomenon produced by the union of material elements. Should steam become the master of heat and water, analyze it, control it, and further, should the steam think, feel emotion, plan and perform physical feats—such an occurrence would correspond very closely to that which mechanistic evolutionists affirm with reference to the relation existing between material substances and life, which they affirm is only a phenomenon of the metabolism in the body. As evidence of the fairness of this statement, quotations will now be made from some of the leading mechanistic evolutionists of this generation. And it is perhaps safe to say that all the leading evolutionists are of the mechanistic school. The following quotations are from the book, *The Nature of the World and of Man* (1926), written by sixteen noted evolutionists, pages 164-65. H. H. Newman says, "There are two opposed biological philosophies: one known as the vitalistic view, or vitalism, the other as the mechanistic view. The mechanistic point of view is one that assumes as a working hypothesis that life is an expression of the transformation of energy and of matter in a large group of materials, differing in detail, but alike in certain fundamental respects—materials known technically as protoplasmic and which constitute what Huxley termed 'the physical basis of life.' Life has never been observed except in some kind of protoplasm, and, therefore, must be due to the physical, chemical, and organizational property of these substances." Nothing can be clearer than that Newman here affirms that life is no more than "an expression" produced by "a large group of materials" that compose "some kind of protoplasm," and "due to the physical, chemical, and organizational properties of these substances," namely, the material elements that compose protoplasm. If this view be true, then make the proper mixture of the material substances that are found in protoplasm, and life is produced or created. The mechanistic view of life is the purest materialism. It logically denies the existence of life as a distinct entity, the existence of spirits and even of God himself, who is the purest spirit.

Everyone knows that life, as manifested in energy, thinking, reasoning, planning and willing, makes a servant of the material protoplasmic elements that form the body through which life works; but life also plans, builds and forms every artificial object or instrument with which man has filled the earth. Every breath and pulse-beat; every thought formed in the mind, uttered in vocal words or traced on paper; every mechanical device planned in the mind and fashioned by the hand; every concept of the intellect, thrill of the divine sentiment of love and aspiration of hope, arise from the entity of life.

CHAPTER II

What Is Man?

THE earth is but a speck in the universe, and man is but an atom on the earth. Yet so far as his knowledge extends, he himself is by far the greatest of all living beings. Any others equal to or superior to man, are of faith and not of personal knowledge.

Of all the questions that engage the interest of man, three rise far above all others in importance:

1. What is man? 2. What is his origin? 3. What is to be his destiny?

In the answer to these questions will be found the answer to these further questions: What is man's duty to himself? What is his duty to those of his kind? What is his duty to the Author of his being? Till he has the answer to the question, "What is man?" he can never know the answer to the other questions. And till all these questions are intelligently answered, man will in large measure grope in darkness.

The character of any object or personality must be known before an intelligent search can be made with regard to its origin and ultimate destiny. Hence the need of considering first the question, "What is Man?" Material objects and spiritual personalities could only have originated from sources where qualities of which they are formed are to be found. The quality of which the coin is made, whether of gold, silver or of some other metal, must be known before its origin can be determined. If the coin be gold, it originated where gold was found. Man, his body and all that which dwells in his body, could have had their origin only from sources where qualities like these were found. So it is necessary first to find the answer to the ques-

tion, "What is Man?" Then the answer to the question, "What is his Origin?" will be easier to determine.

It is well understood that man's body, composed of some twenty-six or more elements, had its origin from the source of these elements, earth, water, light, atmosphere. The destiny of the body is to return to the source of its origin. The composition, origin and destiny of the body need not be further considered here. The present inquiry is in regard to the conscious Indweller of the body. Who that Indweller is, is the question of first importance. The answer to this question will be sought in this chapter. The origin and destiny of the Indweller will be sought in later chapters.

The Indweller can neither be seen, weighed nor assayed by chemical action. It is non-material and eludes every test by which such substances are judged. The Indweller can be studied only by conscious personal experience of the appetites, emotions and attributes, and by correctly observing the outward manifestation of these in the behavior of individuals and social groups. The feeling experienced and the action observed determine the character of the appetite or attribute from which these spring.

Is man only a highly intelligent animal? Is his superiority over the animal due only to a fuller development and a higher cultivation of the attributes that are in the animal in a less mature state? Or is he an animal plus attributes not in the mere animal in any measure whatever? Is there nothing more in man than a highly developed and cultivated animal-self, common to the brute family? Or has he also a complete soul-self? Does his body house only one self? Or is it the tabernacle of two complete but different selves, one an animal, the other a soul-self? To find the answer, the most critical analysis and comparison must be made between man and the animal, not of their bodies, but of that which dwells in their bodies.

The self is the conscious state of being. In the animal-self it is the conscious recognition of the appetites, cravings and emotions that relate solely to the body, its needs and gratifications. The appetites are interested in seeking body nourishment as food, air, drink, comfort, protection; in mating, reproducing

and caring for its young. Its appetites and instincts relate solely to the body. It has no interests except those which relate solely to the needs of the body. When the needs of the body are supplied and the appetites satisfied, the animal is content. Beyond these limits the animal-self does not go.

In the animal-self, with its appetites and instincts, there is perfect harmony; there is not a trace of antagonism. There is no restraining impulse against the full gratification of every appetite, and no urge to moral duty. There is no moral code by which the appetites are regulated. The animal knows no code except the opportunity to gratify its hunger and sex desire. It takes its food wherever food is found, and by whatever method or means that lies within its power. It satisfies its sex desire without any regard to moral or esthetic regulations or restrictions. It has no conception of the rights of property ownership to be respected, and it matters not in the least that its food is obtained by robbing the sick or weak of its kind, or even by the death of its nearest blood relative. The only law that it knows in gratifying its sex desire is the law of opportunity.

The animal-self is concerned in nourishing and protecting the body and in gratifying its sensual appetites. There is not a trace of moral concept, or of a restraining conscience to be found in the whole animal family. It is not concerned with any moral or altruistic ideals, for it has none. It has no moral urge of duty to the less favored of its kind, and no restraint against the full gratification of every appetite regardless of the interests of others. None of the appetites of the animal-self rise higher than the needs and the sensual pleasure of the animal organism. It is not moved with pity to share with the needy and suffering of its kind. The sick, wounded and starving are passed by without ministrations. It takes the life of its nearest relative without experiencing the least remorse. The animal cannot be influenced by any altruistic appeal, nor bound by any moral law.

In the animal there is one self. Its appetites are sensual, relate solely to the body and supply its every need. The body as an organism is perfectly suited for the expression of every appetite of the animal-self, and the animal-self with its appetites fills every need of the body. They supplement each other and

fit together as the two halves of a perfect circle. The body needs nothing more than the animal-self, and the animal-self needs

nothing more than the body through which to express itself. As there is but one self in the animal, and all its interests are related to the body, perfect harmony reigns within the animal.

The animal is one body and one self; one house and one indweller. Every appetite is necessary for the well-being of the body, and perfectly supplies every need of the body. They are inseparably associated and bound together. It is impossible to think of them as existing separately. As the animal has no second self, seeking either to restrain the animal-self or to urge to moral and spiritual ideals, a state of perfect harmony exists in the animal. There is not a trace of antagonism between any of its appetites. It neither needs nor has any moral and spiritual attributes.

The animal-self in the brute has its exact counterpart in man. There is not the least difference between the sensual appetites and their use in the brute, and the same appetites and their use in man. In both they are related to the body, its needs, its preservation and to the perpetuation of the species. The animal-self in the one is the exact counterpart of that which is in the other. In both it is a complete self and perfectly harmonious within itself, as the appetites never seek to restrain or to antagonize each other. The proper gratification of the appetites of the animal-self, both in the brute and in man, is necessary for the well-being of the individual and the perpetuation of the species. The animal-self is the all of the state of being of the mere animal. It supplies every need of the body, and the body is an organism through which it satisfies its every desire.

The Soul-Self

Man has a complete second self that in every internal feeling and external manifestation is distinctly different from that which belongs to the animal-self, that is in both man and the brute. This second self is a soul-self, or a state of being whose attributes are not sensual appetites related to the body, but are moral and spiritual concepts, relating chiefly to ideals outside of the body. The soul-self is not a more fully developed and a

more highly cultivated state of the appetites and instincts that are in the animal in a less measure, but attributes or qualities not present in the animal in any measure whatever. The soul-self is not the animal-self super-cultivated, but is a super-added, complete second self. Man has every appetite and instinct, together with the same uses that the animal has. But man has in addition a group of moral and spiritual attributes that form a complete second self, not a trace of which is found in the animal.

Within the appetites of the animal-self in both man and the brute, there is perfect harmony. And within the moral and spiritual attributes of the soul-self in man there is also perfect harmony. But between the two selves in man there is always some measure of antagonism, and often the fiercest conflict. The keenest conflict of interests is frequently experienced. The animal-self seeks unrestrained gratification of every appetite. The soul-self seeks not only to restrain and guide within the limits of the moral code approved by the soul-self, but also urges to moral and altruistic duty. On no other ground than the indwelling of two selves, different in their nature, is it possible to account for the universally experienced conflict in man. Had man but one self he would be as harmonious in himself as the animal that feels neither a restraining force against the unregulated gratification of every appetite, nor any urge to altruistic duty. In man there are two selves, each seeking to use the body through which to express itself. Their interests often conflict. One house, two tenants with conflicting ideals.

Duty and altruistic service grow out of a feeling of duty to the less fortunate of man's kind, and to a belief in and accountability to God, the Great First Cause. The animal feels neither obligation of duty nor service to the less favored. Its one self is sensual, its interests are material and relate to the body. It has not a trace of any moral quality. The animal-self in man is also sensual and its interests relate to the body. The soul-self is moral and spiritual and its interests are chiefly moral and altruistic, and concerned with things outside of the body and not related directly to the needs of the body. Its ideals and objectives in their ultimate aim are not material but spiritual. Hence the conflict between the two selves in man. Cold and

heat, light and darkness are no more definitely set in opposition than are the ideas of right and wrong, good and evil, moral and immoral, set in opposition in the mind of man. One might as well deny the existence of light and darkness as to deny the ideas of good and evil. It is this conception in the soul-self of man that most strikingly sets him apart from the animal. This moral conception is not found in the animal-self of the brute in any measure whatever.

Nor is it a result of a more highly developed and cultivated state of some appetite or instinct in the animal-self. Man has every appetite and instinct that is found in the animal. His moral conception springs from an entirely different group of attributes than those in the animal-self, even of man. Moral feeling and moral deeds can only spring from moral attributes. Sensual appetites and instincts cannot produce moral and spiritual ideals and deeds. Ideals and actions cannot be higher than the attributes by which they are inspired or from which they spring. Sensual appetites and instincts can never inspire ideals and actions that rise higher than the desires and needs of the body. All that is called good grows out of attributes that are moral and spiritual. All that is called evil grows out of the appetites of the animal-self only when debased. When wisely guided, nothing but good, that which is best for the well-being of the body and the perpetuation of the species, grows out of the animal-self.

The Soul-Self Identified

The task now is more clearly to identify the soul-self. To do this, appeal must be made to personal experience and social groups. It is not necessary to establish the exact line of separation between the animal-self and the soul-self in man. It is sufficient to establish the fact that man is a dual being, that he has two distinctly different selves, each with different attributes; each complete and sufficient within itself; that the soul-self has rational, moral and spiritual attributes, not a trace of which is found in the animal-self either of man or the brute. In the soul-self there is a consciousness of moral and spiritual ideals, concepts and aspirations, that clearly manifest themselves in outward action, that separate man almost the distance

of infinity from any animal on the earth. There is no kinship between the two selves other than minor exceptions that will appear later.

Intelligence

No attempt will be made to establish the exact measure of memory, perception, or possibly reason that may safely be attributed to the animal. It is sufficient to show unmistakably that man has, not a greater measure of intelligence, but an entirely different kind of character of intelligence from that of the animal; a character of intelligence that is not attainable by the animal in this measure.

By the aid of his own inventions, the telescope and other devices, and by his own developed science of mathematics, man has surveyed and charted the heavens, the stars which are millions of light-years distant. He has learned so perfectly the course of the stars that he can predict years in advance the exact location in the sky where a star will be found although it will have traversed almost countless millions of miles in the interim. He can visualize our galaxy of perhaps a thousand million of stars or suns, so great in expanse that it requires thousands of years for light to cross it. Yet our galaxy, though so great in expanse, is very likely but one of a vast number just as great, each rushing through space at an incredible rate of speed. Man's intelligence has enabled him to analyze the sun and determine the elements of which it is composed, even though it is more than ninety million miles distant. There is no appetite, instinct or other attribute in the animal that can grasp in the least measure the simplest problem in mathematics and astronomy. By no possible stretch of the imagination can the conclusion ever be reached that these sciences can ever be grasped in the faintest measure by the super-developed or the super-cultivated appetites, instincts or any other attribute in the animal. And it is just as true of psychology, Chemistry, and every other science. This character of intelligence is entirely beyond the reach of any animal attribute. It is scarcely possible to imagine any state or degree of development or cultivation of any appetite or instinct so that it would be able to attain any measure whatever of intelligence in any science. The sciences, as well as

all other abstract knowledge, are learned by the exercise of the super-added rational, mental attributes that are found alone in man.

Judgment

The soul-self has a conscious sense of judgment, which is the mental ability to compare, weigh, balance and decide the relative value of material objects and mental ideas. The owning of property, the enjoyment of liberty and life depend on the enactment and observance of laws inspired by a sense of justice between individuals and social groups arrived at by the right use of judgment. The enactment, observance and enforcement of law is man's attempt to gain justice for every one. All legal rewards and penalties spring from a sense of judgment as to what is just. Destroy the attributes of judgment and justice in the soul-self of man, and law and order will cease. The animal cannot be regulated by laws of justice. It knows no law to move it to action except the craving of appetite and of self-preservation, and it can be restrained only by superior physical force. It has no conception of justice between individuals and groups of its kind. Not a trace of the sense of judgment and justice is found in any of the brute creation. Had man only an animal-self, he would be as destitute of a sense of judgment and justice as the beast of the jungle.

Thinking

A very large part of man's thinking is in purely abstract ideas, entirely separate from material objects that can be seen, weighed and felt. To illustrate, the idea of *eternity* that has no beginning and can have no ending; the idea of space, can it have any limit? If so, what is beyond that limit? The idea of God alone being self-existing from all eternity; the idea of the probability that there are myriads of purely spiritual intelligences? But why mention more? A chapter could scarcely contain the mere mention of purely abstract ideas about which man thinks, talks and writes, not one idea of which it is possible for the animal to have the faintest conception. And it is just as impossible for man to think of any of these ideas by the use of any appetite (or instinct that he has in common with all the animal creation. This char-

acter of thinking is possible only by the exercise of the rational attributes that dwell nowhere else except in the soul-self of man.

Language

Simple characters called letters, assembled in groups called words, each the sign of an idea, uttered by the voice or formed by signs on paper, through which man imparts and receives very nearly unlimited knowledge—perhaps this gift called language—is the most marvelous of all man's endowments. He uses thousands of words, spoken or written, each the sign of an idea, either of a material object or of an abstract mental concept. By the use of language man is able to communicate his ideas, thoughts, feelings and knowledge to vast numbers of others. By far the greater portion of one's knowledge is received through words, spoken or written. All knowledge reaching back to the dawn of history, and of everything that now exists outside of the range of personal experience, is received through the medium of language. He who knows only what he has seen and personally experienced, is ignorant indeed, knowing scarcely more than the beast itself. The most ignorant savage has received the greater portion of his very limited store of knowledge through the medium of words spoken by his fellows. No attribute in the animal-self of either man or the beast is susceptible of being so developed or cultivated to perform the function of abstract thinking or of imparting knowledge to others. The power to think abstractly, and to impart knowledge, is due solely to the use of the mental attributes that belong to the soul-self of man.

The animal does indeed possess a power that may be called natural language by which it influences others of its kind. But its power to communicate is limited to sound, sight and touch, and it is only able to awaken sensuous feelings related solely to the body. But no knowledge can be imparted. It does not think abstractly, and, of course, it does not have language by which to impart knowledge. Man alone thinks in words that he imagines.

The animal communicates its feelings chiefly by sight and sound. The mother in the bird family sees or bears the enemy,

is convulsed with fear, ruffs her feathers and utters the sound creating a sense of danger. The feeling of fear is awakened in her brood, and they instinctively hide from the enemy. The watchman crow, perched on the topmost branch, sees the farmer approaching, feels a sense of danger, utters his warning cry that reaches the ears and vibrates the same emotional chord in his fellows in the corn field, and they instinctively take to the wing. Mating sounds are made and received in the same way. The sight and sound of fighting dogs will awaken in some men the same feeling of rage and impulse to combat. The expression of suffering, sorrow or joy on the face of others awakens the same emotions in the onlooker. The sound of joyous laughter, the wail of grief, the outcry of pain, or of raging anger, vibrates the same emotional chords and awakens the same feeling in those who hear, even though darkness, blindness or obstructing walls shut off vision. Such sounds produce these effects when no articulate word is spoken. It is not articulate language, but sound-and-sight language. It cannot impart knowledge nor experience. Its effects do not reach beyond the range of touch, sight, sound, and personal contact, and it awakens only sensuous feelings related to the body, its appetites and protection. And man has in his animal-self this natural but inarticulate language just as fully and completely as it is possessed by the mere animal. The feelings of pain, joy, sorrow and mirth are more deeply stirred by sight and sound in man, due in part, perhaps, to cultivation. If man were lacking in sign language, then there would be some reason to conclude that his word-language is due to a more fully developed and a more highly cultivated state of the attributes in the animal. But man is not one whit behind the animal in his endowment of sign language. He has all the sign language possessed by the animal, plus word language. And this recognized fact demonstrates that man must have all the appetites and instincts possessed by the animal, from which sign language springs, plus mental attributes not possessed by the animal, from which springs his word language.

Sign language is not learned. It is implanted instinct, inherited. It belongs to the animal-self in both man and the brute.

In both it is related to the body and its senses. But knowledge cannot be imparted, nor moral and spiritual feeling awakened by the medium of sign language. Words alone can impart knowledge and awaken moral and spiritual feeling.

What the animal has never seen, heard and felt, it can never know, and what it has personally seen, heard and felt, it can never impart to its kind. Its store of knowledge can never extend beyond the range of its personal experience. Man corresponds exactly to the animal in this contact knowledge. But man has language by which he is able to communicate his contact knowledge to his kind. This fact sets him entirely apart from the animal. He not only has a greater measure of contact knowledge than the animal can attain, but he also has a different kind or character of knowledge. He not only can awaken in others the same kind of sensuous feelings that the animal can, but he can also impart his knowledge to others. He is able not only to learn from history much that has happened during thousands of years past, but also to gain a knowledge of much that now exists over the whole earth, and even of the universe around him, consisting of countless suns, millions of times greater in volume than our earth, and millions of light-years distant.

If man had no other attributes than those common to both man and the animal, he might indeed attain a greater measure of knowledge than the animal, but he certainly could not attain a different character of knowledge, a character of knowledge beyond the power of the animal to attain in the least measure. It is not so much a question of the measure of knowledge, but rather a question of the character of knowledge that sets man apart from the animal. It is not possible to attain this superior character of knowledge except by the exercise of mental attributes not possessed by the animal in any measure whatever. The animal appetites and instincts have their function to perform in serving the needs of the body. But they can no more apprehend the character of knowledge now under consideration than the ears can see or the eyes perceive sound. These facts, well known by every one of ordinary intelligence, amount to actual demonstration that man has a second self, rational, moral and spiritual, of which the animal has not a trace.

Love

Were it not for altruistic love, the world would be ruled by cunning, intellectual savages, preying upon each other. Cannibalism would universally prevail. Pity, sympathy, kindness and gentleness would perish from the earth. It is the hand of love that reaches down to lift up the fallen. Benevolence, service and sacrifice that make the world a place at all tolerable in which to live, are the fruits of altruistic love. As the earth, without the radiant beams of the sun, would be dark, cold and lifeless, so would the intellectual attributes also be cold and cheerless were it not for the radiant, fructifying, life-giving beams of love. When love rules the appetites and guides the intellect, man becomes God-like. When the animal appetites rule, man becomes beast-like.

Conscience

Conscience is the monitor of behavior, the arbiter of every voluntary act and even of the kind of thought entertained. It approves or condemns every deed and thought. It urges to duty and more than duty, even to the greatest service and sacrifice. It approves what is believed to be right, and urges its performance, and condemns what is believed to be wrong and restrains from doing the wrong. The deepest regret and the bitterest remorse follow disobedience to its dictates, and the greatest joy springs from obeying its voice. Countless numbers have suffered martyrdom rather than violate its dictates. When joined to religion, conscience is unconquerable by any external force, and in this connection it is probably the only motive that will lead men calmly to choose death rather than violate its dictates. Men die in war in defense of their country, and also in war for conquest. But men go into battle with only the probability of death, not the certainty of death. When the battle is joined, it is then a matter of self-preservation with at least some hope of surviving. But for a religious conscience, numbers have gone calmly, and many even joyously to the stake and flame. No other feeling or emotion has led or can lead people to deliberate death rather than violate its dictates. What appetite, instinct or other attribute of the animal can reasonably be regarded as the root from which conscience could grow? Has any one yet

been so rash as to affirm the discovery of the least trace of conscience in any animal on the earth? Conscience is as distinctly different from the highest instinct in the animal as the imagination itself can go.

Conscience not only differentiates man from the animal by an impassable gulf, but it also differentiates the two selves in man, the animal-self from the soul-self. By no method of reasoning is it possible to associate conscience with the group of appetites and instincts that is in both man and the brute. Conscience can only be associated with the group of moral and spiritual attributes that make up the soul-self in man.

It is not here contended that conscience is a guide to determine what is right and what is wrong. It is conceded that many have died rather than renounce error. Error believed is held to as tenaciously as truth believed. Conscience does not determine what is right or what is wrong. That is done by the sense of judgment and justice. The office of conscience is to restrain the appetites from leading the body to act in violation of the moral code approved by the soul-self, and urge the performance of the moral and spiritual duties contained in that code. Conscience approves or condemns when the accepted moral code of the soul-self is obeyed or violated. Further than this, conscience cannot go.

The basis of conscience is a feeling of accountability, not to man, but to God. It seeks to avoid disapproval and penalty on the one hand, approval and reward on the other hand, not from man, but from God. Conscience is internal, not open to the view of man but of God. The basis of conscience is a belief in God, and that He will justly and mercifully reward. In the absence of a belief in God and a feeling of accountability to Him, conscience cannot exist. The animal can have no conception of nor belief in God and no feeling of accountability to him, and so does not and cannot have a conscience.

Faith

Faith is the basis of confidence in all social relations. When related to material objects and abstract mental concepts, it may perhaps be defined as mental assent to, or the conviction of the

truth of the existence of such material objects that one has not seen, or of the correctness of the idea that cannot be proved by demonstration. The existence of lands, oceans, cities, peoples and such objects that one has never seen can only be believed by giving mental assent to the word of others. So also of scientific matters. The layman can only mentally assent to what the scientist says. But there is a faith that is higher than a mere mental assent. In its relations to persons and social groups, it carries the idea of confidence, trust in their honor, integrity and virtue. It is one of the virtues of character that forms the very foundation of law, order, the enjoyment of property, liberty and life itself. Faith, confidence and trust constitute the very breath of life of all social relations between individuals and social groups, without which law, order and liberty would perish.

Schools, from the kindergarten to the university, are engaged in imparting knowledge to pupils, perhaps ninety-eight per cent of which is faith-knowledge, communicated through the medium of language, not one idea of which can be imparted to the animal. All knowledge, except that which is received through the five senses is attained by faith based on testimony. All that man can know about things and events of the past, and of everything which now exists outside of the range of personal experience, is by faith. And this knowledge has been received through spoken or written language. Language, knowledge and faith are inseparably linked. By the medium of language every one has access to much of past events and of that which now exists outside of the range of personal experience. Deprive man of faith-knowledge and he would know but little more than the animal itself. Its knowledge is limited to its personal experience, and this limited store of knowledge cannot be imparted to those of its kind. It is inconceivable that the animal can have any conception of any past event that it has not experienced or of the existence of any place or thing not associated with its experience through its personal contact. It knows nothing except that which it has seen, heard, smelled, tasted and felt by touch. And its knowledge of these experiences it cannot communicate to others of its kind, because it has neither the mental concept nor language. This faith-knowledge belongs alone to man, and does not spring from some instinct that is in the

animal in a less mature state of development and cultivation than is present in man. No instinct or appetite in the animal is susceptible of being so developed or cultivated so as to be taught faith-knowledge. It is as impossible for the animal to believe by the use of its group of appetites and instincts, as it is to see through As ears. Receiving and imparting faith-knowledge is possible only by the exercise of the attributes in the soul-self of man.

Hope

All human effort, mental and physical, is inspired by hope—the desire and expectation of future good. Hope is never related to the past nor to the present. It looks into the future and visualizes the good yet to be attained. The farmer plants, the merchant buys, the artist paints in hope of some adequate reward. Whether the objective aimed for be health, wealth, the satisfaction of achievement, or greatest of all, a future life, the final objective aimed for is personal happiness. When the last ray of hope of future good fades, life is no longer bearable. Truly, hope is the lodestar that allures man onward in toil.

The prophetic function of the soul-self visualizes future good, faith convinces that it can be attained, hope desires and expects its achievement. Prophetic vision, desire, faith, toil, the ultimate aim, happiness. Only the desire of moral and spiritual objectives and the employment of worthy means, can lead to true happiness. The choice of wrong objectives and the employment of unworthy means leads to the deepest sorrow. Man alone hopes.

Religion

Religion is as universal as man. No race and but few individuals deny religion. Religion is the worship of Deity. A belief in Deity, a feeling of accountability to Him, and a desire to live again, form the basis of religion.

It is not here contended that all worshipers have had as the object of their devotions the one true God, the I AM, or that the teachings and ceremonial observances have always been such as would elevate the worshiper to a higher plane of goodness. Perhaps in the vast majority of religions, the imagined deity set up, together with the ceremonies observed, have been de-

grading rather than elevating. When man worships the one true God, to whom are ascribed the highest and holiest attributes that the human mind can understand, together with the most altruistic service, and unassociated with formal, dead ceremonies—only then can religion bless him by lifting him to a higher plane of purity. The purpose of true religion is to make man happy by making him holy. Apart from true holiness there is no true happiness.

Belief in God, a feeling of accountability to Him, the fear of penalty for wrong-doing and the hope of reward for well-doing, is the basis of religion. Conscience is related to a fear to displease, and a desire to please, God. Destroy belief in God, and conscience ends, and with it all feeling of accountability. Where there is no belief in Deity there is no conscience, no moral code, no restraint against evil and no urge to good. Among all the living on the earth man is the only creature that can believe, and therefore, he is the only moral and religious being.

Rather than violate a religious conscience, vast numbers have deliberately gone to a martyr's death. It is the most impelling motive that dwells in man. The proper direction and exercise of religion elevates man almost the distance of infinity above the animal. It cleanses, sanctifies and guides the appetites within the divinely intended limits, and results in the greatest good and happiness of man. Pure religion sanctifies every animal appetite and instinct, brings them into harmony with, and under the guidance of, the moral and spiritual attributes of the soul-self, and exalts man to a nobility that reflects his kinship to Deity.

It is true religion alone that leads man to curb the appetites that often want to run riot to his debasement, and that leads him upward into a sphere of purity and service to his kind. It is true that many who do not profess the true religion are fine examples in many respects of moral probity and altruistic service. But it will be found that these have been reared under the influence of a deeply religious environment, and so their good qualities are due to the influence of the worship of the true God.

No one has been so rash as to attribute to the animal the least trace of religion, the worship of Deity or the idea of a future

life. Can any one logically group and associate the attributes of justice, altruistic love, hope, conscience and the worship of Deity with the animal appetites that dwell in both man and the beast? If these moral and spiritual attributes were all that dwell in man, then indeed there would be some ground for the contention that these attributes are only a more mature state of development and a higher degree of cultivation of the appetites that are found in the animal. But man has every appetite and instinct that belongs to the animal, and he also has a full and complete group of moral and spiritual attributes that are as foreign to the animal appetites as they are to a stone. How, then, can it be doubted that there are in man two selves—the first, as all admit, his animal-self that he has in common with the brute, with its appetites and instincts, that relate to the body, its nourishment, comfort, protection and the reproduction of its species; and a second self that is moral and spiritual, concerned chiefly with spiritual ideals, altruistic love, service to the less favored, consciousness of right and wrong, the worship of God, and that faith and hope that in prophetic vision, reaches even into the spirit realm and embraces the idea of a future life?

Resume

The animal-self is the state of being recognized through the appetites and instincts. The self feels hunger, thirst, ease, pain, sex desire.

Instinct is the power or disposition by which, independent of instruction or experience, without deliberation, and without having any end in view, animals are unerringly directed to do spontaneously whatever is necessary for the preservation of the individual or the perpetuation of its kind. If the eggs are taken away from any of the bird family, the young hatched and reared entirely out of contact with any of its kind, the new generation will repeat every method of its ancestors. The birds will build their nest and perform every other act of life just as did their ancestors as far back as their history can be discovered. Instinct is not taught but inheres in the animal-self by inheritance. Some animals can be taught to perform some physical acts in a very

limited measure. But the learned acts, chiefly of imitation, cannot be taught by any animal to its kind.

Man has instinct in a very limited measure. After the period of infancy, it is very little that man does by instinct. The higher attributes of reason and judgment that belong to the soul-self become his guide.

The interests of the animal-self in both man and the brute relate to the appetites and needs of the body. It is satisfied with material substances that nourish and comfort the body, and physical contacts that gratify its sex and other appetites. To the arts, sciences, moral and spiritual ideals, it is a total stranger. To the animal-self, these make no appeal.

The soul-self is the state of moral and spiritual being. Its consciousness is its recognition of its moral and spiritual feelings. The soul-self experiences moral and spiritual feelings, ideals and aspirations, and is satisfied only with non-material, spiritual concepts outside of the body — those not vitally related to, or connected with the things that satisfy the animal-self.

The soul-self is interested in the body in two respects (a) to hold it within the limits of the moral code approved by the soul-self, (b) to preserve the body in the best possible health as a vehicle through which to work in order to attain its moral and spiritual objectives. To this end, the soul-self strives to regulate the body. While the appetites are gratified within the limits of the moral code approved by the soul-self, there is perfect harmony between the two selves. But when the animal-self seeks to gratify the appetites outside of that code, there arises the fiercest antagonism between the two selves. And this antagonism that is experienced by every one, establishes the fact that there are two selves in man, the one animal and the other spiritual. On no other ground can this antagonism be explained.

It is admitted by all that the brute has a complete animal-self, related to the body and the gratification of its appetites, and that perfect harmony reigns within this self, with no restraining feeling nor urge to altruistic service. And it must also be admitted that there is in man an animal-self, the exact counterpart

of that which is in the animal. There is not the least difference between the two. But it is also known that man has another complete group of attributes that are moral and spiritual, and that are entirely different from, and in addition to the animal appetites that are in both man and the brute. It is between the two distinctly different groups in man that the fierce antagonism is experienced. There is not the least antagonism in the group of animal appetites and instincts in the animal. Nor is there the least antagonism within either group in man. It is between the two groups in man that the war rages. But this war is experienced only when the animal group seeks to lead outside of the limits of the moral code approved by the soul-self. Within the limits of that code, the soul-self enlists reason, planning and the will in behalf of the lawful gratification of every animal appetite. In the most highly approved examples of character, the appetites of the animal-self are so well disciplined that there is but little antagonism between the two selves. In such, the energies are not dissipated in a fierce war of emotion, but are left free to be used in the achievement of worthy objectives. In these are found many of the world's greatest benefactors. These are they in whom the soul-self sits on the throne and rules, while the animal-self is made to serve the needs of the body. The soul-self is not made for the sake of the animal-self and the body, but these are made for the soul-self, through which to work in order to attain moral and spiritual objectives. The moral and spiritual attributes are greater than the body and its appetites. The animal-self and body are temporal; the soul-self is eternal.

In many the animal-self has gained the complete mastery, and the soul-self has been so weakened by frequent defeat that it has been enslaved. The intellect and all its skill is prostituted to the desires of the debased appetites. Such descend to lower depths than the mere animal. In some the two selves are very nearly balanced; the good and the evil mixed in about equal proportions in the life. Between the two extremes, of the highest type of nobility and the lowest depths of debasement, there is found every possible degree of antagonism and mixed conduct.

When the soul-self rules and guides the animal-self with its appetites wisely, man attains the lofty plane of nobility designed for him in his creation, and shows his kinship to God himself.

The self is the conscious state of being, the I Am. The self is the Knower, the Ultimate of what we call *Being*, the I.

The appetites in the animal-self are not the self, but the experiences of the self. Hunger and thirst are the cravings of the self.

The soul-self experiences feelings of altruistic love, a sense of right and wrong, conscience, a desire to worship God, a desire to live again. But these feelings are not the self but the experiences of the self. In order to feel, there must be a self to experience and recognize emotion. If it be asked, "What, then, in the last analysis, is the self that feels and recognizes emotion?" the answer must be that it is as yet an unsolved mystery. If this be wondered at, it is enough to reply that in the last analysis no one knows what matter is, or even what is in the atom that was once thought to be the ultimate in the division of matter, but it is now thought that the atom may be divided into four or more parts. So if the ultimate of matter, or even its ultimate division, is unknown, it need not be thought strange that the ultimate of the soul-self, a purely spiritual entity, is unknown. And if it be argued that because the ultimate of the soul-self is not known, that therefore it does not exist, it is replied that by the same reasoning the non-existence of electricity can be proved, for no one knows what electricity is. But the manifestation of the power of electricity proves its existence. On the same principle, the soul-self in man must be admitted to be an actuality by its manifestation of moral and spiritual power. Only a spiritual self, having spiritual attributes, can manifest spiritual influence. The body is material and manifests itself in material phenomena as form, weight and chemical reaction. The animal-self is sensual and can only manifest itself in sensuous feelings as appetite and instinct. The soul-self is moral and spiritual and manifests itself in moral and spiritual influences. If form, weight and chemical reaction prove the ex-

istence of the material body, and if the sensual appetites prove the existence of the animal-self, then by the same logic the manifestation of moral and spiritual influences prove the existence in man of a moral and spiritual soul-self from which these qualities spring. To deny the existence of the soul-self in man, is to deny the existence of the animal-self in the brute, and even of the material body. All must be accepted, or all rejected, for all are based on the same character of evidence.

CHAPTER III

The Origin of Life

THERE was a time when there was no life on the earth. The earth was probably a lifeless mass of ninety-odd elements. Certain combinations of some of these elements had to be quickened in order for life to be present on the earth. Starting with nothing but dead matter—lifeless material substances—life must appear and quicken' this dead matter. Life came from some source and by some process. And unless the supply of life in the original source was exhausted, or the process suspended, life would still be originated as at the beginning. But life is not still being originated. All life now on the earth is inherited from parentage like itself. That life transmits life to its offspring is a universally known fact. If, then, all life now on the earth came from parentage living on the earth, from what source and by what process did the first life appear on the earth? Only two theories have been seriously advanced to answer this question, namely, *creation by miracle*, and *evolution by natural law*.

That natural law quickened dead matter into life is the bedrock on which is built the whole superstructure of the theory of evolution. To admit Divine intervention by miracle in a single particular would wreck the whole theory. Dead matter is the source from which life came, and natural law is the process by which life came on the earth, is the whole sum of the theory of evolution.

That God by a miracle breathed life into the first life-forms, and endowed each with the power to transmit life to offspring, is the foundation of the theory of creation.

It is only fair to state that neither theory can be proved by actual demonstration. The theory accepted must be accepted by faith, based on reasoning and existing facts. Which of the two

theories is supported by the stronger evidence must be left to the individual. Both cannot be true. And to disprove either theory is equal to proving the other theory, at least so long as only the two theories are seriously offered. The question of the reasonableness of the theory of evolution will first be considered.

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

Life had a beginning on the earth. It came from some source, and was produced by some process. It first existed somewhere. To say that life came on the earth from a source where no life existed, is contrary to all reason; is to deny self-evident truth. To say that life came on the earth without the operation of some process, is contrary to all right reason and to all known facts. Life, then, came from some source and by some process. And unless the supply of life was exhausted, there — still remains life in its original source. The same process that first produced life, if still operating, would still produce life. Like causes produce like effects. What, then, was the original source of life? And what was the process that first produced life on the earth? Evolutionists affirm that life originated by spontaneous generation. That is, by natural law acting on dead matter. If that be true, then the original source of life was dead matter, that is, earth, water and air. And the process was the action of natural law on dead matter. If evolution be true, natural law either quickened dead matter into life, or breathed some life-essence into dead matter. If the supply of life in its original source was not exhausted, and the natural law still operating, life would still be spontaneously generated. Life is not now being spontaneously generated. Was the original source of life exhausted? Or has the natural law been suspended? If the first life on the earth was produced by natural law acting on dead matter, then the supply of life was exhausted or the natural law was suspended, for life

is not now being originated. That either the supply of life was exhausted or that any natural law has been suspended, no one is so bold as to affirm. There remains but one logical conclusion. Life came on the earth from another source than dead matter and by another process than natural law.

Human life is far more than animal activity. Its higher attributes are intelligence, volition, soul. Whence came these attributes that, when they have full sway, make man God-like? Came they forth from the womb of dead matter? Were these spiritual attributes begotten by unreasoning, unfeeling, lifeless, spiritless natural law? Evolutionists are strong contenders for heredity—that the child shall bear the likeness of the parent. Where in all the earth is there any likeness between the soul, and natural law and dead matter, the parents from which evolutionists teach it was born? We know that the garment with which life clothes itself is woven from material substances. But the child, the soul, that wears this garment, was it begotten by natural law, conceived and brought forth from the womb of dead matter? Is such a conclusion conceivable? Yet this conclusion is the whole sum of the theory of evolution.

How do evolutionists account for the origin of life? Some have indefinitely hinted at a mechanical-chemical process, as will be noted later. But when speaking plainly they confess no knowledge, and in fact no definite theory, as to how the first life was produced on the earth. But all evolutionists strenuously deny that life came on the earth by a miracle. Their denial of a miracle is a logical affirmation that natural law produced life. Life by spontaneous generation effected by natural law, and life by miracle, are the two theories proposed. To deny the one theory is logically to affirm the other theory.

Darwin says: "It is no valid objection that science as yet throws no light on the far higher problem of the essence, or the origin of life. Who can explain the essence of gravity?" (*Origin of the Species*, 1859, p. 496). He frankly admits that "science throws no light on the origin of life." To excuse the entire lack of light on the origin of life, he confuses the issue by assuming a parallelism between gravity and the origin of life. No parallel

exists. We see and feel the operation of the law of gravity every hour. We see no manifestation of the origin of life.

Darwin's theories as to the causes of evolution, that is, how life evolved from the lower animals into man, have been so nearly discarded that little will be quoted from him. The leading evolutionists of the present have almost entirely discarded the former theories of the mode of evolution. Of course all still cling to the idea that man was evolved, but in regard to the causes that wrought this evolution, scarcely no two agree.

H. F. Osborn, professor of zoology, Columbia University, who has degrees from Princeton, Trinity, Columbia, Cambridge and Christiana, and late president of the world assembly of scientists, probably stands at the head of evolutionists today. He says: "It may be said that Darwin's law of selection as a natural explanation of the origin of all fitness in form and function has also lost its prestige at the present time, and all of Darwinism which now meets with universal acceptance is the law of the survival of the fittest, a limited application of Darwin's idea as expressed by Herbert Spencer" (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, preface, XV, Charles Scribner — Son, 1925). Quoting again from Osborn: "The mode of the origin of life is pure speculation, in which we have as yet little observation or uniformitarian reasoning to guide us, for all the experiments of Butschli and others to imitate the original life process have proved fruitless" (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, p. 67). Tyndall (*The Other Side of Evolution*, p. 24, Winona Publishers) says: "From the beginning to the end of the inquiry, there is not, as you have seen, a shadow of evidence in favor of the doctrine of spontaneous generation. In the lowest as in the highest of organized creatures, the method of nature is, that life shall be antecedent to life." Huxley said: "The doctrine that life can only come from life is victorious all along the line." Professor Conn in the same work, p. 27, said: "There is not the slightest evidence that living matter could arise from non-living matter. Spontaneous generation is universally given up." Pages of like quotations could be given. All agree with Osborn's statement that "the mode of the origin of life is the purest speculation." This is a frank confession that the very foundation of the whole theory rests on nothing more substantial

than "the purest speculation." What, then, must be said of the unsafety of the house built on a foundation of the "purest speculation?"

Life is everywhere present. It came from source and by some process. It either came from dead matter by the process of natural law, or it came from God, the source of all life, by a miracle in contravention of natural law. If evolutionists should definitely affirm that life came from dead matter by spontaneous generation, then we would inquire as to why natural law is not now producing life. The answer would have to be either that the supply of life in dead matter was exhausted, or that the natural law that first produced life has been suspended. From one of these conclusions there is no escape. But if life came on the earth from God by a miracle, then the supply of life was not exhausted but the miracle is no longer in operation.

Evolutionists well know that life is not now appearing except as it is transmitted from living organisms to offspring. They do not intimate that any material substance has been exhausted, or that any natural law has been suspended. And if material substances and natural laws are now as at the beginning, then they know not how to explain why new life is not now appearing. And is not such an explanation vital to the theory of evolution? The question of the beginning of life must be met. This evolutionists fail to do, except by vague intimations. Creationists have no such difficulty. They know full well that natural law does not now produce life from dead matter. And they have no evidence that any natural law has been suspended or that any material substance has been exhausted. From these known facts they reason that life could not have been produced by any natural law now in operation, and from any substances now known to exist on the earth, and that, therefore, life must have originated by a miracle in contravention of natural law. Evolutionists reject the theory of creation by a miracle. Spontaneous generation is their only alternative. It is their only stone on which to build their house.

To be credible, a theory must explain the facts to which it is applied. To illustrate. A company of men find an automobile with the engine running. It is the first one they have ever seen.

They divide into two companies and formulate two theories as to its origin. One company affirms that it was all assembled from material found in a building across the street. The other company agrees that part of it was made out of material from the building across the street, but that the gasoline and ignition system came from a building over on another street. Each company is confident that it is right. A thorough examination is made of the material found in the building across the street. The parts that are found are put together and the automobile is complete except the power to make it go. It lacks gasoline and ignition, neither of which can be found in the building across the street. But in the building over on the other street gasoline and ignition are found and the car runs.

Here is man, body, mind and soul. Evolutionists teach that all that man is was evolved from the earth, water and air. Creationists agree that man's body came from the earth, water and air, but affirm that his life with all of its attributes, that makes man go, came from another source. Chemists have analyzed man's body and find that its elements came from the earth, water and air. Beyond question, then, man's body was assembled from the source of all such material elements. But with these material elements formed into a body, you do not have man. The power to make that body go is lacking. That is but the house in which man dwells. Scientists have searched all known material substances and no life-essence is found to make man's body go. All the possible blendings and combinations of material elements have failed to produce life to animate the body. Creationists readily agree that man's body was assembled from material substances, but deny that the life with its spiritual attributes came from dead matter. Material elements come from the source of such elements. Spiritual attributes can only come from a spiritual source. It is known that life, mind and spirit, are in God, and from no other source can these come. To affirm to the contrary, is to affirm without proof, against all existing facts and in opposition to all right reason. Remains there then a doubt that life came from the source of all life-God?

Although H. F. Osborn says that "the mode of the origin of life is pure speculation," yet he declares, "We may express as

our opinion, based upon the application of uniformitarian evolutionary principles, that when life appeared on the earth some energies pre-existing in the cosmos were brought into relation with chemical elements already existing." (*The Origin and Evolution of Life*, p. 2). Here the opinion is expressed that life was produced by "energies" "already present" coming into "relation with chemical elements already existing in the cosmos." Were those "chemical elements" exhausted? Or were the "energies" no longer present in the cosmos? Was the natural law that "brought into relation" these "pre-existing energies" suspended? If Osborn's opinion is correct in regard to how life first originated, then the "energies" and "chemical elements" are no longer "present in the cosmos," or the "force that brought these into relation" has ceased, or the chemical formula has been lost, else life would still be originated from dead matter, the source from which Osborn opines the first life came on the earth.

If Osborn's opinion be the true theory of the process by which life came on the earth, then natural law, out of totally dead elements, chemically created life. Certain it is that before life appeared on the earth all material elements and energies were lifeless. This being true, if "energies present in the cosmos" produced life out of lifeless chemical elements, then the totally dead produced from itself the living. These are fundamental difficulties that cut the very tap-root of the whole theory. Till they are cleared away, not even the first stone can be laid on which to build the theory.

Admitting Osborn's assumption that some lifeless "energies pre-existing in the cosmos were brought into relation with chemical elements already existing," does it follow that life could thus have been chemically produced? It is contrary to the facts of every known chemical process. Failure has been written over every effort of the greatest scientists of the world to produce life by any chemical process. If the mixing and blending of material substances produced the first life on the earth, mixing and blending of material substances would now produce life, unless some necessary material substances are no longer present, or the proper chemical reaction no longer occurs. Neither of which has any evolutionist yet affirmed.

The assumption that life appeared on the earth by some unknown chemical process is without the faintest shadow of supporting evidence.* Two or more of the ninety-odd material elements can be mixed. Only a compound results. No distinctly new element is produced, much less a new entity equal to life.

The compound never rises higher in refinement than the average of the material substances mixed. Gold, silver and lead may be mixed in equal parts. No new element results. The compound would partake of the nature of each of the three substances of which it was made. The compound would be higher in refinement than lead and lower than gold. But no distinctly new element has ever been produced. Yet the first and most vital point in the whole theory of evolution is the assumption that lifeless natural law produced life—plant life, animal life, spiritual life—by a chemical process resulting from the mixing of lifeless material substances present in the earth, water and air. Was any assumption ever made that is more directly contrary to all known facts and to every element of sound reason?

As further proof that the leading evolutionists hold the view that life was first produced on the earth by a chemical process, note the following from Anton J. Carlson (*The Nature of the World and of Man*, University Press) — "The modern physiologist proceeds on the theory that life is a manifestation of physico-chemical processes in complex organization of living cells and *tissues*—*Mechanism versus vitalism* in biology is not a matter of opposing one dogma with another dogma. For the present, the mechanistic hypothesis works, while vitalism tends to close the door to experiment and analysis." And this from Charles Hubbard Judd: "The psychologist joins with the physiologist in studying the nervous structures on the actions of which consciousness depends." (*The Nature of the World and of Man*, pp. 506-7-11).

It will be noted first, that Carlson says "that life is a manifestation of physico-chemical processes." Which is equivalent to

*The author is aware of the fact that some one may call in question this statement as related to iron rust. It is true that under the microscope nothing is seen in iron rust except red particles. But when subjected to the proper test, it is proved to be still iron but in a state of disintegration. The iron can be recovered from its changed state.

saying that life was physically and chemically produced. It will be noted second, that he says "the mechanistic hypothesis works." Most assuredly "mechanism," that is, chemical and physical forces, "works" in the sphere to which it is limited. Carlson's "physico-chemical processes works" effectively in producing wine, cider, beer, from fruit juices and grain. And the same "physico-chemical processes works" in a multitude of other fields of material substances, changing and transforming them from one class of combinations to others. About that sort of work there is no question at issue. The whole question in dispute is this: Does mechanism—"physico-chemical processes work" in producing life from dead substances? This is the vital point at issue. What do evolutionists mean by the word "mechanism?" Simply this: That the active forces of natural law chemically produced life. Carlson says that the "mechanistic hypothesis works." Yes, but has it ever so "worked" as to produce life?

In this view of the origin of life, it is assumed that the totally dead out of its own lifeless elements produced the first life on the earth. And in turn this life mastered its own parent, dead matter, and thus enslaved its 'Own creator. For we know that life by its attributes of intelligence plans; by its will executes, and by its own material tool, the hand, fashions every need and luxury, from the toothpick to the watch that keeps his time; from the simplest toy to the great steam railway; the steamship and the implements of war; the wonders of the moving pictures and the radio, and all that intervenes. In other words the theory of mechanistic evolution in effect affirms that life was created by, or resulted from, the mechanical action of dead substances, and that the creature—life—in turn conquers and makes a servant of its own creator. And thus the created becomes greater than the creator. For most assuredly life is master of dead substances. Does such a theory accord with right reason?

We know that the essence of life now present in the living seed of both plants and animals is passed on by each parent to living seed. We know that the life essence inherited from parents of plants and animals is able to take hold of the material substances *in* the earth, water and air, and builds for itself a habitation in the

plant or the body of the animal. We know that all life now on the earth has in this way been inherited from parents of plants and animals. We know that these have the power to again divide this life-essence and transmit it to offspring. Since all life now on the earth came by the process of the plant or animal passing *on* to offspring a part of its own life-essence, creationists logically conclude that the first life-forms on the earth received life from God by a miracle. When life first appeared on the earth the original supply of life was not exhausted, but the process, a miracle, was suspended.

CHAPTER IV

Variation

THE first vital question between evolutionists and creationists is: How did life first appear on the earth? In reality all other differences are rooted in this one. If evolutionists can formulate even a fairly reasonable, logical theory as to how natural law, that admittedly is not endowed with intelligence, planning, volition and non-living—without life—could have quickened dead matter into life, endowed it with all the intellectual and spiritual attributes that go to make man, then, assuredly, the greatest point of difference would be settled. For undoubtedly a power that could first produce life from dead matter could then advance it till man was developed. Logically, this point should be settled before proceeding to the consideration of minor questions. It seems that reason would demand that at least a definite theory should be formulated that would in some measure explain the first and most vital point at issue. No more than a merely hinted at theory of some sort of mechanistic, chemical process, vague and indefinite, has thus far been offered. Osborn says: "The mode of the origin of life is pure speculation." And with this statement all evolutionists agree. Yet Osborn, as well as all others, assumes the most vital point at issue when he says: "We know, for example, that there has existed a more or less complete chain of beings from monad to man—that man has descended from some ape-like form somewhere in the Tertiary" (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, preface X).

Creationists can well afford to be generous, and so we will just grant evolutionists the assumption that natural law quickened dead matter into life. But it is a long and perilous journey from Osborn's monad to man. There are many as yet un-

explained difficulties in order to get man theoretically across the broad gaps. Out of that tiny single cell life must come 636,000 different forms of life. A parallel would be to plant an acorn that would send out 636,000 branches, and at the tip of one branch an acorn just like the one planted, and at the tip of each of the other branches something as different from each other as jelly fish, sharks, whales and octopuses of the ocean, and insects, reptiles, elephants, birds and man on the land, differ from each other. For the theory of evolution affirms that from the first single cell life form, came every extinct animal, some of which were supposed to have measured possibly eighty feet in length, and to have weighed eighty tons, and also including every living being, from the single cell just like the supposed original one, and man. It seems that they whose credulity will enable them to believe that natural law has wrought this wonder, ought not to falter at believing creation at the beginning by miracle. If evolution be true, then :01 these 636,000 living species were either latent in the original single cell life form, waiting to be unfolded, or they were introduced by external agencies along the journey to man.

We grant evolutionists the privilege to assume the existence of the first single cell life form, a tiny jelly-like speck of animated matter. From this tiny speck must come at least 636,000 living species including man. Three processes are proposed to evolve upward to man: variation, natural selection and heredity. No progress upward is possible without the operation of all three processes. Variation to originate improved individuals, Natural Selection to preserve these favored ones alive to reproduce, and Heredity to transmit the improvements to off spring.

The single cell produces offspring by dividing into equal halves. There would be just two of the second generation, and these just alike. From one of the first two must come the 636,000 different species including man. From the other twin nothing has come except uncounted numbers of single cell life forms just exactly like the first one. Were all these in the first cell before it divided into the twins? If so, how did one twin inherit the 636,000 species and man, while the other twin inherited nothing that it could transmit except its own likeness? We have man and we have countless numbers of single cells just like the supposed

first one, and 636,000 species in between, all from just one cell. How was it possible that one of the twins inherited all these species and man, while the other one inherited nothing except its own likeness? And if the one twin inherited from the first single cell all these species including man, how, then, can it be explained that jelly fish were passed out at one point, fish at another point, later on amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals, and finally some ape-like form and finally man? Would it not be very interesting for the most logical evolutionist to formulate a working theory as to how this wonder was wrought? This is a mighty problem waiting a reasonable explanation.

If all these species including man were not present in the original single cell, then in that case every improved species up to and including man, had to be acquired from without along the way. This being true, and manifestly it is true, what agency, influence or power injected these improvements along the journey to man? Environment is the only external influence suggested by evolutionists. Environment is chiefly climate and food. Rejecting for the present the theory that changes come from within, environment—food and climate—must be relied upon. We have man and we still have millions of single cell life forms. Conservative evolutionists estimate that the two are at least sixty million years apart in development. Both have descended from the first cell. The ancestors of both began life together and have lived under exactly the same natural laws and environment. Natural law and environment have held one of the twins back without the least improvement sixty million years, while natural law and environment seized the descendants of the other twin and advanced its offspring sixty or more million years to man. The original twins and their descendants began life and have lived under exactly the same environment and were acted upon by the same natural laws. But their descendants are sixty millions years apart. Where there are reverse effects there must of necessity be reverse causes. Here reverse effects are clearly seen. Where are the reverse causes? What caused natural law to select one twin and from it evolve man, and 636,000 species of animals, while some reverse natural law

held descendants of the other twin stationary without the least improvement for sixty millions years? Are these opposing natural laws still operating? Or have they been suspended? Who will arise and explain this mystery?

Was the complex body of man latent in the single cell only waiting to evolve or unfold, like the tree in the acorn or the chick in the shell? And were all the mental and spiritual attributes also present in the original cell? If so, whence did it acquire them? Man's complex body is a material fact. His intelligence, volition and soul are also just as definite spiritual entities. That these have all been inherited from ancestors, both creationists and evolutionists agree. These originally came from some source and by some process. Creationists affirm that the first man was created as he now is, and transmitted all these attributes to his posterity down to man now living. Evolutionists affirm that all that man is has been inherited from ancestors. But they also affirm that his first progenitor was a single cell life form. And it appears that no one has yet been willing to affirm that all that man now is was latent in the original cell. And if man's body and soul were not in it, then these improvements had to be acquired somewhere along the road. Had not the miniature tree been latent in the acorn, and the chick in the shell, then these would have had to be acquired. Even so must the evolutionist's single cell life form get from without itself all that man now is more than what was in the original one. If a man starts to his office with only a business suit on, and arrives with a topcoat, handbag, cane and typewriter, then these had to be acquired along the road. There had to be a Where that he acquired them, and a How that he acquired them. To prove their theory, evolutionists must show where and how man acquired all that he now is more than the single cell. They assume that environment, chiefly climate and food, is the how, of the outside influence that has operated to evolve man from reptiles and still lower animals. But why has the same environment made man from one twin of the original single cells, and failed to make the least change in the descendants of the other twin? And why has the same environment left along the road between man and the single cell, 636,000 intermediate species? If envi-

ronment has been the cause operating to evolve man from the single cell, how can it be explained that the same environment has produced 636,000 results?

If it be true, as creationists claim, that there is in each species including man, a life-principle or entity, that lays hold of material elements and fashions its body, then such difficulties as confront the evolutionist disappears. In this view the controlling principle is the life—the living principle—that dwells in the body. In reality it is this life, or living principle, that divides itself, and this new unit of life takes hold of material substances and fashions its body. It is this life principle that begets its kind by dividing its own life-essence, which in turn takes hold of material substances and fashions its body to correspond to its life-form. In this view the first life-principles were by miracle and were empowered to fashion their own bodies around them. This view encounters only one mystery, namely, the life principle or entity, while the evolutionist's view encounters unexplained mysteries at every turn. The living principle present in the germ of the grain of wheat unerringly forms a wheat plant and matures more grains that are able to repeat the process for a thousand generations. The life of the germ of the animal unerringly fashions a body to correspond with its own character. Perhaps under the microscope and in the laboratory no difference could be discerned in the form and the substance of the germs of the various animals. But the living principle hidden in that microscopic speck of jelly-like matter never makes a mistake. It lays hold of material substances and forms the body of a fish, a reptile, a bird or a man, governed not by the environment in its surroundings but controlled unerringly by the invisible, undiscoverable life principle, that came by the self-division of its ancestral parent first created. Under the microscope, the biologist sees the speck of jelly-like substance called a single cell life form as it constricts in the center and divides into two new cells exactly like the parent. Could the biologist see the life-principle in that speck, he would doubtless discover that this life-principle was altogether the controlling factor in reproducing new cells. And could the scientist see what is in the germ cell, he would likewise doubtless see a life-image of

fish, reptile, bird or man similar to that of the parent, and what the child was to be. The controlling, guiding cause must be within the germ. If it were from without, why do not the germs of birds produce fish, or any other kind of animal? The form of the observed germs appear alike. Their substance when analyzed is the same. The environment under which they are produced and developed is often the same. Admit an invisible controlling, guiding, life-principle, that is a part of the self-division of a parent like itself, back to the first of each family by a miracle, and every difficulty disappears. And this view is in harmony with every observed fact of life. Deny this guiding life-principle in the germ, and a clash of conflicting opinions reigns supreme.

It is impossible for parents to, transmit to offspring any element of body or attribute of mind that they do not possess. Is this statement true? If yes, then does the reptile have a soul? If no, then man is not the child of reptiles. And if the truth of this statement is denied, then where is there a record of parents that ever transmitted to offspring any element or body or attribute of soul not possessed by the parents? To prove the theory of evolution it must be affirmed that the reptile has a soul, or denied that man has a soul, or affirmed and proved that the reptile has transmitted to man that which it did not have, a soul.

It matters not from what angle the theory is approached, difficulties like granite walls stretch across its path. Evolutionists themselves keenly realize the barrenness of facts and the weakness of their reasoning in support of their theory. They are constantly changing base. Different schools of evolution not only use different arguments to support their theory, but also employ directly contradictory reasoning. The lack of facts and argument satisfying even to evolutionists themselves most certainly is not due to any lack of intelligence, learning and research. Perhaps no other theory has ever been supported by a greater array of natural and acquired talent. The weakness is not found in a lack of ability in its advocates but in the cause they plead.

As proof of these statements now hear what H. F. Osborn, certainly one of the brightest lights in the whole galaxy, has to

say: "Thus the long period of observation, experiment, and reasoning which began with the French philosopher, Buffon, one hundred and fifty years ago, ends in 1916 with the general feeling that our search for causes, far from being near completion, has only just begun—" (*The Origin and Evolution of Life*, preface X). "Moreover," he says, "all the explanations of evolution which have been offered by three generations of naturalists align themselves under two main ideas only. The first is the idea that the causes of evolution are chiefly from without inward, namely, beginning in the environment of the body and extending into the germ; this idea is centripetal. The second idea is the reverse: it is centrifugal, namely, that the causes begin in the germ and extend outward into the body and into the environment." (*Ibid.*, preface XIII.) These two theories contradict and nullify each other. If the "causes are from without" they are not "from within," and if "from within," they are not "from without. Which school will prevail?

These two contradictory theories of the "causes" of evolution are held by the two leading schools of evolutionists, the Darwinians and the Lamarckians. Between these there has raged an unceasing war for many years, with no sign of a victory or a truce. Osborn repudiates both theories, and proposes a new one of his own that he calls the "Energy Concept." It is purely materialistic, which denies all spiritual attributes. "I do not propose," says Osborn, "to evade the difficulties of the problem of the origin of life by minimizing any of them. Whether our approach through energy will lead to the discovery of some at least of the unknown causes of evolution remains to be determined by many years of observation and experiment. We have obtained a starting point for new and untried paths of exploration which may be followed during the present century." (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, preface, XVII). As it seems but very few have as yet embraced Osborn's "Energy Concept" theory it will be passed for the present, except to say that in its final analyzes it ends just where the whole theory ends, in materialism, or Naturalism. Life had its origin either by a supernatural process, that is, by a miracle or by a natural process, that is, by natural law acting on dead matter. Different writers may use different terms, but the end is either natural law or miracle.

If the Lamarckian school could show a single instance in which any change has ever taken place in the germ so as to produce a new species, that would disprove the Darwinian theory. Or if the Darwinian school could show a single instance in which the environment of climate and food has ever so changed the form so as to originate a single new species, that would disprove the Lamarckian theory. But it is frankly admitted that no such instance has ever been observed. Hence there is the controversy between the two schools and the total lack of any substantial proof of the origin of any new species.

In the absence of any proof that it ever occurred, we will grant the assumption that changes may take place in the germ. The theory teaches that in order to produce new body-organs, and finally new species, the change in the germ cell must work "outward into the body." But this supposed original single cell life form has but one germ cell. One cell is it all. It has no body to work outward into in order to produce new species. Evolutionists apply their theory to the germ cells in highly organized plants and animals, composed of billions of single germ cells. It is a beautiful theory, even though lacking in supporting evidence, when applied to many-celled organisms. But just remember they must begin with their assumed single cell life form. That is their start toward man. If a million improved changes should take place in their original single cell, it would utterly fail to produce a new species, because it has no "body to work outward into." Of course, if they could start with a many-celled animal, their theory would sound more plausible. It is very much like a man saying he could weigh the earth if he had something on which to set his scales. Their theory cannot get them out of their single cell life form.

As we advance, difficulties multiply. Contradictions meet us at every turn. In order to evolve man, the single cell must improve. In some way, from within or from without, it must begin to acquire head, eyes, feet and legs, and also sex, male and female. Variation must produce the improved individuals, Natural Selection must preserve them alive to reproduce, Heredity must transmit the improvements to offspring. A beautiful theory, isn't it? But how will it work in actual test as applied to

the single cell? A theory must work when applied to existing conditions. Well, just suppose that, from within or from without, a large number of single cell life forms actually so vary as to make a good start toward acquiring head, eyes, feet and legs, and as also must necessarily occur, to acquiring sex, male and female. A fine start indeed. Variation has operated. Now Natural Selection saves these improved individuals alive to produce offspring. It now requires Heredity to pass these improvements on to the next generation. But in order to do this, improved individuals must produce offspring. And how do they produce offspring? By dividing into equal halves. And what would the two new halves be like? just exactly like the parent before it divided to produce the two offspring. Equally dividing itself into two just like itself, is the only possible way for the single cell to reproduce its kind. Any variation whatever that might appear in the parent cell could not be transmitted to offspring. This self-division may be repeated till a million generations have come and gone, and the last generation is exactly like the first one. And this is why countless numbers of single cell life forms are still present all over the earth, right by the side of man who, it is affirmed, descended from the original one. How would it be possible to make the least improvement when every gain would be lost in the first offspring? The Quarterly Review of Biology, issued by the Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D. C., says: "A single cell cannot increase in size beyond a certain point without serious interference with the chemical and physical interchanges on which life depends. On reaching the maximum size permitted by the chemical and physical restriction, the animal cell divides into two, becoming four, these four eight, these eight sixteen, these sixteen thirty-two, and so on, indefinitely." Thus it is seen that single cells can produce nothing but single cells from the first to the last. Any variation is lost in the first generation. Not the least possibility of their producing improved individuals.

CHAPTER V

Natural Selection

AS already suggested, in the theory of evolution variation, natural selection and heredity are so inter-locked and interdependent, that it is difficult to treat them separately. Yet it seems necessary to do so.

What do evolutionists mean by natural selection? It is supposed that natural law and environment will so operate as to preserve improved plants and animals till they reproduce offspring. Variation is supposed to create improvements, natural selection to preserve these alive, and heredity to transmit these improvements to offspring. What are the processes, agencies, or influences attributed to natural selection? Let the highest authority, Darwin, as quoted with approval by H. H. Newman, (*Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics*, p. 256) answer: "So again it is difficult to avoid personifying Nature; but what I mean by Nature is only the aggregate action and product of many natural laws." "Unless such (variation) occurs, natural selection can do nothing." (p. 254) "We must not forget that climate, food, etc., have no doubt produced some direct effect." (p. 259) "I must beg permission to give one imaginary illustration. Let us take the case of a wolf, which preys on various animals. Let us suppose that the fleetest prey, a deer for instance, had from any change in the country increased in numbers, or that other prey had decreased in numbers, during the season of the year when the wolf was hardest pressed for food. Under such circumstances the swiftest and slimmest wolves would have the best chance of surviving and so be preserved or selected, provided always that they retained strength enough to 59

master their prey at this or any other period of the year, when they were compelled to prey on other animals." (p. 263).

In this quotation we have the supposed method by which the fleetness of the wolf and deer has been "evolved." How is it proved? The premise is an "imaginary illustration." The start is "imagined," a case never known to have occurred, else the present or historical fact would have been cited. If any actual facts supporting the theory were known to exist, or ever to have existed, there would have been no necessity of calling on a fertile imagination for the major premise on which to base the proposition to be proved. Next it is "supposed the fleetest prey had increased in numbers." Again it is "supposed that a season of the year came when the wolf was hardest pressed for food." Then, "provided," another supposition, "always that they retained strength enough to master their prey." From this string of the merest "suppositions," and imaginary cases, none of them ever known to have actually existed, the fleetest wolves and deer are supposed to have been "evolved" by the aid of natural selection, and remain with us as we now know them. And these "imaginary" and "supposed" cases form one of the chief foundation stones, not only of the minor theory of natural selection, but also of the whole theory of evolution. It seems to be universally agreed that unless the idea of natural selection can be clearly established the whole theory must fail.

The idea here set forth is that the wolf pursuing the deer to eat it, and the deer fleeing to avoid being eaten, "evolved" fleetness in both. But just remember that but few generations back of the wolf and deer, both existed in the same parents, that is if evolution be true. The ancestors of both wolf and deer were the same parents. Now just what was the cause that started the offspring of the same parents to "evolve" different appetites, one to eat grass, the other to eat flesh. The ancestors of both the wolf and the deer were full brothers. And were these full brothers grass eating animals? If so, why did one of them "evolve" an appetite to eat flesh? Or if they were flesh eating animals why did one "evolve" an appetite for grass? Both lived under the same "environment" and were operated on by the same supposed natural selection. This is the first problem to be solved. Dar-

win and Newman take the descendants of the same parents when they are wolves and deer, and spin a fine "imaginary" theory as to how the two became more fleet of foot. But they utterly fail to begin back when they claim both came out of the same parents, subject to the same supposed natural selection, and give a reasonable explanation how the children of these two parents started to reach their present state, the one to eat grass, the other to eat flesh, the one to eat its relative, the other to be eaten. And here is the untouched difficulty at every supposed step in the upward ascent from the jelly fish to man. They imagine some manner of change when the animals are far apart. But let them just start with the first divergence or branching out back in the ancestors when one began to "evolve" into deer, the other into wolves to devour them, and another into man to eat the deer and to exterminate the wolves. All three, and thousands of other animals, branched out from the same two parents—that is, if evolution be true.

Quoting again from the book noted above, page 216.* "The adaptation of every species of animal and plant to its environment, says Jordan and Kellog, is a matter of every day observation—The animal is fitted to the air it breathes, the water it drinks, the food it finds, the climate it endures, the region it inhabits. All its organs are fitted to its functions: all its functions to its environment—as the loaf is fitted to the pan, or the river to its bed, so is each species fitted to its surroundings."

Most assuredly the needs of the plant and animal must be found in their surroundings, else life could not exist at all. Rob the plant or animal of proper food, moisture, climate, and they die. It is the plainest possible fact that there must be adaptation between the living being and the environment in order for life to start, to say nothing of continuing to exist. And that environment may produce minor modifications in living things is also recognized. But evolutionists affirm that man's ancestors were fish. The fish must of course fit the environment of water, either to begin living or to remain alive. But how in all reason can it be explained that the "environment" of living in and

*As quoted by H. H. Newman, from D. S. Jordan and V. L. Kellog in *Evolution and Animal Life*.

breathing water could first fit the fish to its "environment" in the water, and then the same "environment would and fit" the fish into a man living out of the water and breathing air instead of water? While the fish is in the water, it is undoubtedly "fitted to its environment," even "as the loaf is fitted to the pan." But the unsolved mystery is how the suitable "environment" of living in the water could so change the offspring of the fish, as to fit it to live on the land, and finally, into man? In this case unquestionably the environment of water would fit the fish to an entirely different "environment," the difference being that of living in and breathing water, to living on the land and breathing air. There are still countless thousands of fish, and many different species, still living in and breathing water, and hundreds of thousands of species of animals, and man, living on the land and breathing air. Yet if the theory of evolution be true, the environment of water so operated as to produce thousands of different species of fish still in the water, and the environment of water fitted every living species now on the land to live out of water. For they teach that all that now lives in water as well as on the land came from fish in the water. Would it not require superhuman skill as a logician to explain this contradiction? Evolutionists affirm that fish are the ancestral parents, not only of all fish, but also of all living things on the earth. Yet "environment" that is said to "fit and would each form of life to its surroundings, as the loaf is fitted to the pan," "fitted" all fish to remain in water, and "fitted" hundreds of thousands of living creatures including man, to live on the land. Land creatures could not live on land till they were "fitted" to land environment. And evolutionists affirm that the environment is the influence that does the fitting. And they also say that the animal cannot live except in environment to which it is fitted. That being true—and it is true—the animal must first be fitted to the environment before it can live therein. How can "environment fit" an animal to live in the environment, as evolutionists teach, when, as they also teach, it cannot live in an environment till it is fitted for the environment. The animal cannot live in an "environment till it is fitted, even as the loaf is fitted to the pan," yet it is the environment that does the fitting.

And this is one of the foundation stones on which the theory of evolution rests.

It is affirmed that Natural Selection "fitted" the quail, grouse and other birds in color to resemble the color of their "environment" and thus conceal them from the piercing vision of the hawk that preys upon them, And the same Natural Selection evolves in the hawk almost incredible eyesight, claws to seize and hold the grouse, an appetite for flesh, and a beak to tear it from the bones. The ancestors of both the hawk and the grouse were the same fish, then the same reptile, and later the same birds. The ancestors of both lived and produced offspring under exactly the same "environment, chiefly of food and climate," that it is affirmed "fitted and moulded" each species to its "environment as the loaf is fitted to the pan." Yet the same "environment" evolved an appetite in the grouse to eat vegetation and would its color to hide it from the hawk. Exactly the same "environment" evolved in the hawk an appetite to eat the grouse, a piercing vision to see the grouse in spite of its disguise of color that "environment" fitted it with, claws to seize and beak to tear its flesh from the bones.

Repeating again the quotation from Jordan and Kellog, page 216 of the above named work: "As the loaf is fitted to the pan, or the river to its bed, so is each species fitted to its surroundings. If it were not so fitted, it would not live." Nothing of course is more true than this well known fact. And this being true, on what basis of reason can it be assumed that the environment or surroundings of living water fitted thousands of insects, birds, cattle, elephants and man to live on land and breathe air? According to Jordan and Kellog these could not live on land in the air till they were fitted for such surroundings. Yet they say it is the environment that fits them to live in their environment. Fish could not live in water till fitted for such environment, and still they say it must be environment of water that fits them to live in water. Man could not live in the environment of land and air till fitted for such environment. Yet it is the environment of air that must fit man to live in his surroundings, "even as the loaf is fitted to the pan." Of course, creatures that live in the water were "fitted" for their surroundings. But

where is there any evidence that the environment of water did the fitting? They must first be fitted to live in water before they could live in water. And so it is also true of man and all land creatures. The fitting must be done, not in the water, but before life can exist in the water. The fitting to live on land in the air must be done before land creatures and man could live on land. What other conclusion can be reached than that the first ancestors of creatures living in water were fitted for the environment of water at the beginning, and have transmitted to their offspring the same fitness down to the present. And that the first ancestors of man and land animals were fitted for the environment of land and air, and have transmitted the same fitness to their offspring down till the present?

CHAPTER VI

Heredity

STARTING by assuming the existence of a single cell life form, evolutionists affirm three theoretical processes by which they claim man was evolved. Variation is supposed to produce, in some unknown way, an improvement. Natural selection then steps in and preserves these improved individuals alive to reproduce offspring, while tending to destroy the ones less favored. Now heredity comes forward and passes these improvements on to succeeding generations. And thus the threefold process is supposed to be repeated in perhaps millions of generations till man is completed.

Heredity, or the law that plants and animals shall bring forth after their kind, is a fundamental of creationists. This universally known law of nature, that like shall produce after its kind, is a perpetual and irrefutable proof of the credibility of the history in Genesis. So far as the knowledge of man extends the command, "Let them bring forth after their kind," has never been violated.

Evolutionists have a different theory of heredity; a theory that attributes to heredity that which has never been known to occur. And it forms the key in their arch; the middle link in their chain. Remove this keystone—their theory of heredity—and their whole theoretical superstructure comes toppling to the ground, a jumbled mass of separate stones. For if their theory of heredity is untrue, then man was not evolved from reptiles and apes. They must have a bridge of three spans over which to get man across each of the twenty or more chasms separating between each of the families or orders of animals from the lowest up to man. Twenty or more chasms; a bridge of three spans is

needed over each one. No one affirms that fewer than three spans will reach across any of the twenty chasms. The spans are called Variation, Natural Selection and Heredity. And all three spans are the purest imagination. No one has ever hinted that any known variation has been sufficient to produce a new species, or any natural selection of sufficient importance to materially aid in originating a new species, or that any instance of heredity ever transmitted anything materially different from the parent itself. Can the child receive from the parent through heredity that which the parent does not possess? Can the parent transmit by heredity to the child that which it does not itself possess? This is one of the vital questions on which the whole theory of evolution hangs. For it is self-evident that if the reptile is the ancestral parent of man, then the reptile most assuredly transmitted much to its offspring that it did not possess, unless, however, man was latent in the reptile, a conclusion that no one has seemed willing to assume.

On the subject of Heredity, H. H. Newman, Professor of Zoology in the University of Chicago, and the author of a number of widely-used text books, says: "One of the truisms of biology is the familiar fact that like produces like. How surprised one would be if sparrows had anything else but sparrows for offspring, or if two Caucasian parents should have a Negro child." (*Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics*, p. 8.) Yes, the "familiar fact that like produces like" is well known. But like has never been known to produce the unlike. There is perfect agreement between evolutionists and creationists in regard to this fixed law of heredity. It is only when the directly reverse effects that evolutionists affirm in regard to heredity that disagreement arises. One would indeed be "surprised if Caucasian parents had a Negro child." It would be contrary to all reason and to all known facts of heredity. And that is just why creationists cannot believe that a beautiful woman, with intelligence and a soul, is the child of two reptiles. For if evolution be true, then the beautiful, intelligent woman is as certainly the child of insects, fish, reptiles and beasts of the jungle, not as the Negro child, but as the white child is the child of white parents. Evolutionists list all these and many other loathsome beasts as

man's ancestral parents. The number of different kinds of such beasts is limited only by the sixty or more millions of years of generations that it is assumed were required to evolve man. The fact that man, according to their theory, is millions of years removed from these loathsome beasts makes them no less his blood-parents. Their pedigree of man makes the blood-stream unbroken.

After stating the foregoing well known and universally accepted law of heredity, Newman glides over and assumes the very opposite as the effect of heredity. To quote further: "Now, a careful survey of the situation reveals the fact that the only assumption that the evolutionist makes is no more nor less than a logical extension of what the layman considers a truism or a self-evident fact, namely, that the fundamental structural resemblance signifies generic relationship; that, generally speaking, the degree of structural resemblance runs essentially parallel with closeness of kinship." Newman assumes the great vital point in the whole controversy, namely, that all animal species, including man, have descended from a common parentage. If it were first proved that man and animals have come from the same ancestral parents, then it would be reasonable to conclude that "structural resemblance" would indicate "closeness of kinship." But the very basis for such a conclusion has not been proved, namely, that both beasts and man have descended from the same original parents. That is the point at issue. Till the basic idea of one common parentage is proved, the "structural resemblance" is but a second assumption by which he tries to prove the major proposition. Given such liberty almost any proposition can be established.

But suppose that it should be admitted that "structural resemblance" "signifies closeness of kinship." Would that prove that jelly fish and reptiles were ancestral parents of a beautiful woman? This is the logical conclusion of his reasoning. He starts out by calling attention to the universally known law of heredity, that "like produces like," and illustrates it by saying, "how surprised one would be if sparrows had anything but sparrows for offspring, or if two Caucasian parents should have a Negro child." All know that this is the unchangeable law of

heredity. But what is the conclusion reached by evolutionists from these premises? Their conclusion is that heredity has produced man from worms, fish, reptiles and apes. Then why should one be surprised if sparrows should have as offspring other kinds of birds, and two Caucasian parents should have a Negro child? If reptiles could have for offspring birds, and both Caucasian and Negro children could evolve from reptiles and birds, as evolutionists affirm, then why be surprised if much less departures from the fixed laws of heredity should occur? All these and many more animals of the lowest order evolutions list in man's pedigree. The two living the farthest apart are the single cell life form and man. Evolutionists affirm that man has inherited all that he is from the lowest order of animal life. Yet they exclaim, "how surprised one would be if sparrows should have anything but sparrows for offspring," while no surprise is felt when it is affirmed that fish and reptiles have had man as their offspring. These are all man's ancestral parents, evolutionists themselves being witness. If evolutionists wish to argue "kinship proved by a resemblance," then creationists are ready to risk the whole controversy on this point. But the comparison should be on the whole man and animal; on that which dwells in the body as well as the body. Where in all the world is there any animal whose body bears more than a slight resemblance to the wonderful body of man? Some slight resemblance to be sure in some of the ape family. But even here an unbridged gulf intervenes.

But it is not so much the one hundred sixty-five pounds of earth, water and gasses that make up man's body, but it is the soul that dwells in man's body that removes man from the possibility of any kinship with any animal on the earth. When it can be shown that any animal on the earth has a moral mind, a conscience, a soul and worships a deity, then the battle will have been won in favor of evolution. The soul separates man by an impassable gulf from all other creatures on the earth.

But creationists deny that the facts show the least evidence of a "kinship," even in body, between man and any beast. How much are a serpent and man alike? Well, the serpent has a backbone, and so has man. Both have eyes but very unlike.

Man has feet, legs, hands, hair; the serpent does not. Not much proof of kinship "by close resemblance." If heredity transmits likeness, as evolutionists correctly admit, how did "heredity" make man's body from the reptile? So it is clearly seen that Newman, together with all other evolutionists, assumes that heredity transmits not likeness, but the reverse of likeness, exactly the opposite in form. The facts are not changed in the least even though millions of years of generations intervene. Man's body is not only unlike the fish and reptile and beast of the jungle, but in most respects the very reverse. In order to evolve this opposite form of body, the direct reverse would have to be produced.

How does Newman try to prove the theory of reverse effects of heredity? He makes not the least effort to prove it, either by logical reasoning or by example. The evidence that heredity "brings forth after its kind" is so abundant that he says: "One of the truisms of biology is the familiar fact that like produces like." Indeed this is the universally observed law of heredity. How, then, can heredity be summoned to prove that like produces the unlike to the extent that the reptile finally produces man? Listen to Mr. Newman while he tells you: "If we cannot rely upon this assumption, which may be called the principle of homology, we can make no sure progress in any attempt to establish the principles of evolution." (p. 83, *Evolution, Genetics, and Eugenics*) "The principles of heredity, and its necessary implications, is the only assumption that is necessary for the evolutionist to make, in order to go ahead on a sound basis with a presentation of evidences of evolution. Give him this one point and he asks no further concessions." (*Ibid.*, p. 85) Here it is stated in the clearest possible language, that unless granted one "assumption" and "its necessary implications," "we can make no sure progress in any attempt to establish the principles of evolution." One "assumption" and some "necessary implications" form the vital basis of evolution—at least so declares Newman. Given one "assumption," and "its necessary implications," and any imaginary proposition can be proved. For example, we "assume" that all nature is in a state of deterioration. We "imply" that some man, sometime, somewhere lost his legs

and arms and began to crawl on the ground. We "assume" that this change was transmitted to offspring till the serpent was evolved from man. And why not? Evolutionists teach that the process works backward as well as forward. Start evolution backward, and they say it works backward, and the serpent is evolved from man. This is not treating the subject lightly but in all seriousness.

But Mr. Newman is not careful in his statements when he says, "this is the only assumption" that it is necessary to make in order to establish the theory of evolution. The first "assumption" that evolutionists must make is that natural law quickened dead matter into life—that the totally dead from its own dead substance created life. The origin of the first life on the earth is the first "assumption." If this first assumption could be proved, all else would be minor difficulties. Evolutionists themselves being witness, there is not a single known fact that can be cited as proof that natural law has ever quickened dead matter into life; that from the dead, unaided by Supernatural intervention, has come the living.

But even granting the "assumption" of the original life to start with, it still demands "assumptions" and "implication" in order to cross a score of chasms between that first life and man. The only bridges that span about a score of chasms separating the families or orders of life, affirmed as the ancestors of man, are figments of the most fertile imagination. It must be "assumed" that the single cell life form varied enough to form a newer and higher species; a fact that it is admitted has never been known to have occurred. It must be "implied" that natural selection preserved improved species alive to produce offspring. Then it must be "assumed" that heredity passed these improvements on to offspring. These three "assumptions" with the "necessary implications" are the materials out of which they construct their twenty or more bridges across the chasms existing between the different families of animals that they say are man's ancestral parents. For evolutionists admit that they do not know of a single instance where natural law has ever produced enough change to originate a single new species. The

chasm between no two species has ever been known to have been crossed.

What sort of a "sound basis" is a mere "assumption" on which to build so momentous a superstructure? If the "assumption" and its "necessary implications" ran parallel with known facts of heredity, possibly it could be accepted as the "basis" of some theory, provided that it did no harm to faiths, hopes and morals of life. But when, as in this case, the assumption contradicts every known fact of the law of heredity, destroys beliefs, blasts hopes and poisons the fountain of joys, then creationists demand, not mere "assumption," but clear evidence that the unchangeable law of heredity has ever made the reptile into man.

"Give him this one point," pleads Mr. Newman, "and he asks no further concessions." No, creationists will neither give evolutionists this one point, nor grant to them one concession. They must prove every point by fact, reason or logic. Wherever facts and reason lead, creationists will follow. But not one step will they take on the "new and untried paths of exploration" proposed by Osborn. Nor will creationists lay one brick on the foundation of mere "assumption." Creationists serve due notice that the mighty battle is on. Evolutionists are the invaders. For nearly two thousand years creationists have rested in the full and unwavering belief that God created man in his own likeness; that Jesus died and rose again to make it possible that man might have a future and a better life. They have relied upon the assurance that the Bible, in which these hopes are recorded, was inspired from Heaven and worthy of all confidence. The denial of man's supernatural creation, and the affirmation of his animal ancestry, robs man of his strongest hope. They deny the record that forms their basis. Yet they would have creationists tax themselves, build schools, employ them as teachers and entrust their sons and daughters to their guidance. They have ridiculed in the presence of these sons and daughters the faith of their parents whose money has fed, sheltered and clothed them. And when a protest has been made, they have cried out that their liberties were being restricted. And still with unblushing face and atrophied conscience, they have persisted in undermining the faith of youth, which faith was and is

the foundation of all morals and the wellspring of all good. Evolutionists, you have thrown down the gauntlet; you have unsheathed the sword. You have attacked the faith of countless numbers; the faith for which fifty million martyrs willingly gave up their lives rather than renounce it. Creationists gladly accept the gage of battle. They warn you here and now that there will neither be sent nor received any flag of truce. An armistice is impossible. The two ideas, creation or evolution—is man the direct offspring of God? or is he the product of natural law, with animal ancestry?—are as inharmonious as light and darkness. Peace can only come when but one remains on the field. With the shield of faith, girded about with the truth of the Word Of God, evading no fact and granting neither "assumption" nor concession, they welcome the test to arms. The truth that has withstood every assault throughout the ages is impregnable. With full confidence they anticipate victory.

CHAPTER VII

Unbridged Chasms

BEGINNING with the lowest form of life, evolutionists list about twenty different families or orders of life up to man. The gaps between these are greater than that separating species. It is plain these gaps had to be crossed. From one order must come a higher order till man is reached. Each of these chasms must be bridged, or man could not have crossed to a higher order.

The first chasm is between dead matter and life; between the living and the non-living. Only two bridges have been proposed, natural law and miracle. The origin of life must be accounted for. Knowing that natural law does not now quicken dead matter into life, creationists conclude that life came on the earth by a super-natural process — by miracle — that God "breathed the breath of life into man and he became a living soul." Their belief is based on, first, the total lack of any evidence that natural law ever could have produced life; second, this view harmonizes with every discovered fact relating to life.

Evolutionists reject a creative miracle. That leaves them to choose one of but two possible remaining, positions, namely, by chance or by natural law. Chance would eliminate all law and order. Introduce chance, and nothing is predictable. All would be utter confusion. The number who even hint at chance is so small that it need not be further considered.

Of all the twenty or more unbridged chasms that are still troubling evolutionists, the one separating life from dead matter in the beginning, remains the most difficult. Within the knowledge of man it has never been crossed. All life now on the earth came from life. Each living organism divides its own life

essence, which is able to seize material elements and build for itself a house—the plant and body of the animal. This chasm remains without a bridge.

Osborn says: "The mode of the origin of life is the purest speculation—for all the experiments of Butschli and others to imitate the original life processes have proved fruitless" (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, p. 67). Rollin T. Chamberlain says: "But how did life start on the globe? That is a difficult question which cannot be adequately answered" (*The Nature of the World and of Man*, p. 52). H. H. Newman says: "In all frankness it must be admitted that the problem of the origin of life has not yet been solved" (*Ibid.*, p. 191). From Darwin down, all agree that the chasm between life and dead matter is unbridged. There is not a single exception. Till this first chasm between life and dead matter is bridged, evolutionists cannot even make a start. Life on the earth did not exist till this chasm was crossed. If natural law formed the bridge over which the first life passed to unite with dead matter, then what has become of that bridge that life is no longer crossing it to still quicken dead matter? Was there in the beginning some natural law that has been suspended or ceased to operate? In some way life had to cross over that chasm and unite with dead matter, else there would be no life on the earth. And if the same elements were present and the same processes in operation as at the beginning, life would still be crossing. Has some natural law ceased to operate? Or was the supply of life in the original source of life exhausted when the first life came across? And what was the original source of life? Creationists believe that God was the original source of life, and that it came on the earth by a supernatural process. To admit the least supernatural intervention is to yield the whole theory of evolution. Rejecting the idea of a miracle, evolutionists are unavoidably compelled to affirm that natural law, by its own inherent power, produced life. Either natural law created life in dead matter, or God breathed life into dead matter.

Evolutionists are by no means agreed on man's pedigree. They vary in the number of families or orders of animals through which he is supposed to have descended. Which order

of the great extinct reptiles was man's direct ancestral parent, is still in doubt. It will be recalled that, starting from the lowest order of life, they affirm that life branched out, like the limbs of a tree, till there are now more than six hundred thousand different species. Hence it is no wonder that they have great difficulty among themselves in agreeing just which order or family of animals through which to trace man back to the root—the first life. One of the important orders on which they agree is the reptiles. Five orders or families are living; thirteen extinct. Man's parental ancestors must be found among the thirteen orders that are now extinct. Among the extinct, among which man's ancestors must be found, are listed *Diplodocus*, supposed to have attained a length of more than eighty feet, and a weight of more than fifty tons, and giant lizards and turtles of great size, and many other similar monsters known only by fossils. (See *Origin and Evolution of Life*, pp. 186, 193; *Nature of the World and of Man*, pp. 305, 312-25). It would be highly interesting should some leading evolutionist try to designate which of the thirteen extinct orders of reptiles, and which species in that order is man's direct parent. Would this parent be found among the giant lizards, the *Diplodocus*, eighty feet long and weighing fifty tons, or perhaps would man's parent be found among some one of the great flying reptiles? Certain it is, if man came by evolution he came in a direct line through some one of the great extinct species of reptiles. But is man's specific parent among the reptiles of much importance? So long as he must write some reptile in his pedigree, perhaps it is not of much importance which one.

From the lower order of life up to man, Romer lists eleven families or orders, representing greater differences than between species. He seems to leave out quite a number of the lowest orders of life from his pedigree. In his list there are eleven great gaps separating eleven very different orders of life and no single species among the living nor a single fossil among the dead to connect any two of the orders. The total lack of any intermediate form to connect any two orders is frankly admitted by the leading evolutionists. Here is what H. H. Newman says: "None of the animals or plants of the past (geological

period of extinct life) are identical with those of the present. The nearest relationship is between a few species of the past and some living species which have been placed in the same families." (p. 162, *Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics*.) "The animals and plants of each stratum are at least generically different from those of any other stratum, though belonging in the same families or orders." (*Ibid.*, p. 163.)

Here are unmodified statements by Newman that are revolutionary. This is a clear, unmistakable admission that between all orders or families of life of the past, and between the past and those now living, the gaps are unbridged. Among all the fossils of extinct life there has not been found one to link the different orders or families within each stratum, nor to link the past with those that now live on the earth. The strongest that Newman will risk is to say a "resemblance is found between some of those of the past and the present." Yet admitting the total lack of any evidence, it is still affirmed that these have all been crossed.

How were these gaps supposed to have been crossed? By single leaps, that is, from fish to amphibians and from amphibians to reptiles? In other words, did fish give birth to amphibians and amphibians to reptiles, and so on up to man? None are so bold as to affirm that these great gaps were crossed in single leaps. If it were so affirmed, it would be asked, Where is the evidence? And why after the great leap wait four or more millions of years before taking another leap in forming a higher order of life? Perhaps no leading evolutionist affirms that any of the eleven or more great gaps were crossed in a single leap, that is, a single generation. It is affirmed that each generation "varied" toward a higher form of life; that natural selection preserved these improved forms alive to produce offspring, and that heredity passed these improvements on to the next generation. That would divide the difference between fish and amphibians into four or more million small gaps. The estimate is that it required that long, or longer, between the different orders of life. That would make eight million or more years of generations between fish and reptiles. Divide the difference between fish and reptiles into eight million parts and

the difference would not be great enough to discern between any two generations.

Now the puzzle is this: We have fossil fish and we have living fish. We have fossil amphibians—frogs, turtles, etc.—and we have living amphibians. We have fossil reptiles and we have living reptiles. But what became of the four million or more years of generations that are supposed to have lived and produced offspring in each of these great gaps between fish and amphibians, and between amphibians and reptiles, that they left neither living progeny nor fossils? Every one of the mentioned orders or families of animals supposed to be man's ancestral parents left fossils. But the estimated forty or more million of years of generations supposed to have lived to fill these gaps failed to leave either fossils or living offspring. If evolution be true, only one of two conclusions is possible. First, each of these great gaps were crossed in single leaps. No one has yet affirmed that this was done. Second, millions of years of generations lived, produced offspring, became extinct without leaving either offspring like the parents, or fossils. Each of the eleven orders or families are represented by fossils back to the lowest form of life. Strange is it not that just a few of the many millions that would have had to live to fill these gaps did not leave some fossils. Who will arise and attempt to explain why the orders or families associated in these eleven gaps all left fossils, and some left living offspring, while not one of the perhaps forty million of years of generations that were needed to fill these gaps left either fossils nor offspring. He who can give a plausible explanation of how this marvelous thing could have occurred will render a service to the cause of evolution that will place its advocates under lasting obligations. But whatever explanation may be attempted, it is certain that the chasms separating all orders and species, in both the living and the extinct, remain bridgeless. There is not a living being nor a fossil over which to cross. The admitted fact that there are complete breaks between all geological periods, and also between the extinct and the living, is in itself a clear demonstration that there is no connecting link between man and any form of animal. The bridges are hopelessly missing, evolutionists themselves testifying.

Suppose a tiny seed were planted, from which grows a young tree that begins to form branches till there appear 636,000 twig-endings, each twig crowned with a bud, no two alike, and not much resemblance between any of them. But there is not the least sign of the forming of a single new bud, to form just one more twig. This clearly and fairly illustrates the theory of evolution. The one cell life form assumed to begin with is the seed. The branches represent the orders or families of animals that are supposed to have branched out from the main stem. The 636,000 twigs ending in buds, all different, represent the number of different species, all as different from each other as man is from the single cell life form, the giant whale, the massive elephant and the poisonous serpent. And not the least sign of starting just one new bud, or species. Is it possible that after all these millions of years the natural laws that during millions of years produced 636,000 different species have forever ceased to operate? After so wonderfully crossing so many broad chasms, is it possible that all upward progress has ended and no new species is ever to appear? Must we conclude that the obstacle just now before life is too great? Or has life spent its force?

Here the case might well be rested. Yet some of the difficulties in the way of bridge building across these great gaps will be cited. How did the fish change from breathing water through its gills, to breathing air through its lungs when it became a reptile? And the reptile must become a bird; must lose its scaly skin and get feathers and wings. And what were the four millions or more years of generations like that came between reptiles and birds? Which family of reptiles produced birds, and which produced man?

Evolutionists express surprise that some think they teach that man is a distant child of some of the living monkey family. Are not the living monkeys as honorable as the extinct monkeys? They do teach that man is a distant child of some ape-like form, that came from the same family that the living monkeys came from. Not only so, but that man is a distant child of fish and reptiles. They do teach that monkeys, apes, reptiles, man and every other living creature, good or bad, came

from the same ancestral parents. Hence man is a blood relative of them all. And as shocking as it may be to the sensibilities, if evolution be true, every time one sits down to a meal of animal flesh, he dines on his own blood relative—a distant cousin—for all came from the same parents.

Osborn says that man's immediate ancestor was some "unknown ape-like form somewhere in the Tertiary." Here is an affirmation, the like of which, would be hard to find. If this ape-like form is "unknown" how does Osborn know that it was "some ape-like form?" If it is "unknown" how does he know that it was in the "Tertiary"? And how does he know that it was man's ancestor? He affirms that there was an animal "somewhere in the Tertiary," "that it was ape-like in form," and that it was man's immediate ancestor, and yet it is "unknown." And that this supposed ancestor of man is "unknown" is proved by the fact that it has not left a trace of its existence in any geological strata. Why, then, affirm that such an animal ever existed, and describe it as being "ape-like in form" when it is wholly "unknown"? Their theory demands such an animal. And the "ape-like form" was invented as a pure figment of the imagination. Not a trace of such an animal exists among the living or the extinct.

The whole theory of evolution deals only with man's body, the flimsy garment that the indwelling life has woven for itself. Why spend years theorizing about where a lady purchased her dress and hat, and utterly ignore the woman who wears these garments for a short time, soon to cast them away? Why, then, should the great scientists spend their lifetime theorizing as to where one hundred and sixty-five pounds of water, a few solids and gasses came from, and utterly ignore the man—the intelligence and soul—that dwells only for a short time in this house of material substances, but soon to cast it off? Indeed the house of Hutt is of less importance to the soul than would be a robe of sackcloth to the fastidious lady. Why should not the great scientists, just for a short time, try to formulate a reasonable theory as to how man's soul came out of the earth, water and air? That is the source of the origin of the garment that his soul wears, and will be the place of its ultimate repose.

It is the soul that lifts and exalts man as far above the plane of the animal body and animal life, as the heavens are above the earth. Our present inquiry is to learn the origin of the soul. Man's moral mind, conscience and a desire to worship a Supreme Being, are realities. They were derived from some source. They are either a product of the mixing and blending of some material substances by natural law, or they were first "breathed" into man by a Creator. There remains no other possible conclusion. Neither evolutionists nor creationists can prove their position by actual demonstration. The position accepted must be by faith, based on facts or theories as evidence. Creationists believe that every fact and sound theory unite in proving a miraculous creation.

CHAPTER VIII

Contradictory Theories

THE majority of people think evolutionists are in general agreement, at least on all vital theories. There is general agreement on but one point, namely, that man was evolved from the lower animals and not created. On every other vital point they are at war. On a number of vital points they are in hopeless disagreement. Opposing positions are held by different groups and individuals that are so directly contradictory that it is impossible to harmonize them. A very interesting volume, and as large as desired, could be made by quoting one theory of the causes of evolution advanced by one group, then introducing others of equal rank who deny these theories. Each one is intensely zealous of his own theory, or of that of the school to which he is joined, and is ready to attack with force the theories of all other groups. When an evolutionist gets through with some theory of the causes of evolution advanced by an opposing group, there is not much left. He must refute the opposing theory before he can have his own accepted.

The first irreconcilable difference among evolutionists of different schools is expressed by H. H. Newman thus: "Mechanistic versus Vitalistic views—There are two opposed biological philosophies: one known as the vitalistic view, or vitalism, the other as the mechanistic view. The vitalist is more or less a mystic, in that he believes that life involves some all-controlling, unknowable, mystic, hyper-mechanical force.—This conception is tantamount to a denial that the laws of energy and of matter are sufficient to account for biological phenomena. Such a view is exactly opposite to those which have led to all the scientific progress that has been made."

Newman says further: "The mechanistic point of view is one that assumes as a working hypothesis that life is an expression of the transformation of energy and of matter in a large group of materials, differing in detail, but alike in certain fundamental respects." (*Nature of the World and of Man*, p. 164) "A common parallel to metabolism is the candle flame." (*Ibid.*, p. 173). Stripped of technical language the two theories are about as follows: Vitalism means that life is more than an "expression" resulting from mechanical and chemical effects resulting from the mixing of material elements; that life is an actuality; an entity; a personality, in addition to; superior to, and above material elements or any effects resulting from the mixing and blending of such elements. The vitalistic view holds that life takes hold of material elements, masters them and works through material substances to attain its objectives. It holds that life in man is an intelligent, thinking, reasoning, willing, active personality that will survive the body.

Mechanism teaches that life is only an "expression of the transformation of energy and of matter." To illustrate what he means by mechanism, Newman refers to the candle flame. The combustion, or the "transformation of energy and of matter" at top of the wick produces the flame. In like manner the — transformation of energy and of matter" that are present in man's body, by some mechanical, chemical process, produces life. Totally dead material elements, properly mixed and blended, from which arises a "transformation of energy and of matter," result in "an expression" of a phenomenon called life, that thinks, feels joy, sorrow, comfort, pain, and also plans, wills, executes, controls and fashions material elements into unnumbered mechanical devices. Thus the creature, life, turns and masters its creator, namely, material elements, the source from which mechanistic evolutionists affirm life arises, as the flame from the wick. Mechanism is the purest materialism. It denies that man has a soul or spirit that will survive the body, and that is tantamount to denying the existence of God, who is the purest Spirit. Yet there are some who affirm they can see no contradiction between the teaching of evolution and Christianity. The whole sum of Christianity is the belief that man

has a personality in his body, that will survive the body and enjoy a future life. Evolution and Christianity cannot be reconciled.

A second point of controversy between the two leading schools of evolutionists is the two theories of Darwinism and Lamarckism. Osborn states it as follows: "All the explanations of evolution which have been offered by three generations of naturalists align themselves under two main ideas only. The first is the idea that causes of evolution are chiefly from without, namely, beginning in the environment of the body and extending into the germ: this idea is centripetal. The second is just the reverse: it is centrifugal, namely, that the causes begin in the germ and extend outward into the body and into the environment." (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, preface XIII.) These theories contradict each other. Both cannot be true. And both may be wrong, as contended by creationists. And in this contention creationists are not alone. Osborn himself rejects both theories. But the majority of evolutionists are in one or the other of these two schools. Osborn repudiates both of these theories and proposes an entirely new theory of his own that he calls the "Energy Concept." But he says his new theory gives only "a new starting-point for new and untried paths of exploration which may be followed during the present century." (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, preface XVII.) How much of a following he will rally to his banner remains to be seen. But he has started a third school and will very likely draw many from the two old schools, and thus make the battle among evolutionists more intensely interesting.

The two old schools, the Darwinians and the Lamarckians, have now been in battle-array for three generations with no sign of victory or truce. "After one hundred and fifty years of observation, experiment and reasoning," says Osborn, "the very general feeling among evolutionists is that our search for causes has only begun." (*Ibid.*, preface X.) It is not strange that he felt the great need of some new theory, and so formulated his "Energy Concept," which is just another way of stating the mechanistic view, for both are the purest materialism. But before proposing his own theory he must needs clear away all the

old disappointing theories in order to make way for his own theory. He says: "This essential idea of Lamarckism was refined and extended by Herbert Spencer, by Darwin himself, by Cope and many others. But it has thus far failed of the crucial test of observation and experiment, and has far fewer followers today than it had forty years ago." (*Ibid.*, preface XIV.) "Again, despite the powerful advocacy of pure Darwinism by Weismann and de Vries, in the new turn that has been given to our search for causes by the rediscovery of the law of Mendel and the heredity doctrines that group under Mendelism, it may be said that Darwin's law of selection of a natural explanation of the origin of all fitness in form and function has also lost its prestige at the present time, and about all of Darwinism which now meets with universal acceptance is the survival of the fittest, a limited application of Darwin's great idea as expressed by Herbert Spencer. But as Cope points out, the survival of fitness and the origin of fitness are two very different phenomena." (*Ibid.*, preface XIV.)

"Between the appearance of the *Origin of the Species*, in 1859, and the present time there have been great waves of faith in one explanation and then in another; each of these waves of confidence has ended in disappointment, until finally we have reached a stage of very general skepticism. Thus the period of observation, experiment and reasoning which began with the French philosopher, Buffon, one hundred and fifty years ago, ends in 1916, with the general feeling that our search for causes, far from complete, has only begun." "This confession of failure is a part of the essential honesty of scientific thought." "Chance is the very essence of the original Darwinian selection hypothesis of evolution. William James and many other eminent philosophers have adopted the 'chance' view as if it had been actually demonstrated."

Osborn continues: "I have long maintained that this opinion is a biological dogma; it is one of the strings of hypotheses upon which Darwin hung his theory of the origin of adaptations and species, a hypothesis that has gained credence through constant reiteration, for I do not know that it has ever been

demonstrated through the actual observation of any evolutionary series." (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, p. 8.)

These are surprising statements to be made by an evolutionist of Osborn's rank. He emphatically declares that the very foundation of Darwin's theory has "gained credence by constant reiteration." And that it has never been "demonstrated through the actual observation of any evolutionary series." And it is just as true that the whole theory, and every phase of evolution has "gained credence through constant reiteration." For there is not one vital point in the whole theory, concerning which evolutionists affirm that it has "been demonstrated through the actual observance of any evolutionary series." The hypothesis that life was begotten by natural law, conceived and brought forth from the womb of dead matter, is without a shadow of proof "through the actual observance of any evolutionary series." This fact is frankly admitted by all evolutionists. It has "gained credence by constant reiteration." Evolutionists themselves declare that "the mode of the original of life is pure speculation." Nor has the evolution of a single cell into a higher order of life; of fish becoming amphibians, and amphibians becoming reptiles, and so on till some ape-like form became man—none of these has ever "been demonstrated through the actual observation of any evolutionary series." Every one of these changes is vital to the theory, and unless established, the whole theory crumbles to dust. And when tried by the test proposed by Osborn, every one of them fails of proof. The Darwinian theory that Osborn so strongly rejects must be accepted or rejected along with the whole theory and with every phase of the theory. The whole theory from beginning to end rests on the same character of assumption. Osborn truly says it "has gained credence through constant reiteration," for not one point "has ever been demonstrated through the actual observance of any evolutionary series," which surely is no more than a fair test by which to determine its truth or falsity. Not one phase of the whole theory has ever been demonstrated when measured by the test proposed by evolutionists themselves.

The confessed failure to discover the "causes" of evolution cannot be due to the lack of intelligent search. Many of the greatest minds of the entire one hundred and fifty years have been intensely engaged in the search. Surely the failure must be due to the barrenness of evidence of any causes at all of evolution rather than to the lack of intelligent search. If evolution were a fact, why are its "causes" so obscure? Is there another fact, the causes of which have so completely eluded the diligent search of so many great minds? Would it not be more reasonable for a while to try to establish the fact of evolution before wasting so much time in a fruitless search for its causes? Let evolutionists first prove that natural law produced the first life on the earth from dead matter. When this is done, then how the single cell life form evolved into man will be in order. Till they show at least a reasonable way by which life originated, without a creative miracle, all their talk about ((causes" as to how one species evolved into a higher order till man was made, is like trying to build a house before the first stone for a foundation is laid. Their first stone on which to build is the affirmation that natural law produced life from dead matter. That man was created by a supernatural process called a miracle, is the foundation on which creationists build. Evolutionists must start life and that without a miracle. Spontaneous generation is as certainly the foundation of evolutionists, as that a miracle is the foundation of creationists. If there ever was a natural law that produced life, it does not now operate. Therefore, such a law would be super-natural, that is, above, beyond, super to, any natural law now existing. And hence equivalent to a miracle. A miracle is no more than a force that is above, beyond, super to, any natural law now existing. Evolutionists are logically forced to show that some natural law now existing could have produced the first life, or to admit that which is equal to a miracle.

True science is not theory but classified knowledge. Yet the theory of evolution is piously named science. But the theory of its causes is as unstable as the restless waves of the sea. The faith that it inspires comes and goes as the tide. The light

that it sheds on the pathway of the weary and sin-sick soul is as dim and flickering as that of the firefly by night. The food that it serves to the hungry soul is as unpalatable and devoid of nourishment as the dead husks of unripe fruit. It inspires no abiding faith and points to no star of hope. Indeed it is faithless, joyless, hopeless, as cheerless as the Miasma of death, and its theories are as unsettled as the sands of the windswept desert.

CHAPTER IX

Group Evolution

THE primary meaning of the word evolution is the act of unfolding. There is no controversy about the use of the word evolution when used to define the many changes and variations that take place within the major groups of plants and animals. The difference is whether man was created as he now is, or was he evolved from animals. Creationists readily agree that there have occurred, and are still occurring considerable changes and modifications within the major groups of plants and animals and man. To these changes the word evolution may be properly applied. But creationists hold the idea that there is no evidence of linear evolution, that is, that man was evolved from fish, reptiles and apes. In other words, there is nothing back of man as he is today except man, creation and God. This is the vital point at issue.

In man there are the three great racial groups, the Caucasian, the Mongolian and the Negro. These vary greatly in color, size and habits. But their body-members are all the same, and their mental and moral attributes are alike. Of course the degree or strength of their intelligence, volition and moral minds vary greatly. But there is no fundamental difference either in body or mental attributes. It is easy to conclude that all the races sprang from the same parentage. And the word evolution is properly applied to the changes within these major groups.

In the great major group of animals that are commonly called cattle there are found considerable variations. There are the extreme types as represented by the Hereford, the Short horn, and the Polled and other varieties. Among the dairy types are the Holsteins, the jerseys and several other breeds.

Belonging in the same major group of animals are the bisons or buffaloes, and other varieties that need not be mentioned here. These vary greatly in size, color, type and utility. And it is well known that by crossing, selecting, rejecting and feeding, really great changes can be brought about in all the mentioned breeds. But that each individual in the group of animals called cattle, retains all its fundamental characteristics that separate it from all other major groups of animals. Not the least variation can be detected, tending to originate a new species. The same principle holds true in the bird family, or group. Very great modifications can be produced in regard to size, type, color, and utility for man's use. Some are useful for food; some for their beauty, and some in holding in check harmful insects, without which bird and man might perish from the earth.

The major group, among which are dogs and wolves, represents perhaps as wide a range in variation as that of any group of mammals. The range in dogs alone is from the tiny lapdog to the shepherd, bulldog and many intervening types and sizes. There is no good reason why the skillful, patient dog breeder could not, by selecting suitable individuals from the extreme types, and by crossing, preserving and rejecting, in course of time, produce a variety that would be midway between the extremes. But these would still be dogs, belonging to the canine family of animals. Not a variation would appear in the direction of forming a different order of animal, such as is affirmed to have been produced by evolution. There are fixed limits and unchangeable bounds outside of which no — individual in any of animal life, has ever been known to vary, There is not a link among the living or the extinct that joins any two species. The Creator has decreed: Hitherto shalt thou vary, and here shall thy evolution be stayed. The edict, "Let them bring forth after their kind," has held distinct species within their prescribed bounds so far as the knowledge of man extends. Of course the theory demands that it shall be assumed that the separating lines have been crossed. But it is frankly admitted that no link connecting any two distinct species has ever been found either among the living beings or among the fossils in the rocks. There

is entire agreement in the view that really great variations and modifications have occurred, and are still occurring. But in the absence of any link, among the living or the dead, connecting any two species, creationists deny that man has had any other parents than man.

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

"You will see from the first picture that there was a very great difference between the earliest (small) and the latest (large) horses, and you will also see that there is a very evident developmental line connecting the two. But this line is not continuous; it is broken by numerous gaps which detailed investigation has failed to fill." (Signed, Austin H. Clark.)

In the enclosure from Dr. Clark, which states his position more at length, he says:

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

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

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

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

(I So wide are the gaps between these various types of humbler creatures that these cannot be arranged in any sort of evolutionary line. But they do seem to fit well into a somewhat complicated diagram showing each to have affinities with several others, not merely with a single one."

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

The Fossil Record

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

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

"This long list of animal types represented by the fossils in the Cambrian and immediately succeeding rocks, can have only one meaning. It shows conclusively that as far back as Cambrian time in the state of the animal world, it was, in its broader

features, just what it is today. So we see that the fossil record, the actual history of animal life upon the earth, bears us out in the assumption that at its very first appearance animal life in its broader features was in essentially the same form as that in which we know it now.

Evolution Within Major Groups

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

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

"This continuous alteration in the elements within various groups is what is called evolution.

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

Creationists heartily agree with every conclusion reached by Dr. Clark, as set forth in the foregoing quotations. Creationists recognize the well known fact that really great changes and modifications have taken place, and are still taking place, within all the major groups of animals. And they do not in the least object to defining such variations by the word evolution. Some of such variations have already been noted in the first part of this chapter. The examples could be greatly multiplied, but

enough has been given. We now close this chapter by re-quoting a few sentences from Dr. Clark. "Thus so far as it concerns the major groups of animals, the creationists seem to have the better of the argument. There is not the slightest evidence that any of the major groups arose from any other. Each is a special animal complex related, more or less, to all the rest, but appearing as a special and distinct creation. Ever varying in the finer details of its manifestation, in its major features animal life has from the very first remained unchanged."

CHAPTER X

Missing Links

Of all the vital points of evolution the "Missing Links" has probably been the center of most interest. Could man be linked with an immediate animal ancestor, the theory would be rather firmly established. It is much easier to assume without proof that one species evolved into a higher order of life millions of years ago, than to assume without proof that man was evolved from an immediate animal ancestor. Measured by supposed geological time it was but yesterday when man is supposed to have been born of ape-like parents. And being so recent surely there should be evidence in plenty in the fossil record. There are large numbers of fossils of many orders of extinct animals that are supposed to have lived millions of years ago. If man had an animal ancestor, it must have been the most recent to appear, standing next to man himself, the last of all animal life to appear. Why should the last form of life to appear on the earth, except man, disappear leaving neither fossils nor offspring like itself among the living, while large numbers of lower orders of life, supposed to have lived millions of years ago, left plenty of fossils and offspring among the living? These questions are waiting solution.

The "missing link" so much sought is some brute creature to connect man with some ape-like form, his supposed immediate ancestor. But it is not just one "link" missing, but a score or more links entirely missing from their chain. In fact their "chain" is nothing more than a score of separate "links." Not even any two are connected. They list more than twenty orders or families of animals through which they suppose man has passed in his evolution from the single cell life form into man.

They are in as great need of "links" to connect the different orders of families all the way back to the reptile and below, as a "link" to connect man with some ape-like form. What a task to find all these "missing links" either among the living or the fossils! And what a skillful artist is needed to join them, and make a "chain" that will bear the light of reason!

But it is a "link" between man and some ape-like form that has caused so much worry. No one claims that any living creature will serve as that "missing link." The idea that man's immediate brute parent is among the living has long since been given up. The search is being made among the fossils of extinct animals. What kind of an animal was man's immediate parent? is the disturbing question. Over-zealous evolutionists have often rushed into print with the declaration that the long sought "link" had been found. A few nights of undisturbed rest. But soon the "links" were discounted. Again the unrest goes on.

In 1916, H. F. Osborn boldly declared: "We know for example ... that man has descended from some unknown ape-like form somewhere in the Tertiary." (*The Origin and Evolution of Life*, preface X.) He does not state it as a matter of theory or opinion, but that "we know," a matter of knowledge, that "man has descended from some ape-like form." One would think from Dr. Osborn's seeming certainty that the question had been settled, at least, in his own mind. But not so, even in the mind of Osborn himself. In 1927 he just as positively denies his former assertion as a matter of knowledge. Hear him as quoted by Dr. Gerrit S. Miller, in the volume presently to be named: "I am glad to be first to befriend the dawn man from the long pre-stone age and remove from his reputation the bar-sinister of his descent . . . The myth of ape ancestry lingers on the stage, in the movies, in certain scientific parlance, but the ape-ancestry hypothesis is entirely out of date and its place is taken by the recent demonstration that we are descended from 'dawn man,' and not from 'ape-man'." (*The Controversy Over Human Missing Links*, p. 419).

Who but Osborn has done so much to fasten on man's "reputation the bar-sinister of ape-descent" that he is now so anxious to be the first to remove? No longer ago than 1916 he

confidently affirmed that "we know that man has descended from some ape-like form." The writer in a preceding chapter dealt with Osborn's affirmation of man's ape-descent, but before it went to the printers at that time, he came out in an unqualified affirmation that what he then knew as a fact was now but a "myth," that he was anxious to banish. If an evolutionist of Osborn's standing can so quickly and completely reverse his affirmations on one of the most vital points in the whole theory, can cautious people be blamed for hesitating to accept every theory advanced, unsupported by any tangible evidence? just what may he be expected to say next year? How often will his books need to be revised and reversed in order to meet even his own approval?

What is the present status of opinion of the leading evolutionists of the world with reference to any fossil that might be regarded as a "missing link" connecting man with any other creature living or extinct? Dr. Gerrit S. Miller, Curator, Division of Mammals, United States National Museum, Washington, D. C., has brought together in one volume the opinions of the leading evolutionists of the world. Its title is *The Controversy Over Human Missing Links*. It was recently issued, and is a masterly assembly of facts, and opinions deduced from these facts. Perhaps no other man is better qualified, or whose position enables and permits him to give a more scholarly, painstaking and, above all, impartial condensation of the opinions of the leading evolutionists of the world, than Dr. Miller. It is a monumental work. Quotations will now be made at length from the just-named volume.

"Among recent subjects of animated scientific and popular controversy both in and out of print there is perhaps none that has aroused more widespread interest than the discussion of 'human missing links'." Is man a creature unconnected with the rest of animate nature? Or is he a direct descendant from ancestors which were not human? And in the latter event can we point to any links which actually connect him with nonhuman ancestral stock and which are fairly unanimously accepted by the genuine scientific world as undoubtedly such links? Around these questions as a center the controversy re-

volves, with no present indication that it is likely to come to rest . . .

"If a human 'missing link' is to be found at all, it must be sought among the fossil remains of mammals long ago extinct, since there is no living animal known which possesses the required peculiarities. Investigators know this, and they have long been diligently searching in rocks, caves, in gravel pits, and stream beds. As a result of 70 years of effort these tireless workers have made exactly two 'finds,' known, respectively, from the place where they were unearthed, as the 'Java' ape man or 'Trinil man' (*Pithecanthropus erectus*, Dubois), and the 'Piltdown dawn man' (*Eoanthropus dawsoni*, Smith Woodward). The former was discovered in 1891-92 near Trinil, central Java, the latter about 20 years afterward at Piltdown, Sussex, England."

Following this paragraph, Dr. Miller quotes opinions from a number of scientists of very high rank but who do not believe evolution. The opinion of these eminent authorities will be omitted here. It is desired that the reader shall have none but the opinions of the strongest evolutionists of the present day. It is the aim to give evolutionists every possible advantage in the controversy.

Quoting again from Dr. Miller:

"Coming to thorough-going evolutionists, we find many of them believe that human missing links have been demonstrably discovered. This opinion is set forth in no unflinching words by Sir Arthur Keith in his presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science given at Leeds, August 31, 1927. He says: 'We now know, that as Darwin sat in his study at Downs, there lay hidden at Piltdown in Sussex, not 30 miles distant from him, sealed up in a bed of gravel, a fossil human skull and jaw . . . the skull, although deeply mineralized and thick walled, might well have been the rude forerunner of a modern skull, but the lower jaw was so ape-like that some experts denied that it went with the human fossil skull at all, and supposed it to be the lower jaw of some extinct chimpanzee'."

Again, hear Dr. Miller's comments, followed by his quotation from eminent evolutionists:

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

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

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

"Out of this was put together the transition form Pithecanthropus (Hacket). And it was accepted by many as a proof of the theory that in the process of human development the upright gait was the primary factor and the high specialization of the brain was the secondary phenomenon. Literally the reasoning was as follows: 'The fact the femur appears relatively more man-like than the skull merely confirms the idea (auffassung), supported from several directions, that in the morphogenetic transition from apes to man, the adoption of the upright walking attitude led the way.'—(Zeitschr. für Ethnologie, 1905. p. 748). That was the idea about 15 years ago.

"Now: Eoanthropus dawsoni, likewise an assembled riverbed find, includes—A human brain case; some human teeth; an ape-like lower jaw.

"Thus an antithesis to Pithecanthropus. And at present Eoanthropus is taken as the support for another idea about the course of human evolution. The deduction at present is as follows.

'So far from being an impossible combination of characters, this association of the brain and simian features is precisely what I anticipated in my address—some months before I knew of the existence of the Piltdown skull, when I argued that in the evolution of man the development of the brain must have led the way. The growth in intelligence and in the powers of discrimination no doubt led to a definite cultivation of the aesthetic sense which, operating through sexual selection, brought about a gradual refinement of features.' (*Nature*, Vol. 92, October 2, 1913.)

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

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

"Who is right? Who stands on firm ground? Where are the definite proofs? As to our conduct toward the public I wish in closing to call attention to the memorable words of Professor Boule (*A Anthropologie*, 1915, p. 184). Concerning certain reconstructions of fossil men he says: 'Our duty is to protest.

For such attempts, however agreeable they may appear in certain respects, are of a nature to throw discredit on a science which is still having so much difficulty in getting official recognition and which does not deserve to be thus travestied."

The reader will bear in mind that these quotations are all from evolutionists of the highest rank. But however anxious men of this candor may be to find "missing links" simple honesty compel them to admit facts. You will notice that the Piltdown fossils are interpreted to mean one thing; the Java fossils to mean exactly the opposite.

Dr. Miller will be again introduced to state his unbiased comments:

"Three points of view should now be easy to understand:

"First, Missing links can not be expected to exist.

"Second, Missing links have been found; beliefs that they have not arise from ignorance.

"Third, Missing links have not been found; beliefs that they have arise from preconceptions.

Is Any Agreement Possible?

"To the question whether or not reconciliation is possible among men whose opinions differ so radically the only answer seems to be that nothing can bring agreement short of the discovery of evidence so convincing as to compel its general acceptance by the scientific world.

Summary of Opinions About the Java Man
(PITHECANTHROPUS)

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

(1)

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

"The deposits in which the fossils were found are of Quarternary Age (lower to middle Pleistocene, therefore not old enough to be reasonably expected to contain remains of a creature ancestral to man) (Branca, Obermaier, Pervinquiere, Ramstrom, Schuster, Volz).

(2)

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

"The way the skullcap, teeth, and femur were deposited in the stream bed at considerable distances from each other does not count against the reference of all these parts to one individual. (Branco, Dubois, Jaekel, Marsh)

(3)

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

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

"The remains came from two kinds of animal-teeth and skullcap from a gibbon, and femur from a man. (Krause) — skull-

cap and femur from a man, teeth from an orang. (Topinard). Diagram 5, p. 426.

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

(4)

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

"The characters of the femur are those of a gibbon (Kollam, (Hrdhcka).

"The characters of the femur are those of a gibbon (Kollam, Virchow).

(5)

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

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

(6)

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

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

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

(7)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"The characters of the skullcap are predominantly chimpanzee-like (Eimer, in Branco, Ramstrom, Virchow).

"The characters of the skullcap are not predominantly chimpanzee-like (Schwalbe).

(8)

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

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

(9)

"The creature was an imbecile (Manouvrier).

"The creature was a microcephalous idiot (Lydekker).

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

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

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

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

(10)

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

"The fact that the two teeth exhibit different degrees of wear does not count against the reference of both to one individual (Dubois, Pearsall, Virchow, and later opinions).

(11)

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

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

(12)

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

"The characters of the teeth are predominantly simian (Klbe, Nehring, Obermaier, Virchow).

"The characters of the teeth (apart from size) are gibbon-like (Manouvrier).

"The characters of the teeth are, with unimportant exceptions, within the limits of variation for the living orang (Miller, Toinard).

"The characters of the teeth are not definite enough to permit of exact classification (Luschan, Ramstrom).

(13)

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

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

"(c) The creature was human without definite simian characteristics (Houze, Martin, Petit). Diagram 1, page 426.

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

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

(14)

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

"The assumption that the animal was a gigantic gibbon or gibbon-like ape involves no insuperable difficulties. It is moreover, supported by the fact that gigantic forms are known to have existed in many groups of mammals during Pleistocene

and late Pliocene and by the circumstances that bones of a gigantic pangolin were found in the same Trinil deposits (Boule, Branco).

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

(15)

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

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

The Pilt Down Dawn Man

(Eoanthropus dawsoni Smith Woodward)

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

"The four pieces of the original cranium lack some of the most important areas of contact with each other. Hence it has been possible for each student to widen or narrow the intervening areas according to his personal interpretation of the probabilities, and so to produce brain cases of narrower or broader form and of greater or less capacity. The resulting variations have been exhaustively studied by Sir Arthur Keith in his second volume of his *Antiquity of Man* (new edition, 1925, pp. 514, 602). According to the different reconstructions the form of the cranium may be completely human in striking contrast to the ape-like jaw, or it may have partially simian features which cause this contrast to become less; its height may vary more than an inch, and the capacity of the brain cavity may range from 1,070 to 1,500 cubic centimeters."

The Plates and Diagrams referred to in these quotations are found in the work from which all these quotations are made.

The next quotations from that work follow:

Summary of Opinions About the Dawn Man
(EOANTHROPUS)

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

(1)

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

"The deposits in which the remains were found are of Pleistocene age (Dawkins, Freudenberg and others).

(2)

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

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

(3)

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

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

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

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

(4)

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

"The canine is a milk tooth (Lyne).

(5)

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

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

(6)

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

"The canine tooth came from the lower jaw and is most likely the lower milk canine of man and great apes (Woodward).

(7)

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

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

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

(8)

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

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

(9)

"The jaw is straight like that of an ape (Woodward and most other writers).

"The jaw is horseshoe-shaped like that of a man (Kleinschmidt).

(10)

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

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

(11)

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

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

(12)

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

"The jaw is not that of a chimpanzee (Boule, Miller, Ramstrom).

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

"The jaw has many characters which make it human in spite of the fact that it presents many points of likeness to that of the chimpanzee (Pycraft, with approval of Broom, Keith, Smith, Underwood and Woodward).

"The jaw is more like that of Neanderthal man than chimpanzee (Puccioni).

"The jaw is orang-like (Frassetto).

"The jaw is essentially a human jaw (Broom).

(13)

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

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

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

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

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

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

(14)

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

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

(15)

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

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

(16)

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

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

(17)

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

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

(18)

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

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

(19)

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

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

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

(20)

"Eoanthropus is a valid genus distinct from Homo, and the name is appropriate because the creature lived at humanity's

dawn (Woodward and most writers who accept the association of the fossils as parts of one individual).

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

Conclusion

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

There are many more pages of the highest importance and deepest interest of similar statements from the leading naturalists and evolutionists of the entire world, but these must suffice. It has been the aim to quote from none except the advocates of evolution. It is the wish of the author that the reader may see the best that can be said in favor of man's animal ancestry.

Perhaps no more impartial and competent authority can be named than Dr. Miller, the author and compiler of the work from which these quotations are made, titled, *The Controversy About Human Missing Links*. And let it be remembered that Dr. Miller is an evolutionist as well as all others from whom these quotations are made. It has often been stated in the press, as quotations from evolutionists, that the long sought "missing link" connecting man with some ape-like animal, had been found

till large numbers, perhaps, have been led to believe that evolutionists were a unit in such belief. These quotations show how hopelessly evolutionists the world over are divided in regard to the few fragments that Dr. Miller declares are the only fossils that can be considered at all to be such links.

The reader will first of all be impressed by the meagerness of the "fragments" of fossils that have caused so much heated controversy. just a skullcap and thigh bone, is the Java Man. Nine small fragments make up the Piltdown man. Four small fragments of skull, that Dr. Miller says are so lacking in several "important areas" that in assembling them into a skull, the variation in size is about fifty percent, each one increasing or decreasing the height and breadth to suit his ideas of what it ought to be. And with the teeth, jaw bone and skull fragments before them, the greatest naturalists of the world, not only do not agree, but in many vital points clearly contradict each other. There is not one single point that is not left in the greatest uncertainty. Yet out of these two sets of fossil fragments two "creatures" have been imagined, and heralded by some noted evolutionists as indisputable proof of man's animal ancestry, while as many other noted evolutionists have as confidently denied that they are any evidence whatever of such animal ancestry. No two agree except on very few points. There are fifteen disagreements and contradictions in regard to the Java bone scraps, and at least twenty in regard to the Piltdown fragments. In one group there are six disagreements and contradictions about three teeth alone. Many of these are as direct contradictions as it is possible to make. And each one dogmatically asserts that his opinion is right and should be accepted as final.

True science and scientists should be, and are revered. But when they enter the field of the purest speculation, dogmatically advance opinions as contradictory as those herein quoted, we are constrained from holding them in a higher reverence than others who speculate about other matters of the merest opinion. And when these fantastic speculations, as we may with due moderation call these quotations herein made, destroy the faith of youth, and remove the very foundation of all morals, then we arise and make a most earnest protest. These speculations

destroy the exalting and sanctifying belief in man that he came down from God and instill the belief that he came up from the brute. These speculations destroy the belief in a responsibility to the Creator, and in the end leave no fear of a future judgment to punish or hope of reward. All that is worth preserving in the present civilization springs from man's belief in his Divine origin. To the extent that this belief is destroyed will man descend toward the source from which he believes he sprang.

Dr. Miller truly says: "While waiting these further discoveries we should not hesitate to confess that in place of demonstrable links between man and other mammals we now possess nothing more than some fossils so fragmentary that they are susceptible of being interpreted as such links or as something else." Yet the theories of evolution are poured into the minds of youthful students with all the dogmatical authority as though they were as fully proved and demonstrated as processes in Chemistry.

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

CHAPTER XI

The Issue Defined

THE evidences of creation must now be considered. It is the desire of the writer to subject the theory of creation to as severe a test as has been given the theory of evolution. Truth is the goal sought. Nothing else is worthy of veneration. Belief of the truth leads to the good of the race. Truth has nothing to fear from the most critical investigation. Truth and light are close companions. Error and darkness dwell together. Any theory not based on truth should and must fail. The theories involved in this discussion are as opposite as the poles. If man was created by miracle he was not evolved by natural law, and therefore has no ancestors but man. If he was evolved he has had as ancestors the lowest forms of life such as fish, reptiles and apes. To say that the two theories are harmonious is as contrary to the facts as to say there is no difference between light and darkness.

The aim in this chapter is to fix clearly in the mind the true issue between the two opposing theories of creation and evolution, as that issue is related to the religion of Christ that is revealed in the Bible. Back of the theory of creation and the theory of evolution are two basic philosophies out of which these two theories grow. These philosophies have often been defined by the terms Modernism and Fundamentalism. These terms do not clearly define the opposing philosophies. Better terms are Naturalism and Supernaturalism. Naturalists affirm that natural law has produced everything in the universe as it now exists, including man, body and soul. Naturalists deny that natural law has ever been contravened by miracle. Supernaturalists affirm that man was created by miracle, and that natural law has been

at times superseded by miracle. As the idea of evolution grows out of the philosophy of Naturalism, and the idea of creation grows out of the philosophy of Supernaturalism, for convenience the terms will be used interchangeably.

The religion of Christ and the theory of evolution are as opposite as the poles. Evolution attributes the origin and perpetuation of everything to the power of natural law. Creationists attribute the origin of life and the religion of Christ to supernatural power; We origin of He to a miracle of creation; the religion of Christ to a miracle of revelation. All efforts to harmonize the two theories must fail. Those who attempt to harmonize the two theories lose the confidence of both evolutionists and Christians. The unmodified religion of Christ is attacked in its every fundamental. There are some self-appointed emissaries rushing back and forth between the two opposing camps, but no flag of truce will be unfurled. It is a challenge to Christianity unequalled since the passing of the rack and faggot. It is to be a test of the "survival of the fittest," and but one will be left on the field.

For nearly two thousand years man has rested confidently in the belief that he was created in the moral image of God, and redeemed through Christ, as truth. If evolutionists can prove that natural law evolved man from dead matter up through reptiles and apes, then man's old beliefs must vanish as the merest superstition. The issues are clearly joined. The fittest must survive. The weal or woe of man for this life and that which is to come is involved. If the philosophy of Naturalism, which is the basis of the theory of evolution, can create in man a more enduring faith; point the soul to a brighter star of hope; lead to a higher plane of good; Ell the heart with greater happiness; bring to the couch of the dying saint greater composure than has been bestowed by the religion of Christ, then the philosophy of Naturalism and the theory of evolution should and will prevail. Otherwise sin-sick, weary pilgrims will still retain a firm hold on the Book that teaches these things, or, having let them slip, will, like the prodigal of old, reclaim their heritage.

It is true that some evolutionists claim that "Evolution and Religion are not incompatible." But the vital question is this: What do they mean by the term religion? Most assuredly it is

not the religion of Christ revealed in the Bible. The whole claim of the religion of Christ is that it is a miracle-supernatural. The sole purpose of the religion of Christ is to redeem man from a fallen state. If he was evolved, he was not created sinless, and hence did not fall, and so needs no redeemer or savior, for there is nothing from which to be redeemed. If natural law by the process of evolution, quickened dead matter into life, improved life forms from jelly fish to reptiles, apes and finally produced man, surely evolution can complete the work. For in that case man is now at the highest point he has ever known, brought to his present state by evolution; why, then any need of Jesus stepping in to lift man still higher? And in the last analysis it will be found that evolutionists in fact expect natural law to finish man in his upward course.

The theory of evolution does away with all idea of accountability to God, and therefore of sin from which to be saved. For if man was evolved, then certain it is that his reptile ancestors were not morally accountable to God, and hence not sinners, and in no need of religion and a Savior. No one has ever affirmed that any other creature than man has a moral accountability to God. Man is the only living being on earth that has a moral mind, and is regarded as owing a moral duty to God. How, then, and by what process did man become endowed with a moral nature and therefore moral responsibility in making his transition from the ape when he became man? Is not this an insurmountable difficulty confronting those who affirm there is "no opposition between the theory of evolution and the religion of Christ?" If man was evolved, he is now on the highest plane from every point of view that he or his animal ancestors have ever reached. If, then, he is now a sinner, and needs a Savior, that is as much as to say man has advanced, or evolved upward into a state of sin, a lost state.

If man was at first created sinless, and fell from that state, then the religion of Christ became a necessity to reconcile man again with a sinless Creator. There is the most perfect agreement between the theory of creation and the religion of Christ. But the theory of evolution and the religion of Christ are con-

tradictory to each other in every syllable. The task of those who would harmonize them is utterly impossible of accomplishment.*

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

Evolution teaches that man, body, mind and soul, was evolved from dead matter. The leading evolutionists emphatically deny: (a) The inspiration of the Bible, (b) The creation of man, (c) The Virgin birth of Christ, (d) That he ever performed any miracles, (e) That his death in any way atoned for sin, (f) That he was raised from the dead, (g) That he will come again to redeem the obedient, (h) That there will be a general judgment to reward man for the deeds done in the body. Reject these eight basic ideas—and if evolution be true they must be rejected—and scarcely a shadow of the religion of Christ remains. Destroy the belief of these fundamentals and the foundation of all morals is destroyed. It is the belief of these that has lifted the so-called Christian nations above the level of the non-Christian nations. All that evolutionists have, and are that is better than that enjoyed by pagan nations, they owe to the belief in these fundamentals which they are now so zealously trying to destroy.

Let apologists say what they will, the indisputable fact remains that evolution and the religion of Christ are as contradictory as truth and error. Both cannot be true. No armistice can be declared. The two opposing philosophies of Naturalism and Supernaturalism are in irrepressible war. Before the present century

* — The religion of Christ does not teach what some call "original sin." Only one consequence is visited upon Adam's posterity because of his transgression, namely, the death of the body. All must die this death whether good or evil. All will be raised anew whether good or evil. But the future reward depends upon the choice and life of each accountable individual. The voluntary acceptance of Christ through obedience from the heart, crucifying the lusts of the flesh, appropriating all the spiritual means enjoined in the gospel, results in developing a character and perfecting holiness and prepares the soul for a holy habitation in the presence of God himself. (Jno., 5:28-29. Acts, 17:31. 1 Cor., 15:21-26, 2 Cor., 5:10. Heb., 9:27. Rev., 20:12-16).

ends it will likely prove to be one of the greatest intellectual and spiritual battles known to history. The faiths and hopes vouchsafed to the soul of man in the religion of Christ are held too sacred to be given up in exchange for the faithless, hopeless, joyless, soulless, Godless theory of evolution.

If the theory were applied to material things only, creationists would not be deeply concerned. But when it destroys faiths, undermines morals, robs the soul of its most precious hope, hovers as a mocking specter over the dying saint, denies all future reward for a life of service and holiness here, then creationists enter a most vigorous protest. And what has Naturalism and evolution to offer in exchange for these treasures? Before surrendering these, creationists demand better evidences of the truth of evolution and better treasures in exchange.

Creationists wage no war on science or on scientists. They rejoice in every achievement of science. It is against the unproved theory of the evolution of man from the brute, as opposed to his creation in the moral image of God, that the irrepressible battle is waged. It is the logical denial of the Divine Inspiration of the Bible and of every bask belief and hope of the Christian religion around which the controversy revolves. And on these matters no quarter will be asked or granted. If the belief that the Bible was inspired and man was created be false theories they should be overthrown. If Naturalism and evolution be true, the sooner they are universally accepted the better. The same life cannot be guided by both theories.

H. H. Newman, professor of Zoology, University of Chicago, in his recent book, *Evolution, Eugenics and Genetics*, p. 52, says: "Freedom of thought and freedom of speech, the inalienable rights of democracy, are attacked by proposed legislative acts, and teachers of science are to be classed among law-breakers if they attempt to disseminate their views about evolution." A .strange conception of "freedom of thought," and "freedom of speech;" indeed! Who proposes to regulate by law what Newman or any other man's "thoughts" and "speech" shall be? Every American citizen is perfectly willing that Mr. Newman and all others shall enjoy as much "freedom of thought," and "freedom of speech" as they wish about evolution or any other

subject. The whole question is this: Do citizens of states who tax themselves, build schools, employ and pay teachers, have the right to say what their hired and paid employees shall teach, their sons and daughters? Since when has it become a curtailment of "freedom" for employers to say what kind of work their employees shall perform? And most especially when that work has to do with shaping the lives of their sons and daughters. Surely Mr. Newman is well aware of this "inalienable right of democracy," at least as it relates to most matters between employer and employee. Why, then, should the application of this universally accepted rule governing the relations between employer and employee be exempted when the formation of the character of the employer's children is involved? If one should employ Mr. Newman as a sculptor, and bring to him a very precious stone, would not the owner of the stone and the employer have the right to say how the stone should be fashioned? And should not his wishes be respected or the job surrendered? Why, then, raise a false issue? Why try to hide behind a smoke screen? All know that it is not a question of what any man wishes to think and to teach so long as he does his thinking and teaching at his own charges, or of those who voluntarily support him. The question involved is: Do citizens who hire and pay teachers have the right to say what their employees shall teach their sons and daughters? Every one knows that the exercise of this right is neither a curtailment of personal liberty nor a violation of the principles of democracy. Does not the very spirit of democracy imply that the majority shall govern? If, then, a state by majority vote, decides what shall and what shall not be taught by their employees, is it, therefore, any "curtailment of freedom of speech" of such employees? And does not ordinary honor decree that employees so directed shall obey their employers or surrender their jobs? That the state has every right to enact and to enforce such laws, there is not a shade of doubt. But that it is the wise course to pursue, the author has grave doubts. While holding that states have every right to enact such laws, the author is personally opposed to the exercise of that right. An idea cannot be barred by legislative enactment. Nor can an idea be legislated into belief and acceptance. The only remedy for a bad idea is a better idea. On this basis the opposing ideas of evolution

and creation must meet. The philosophy of Naturalism *and* Supernaturalism are in irrepressible conflict. In the end, the better idea will triumph.

Truth has nothing to fear, and no new enemy has arisen. It is an old enemy—materialistic atheism—in a new dress. But it is true that it is powerfully entrenched. It is barricaded within the walls of almost every institution of learning, both church and state, from the university down to the high school. The philosophy of Naturalism is not only the animating spirit in our educational institutions, but it also permeates almost all of our literature and periodicals. It has the sympathetic ear of our youth. It marshals mighty forces and its leadership is adroit. It seeks to overawe youth by its specious pleas of science and education. But truth is eternal. Nineteen hundred years ago twelve uneducated men from the common walks of life, went forth telling a simple story, based on the philosophy of Supernaturalism. They were opposed by the philosophy of Naturalism which was the guiding spirit of the learned and powerful of the world. The result is well known.

Pilate, the Roman governor, in order to appease the Jewish mob, ordered Jesus crucified between two thieves. Fifty days later, twelve uneducated men began to preach that Jesus was risen from the dead, was crowned King in heaven, and was now able to save men from their sins. Thousands soon believed the strange story, embraced it and called down on their heads the most bitter persecution. These twelve later proved their sincerity and sealed their faith by their life's blood.

The powerful leadership of the Jewish nation was arrayed against their teaching. All the higher education of the world, including the philosophy of Naturalism and also the theory of evolution that originated with the wisest Greeks, and was the prevailing philosophy throughout the educated world was in conflict with their teaching. The philosophy of Naturalism that so strongly opposed the religion of Christ at its very beginning was essentially the same that is now in popular favor. Later the pagan world and the Roman empire united their influence and power to stamp out the new doctrine. The Jews have been scattered among the nations for nearly two thousand years.
Pagan

ism as it was then known has disappeared from the earth. The mighty Roman empire fell, and is no longer known except on the pages of seldom read history.

The simple, story told by the twelve uneducated men has lifted nations to a higher plane than ever before known. Its influence is greater today than ever before, and like the sun in mid-afternoon, is still increasing in brilliance and power. The smoky cloud of evolution has appeared on the horizon, but the rays of the Sun of Righteousness will penetrate its gloom. The light that has brightened the pathway trod by the feet of weary pilgrims for nearly two thousand years cannot be obscured. Today there are not only twelve but many millions who believe and proclaim the simple story of the Cross, that is a message of salvation to all the nations. "And this is our victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

CHAPTER XII

The Truth in Genesis

EACH period in history is characterized by trends of thought and action peculiar to itself. The present is noted for the many new and deceptive attacks made on the Bible and Christianity. Higher criticism under the badge of scholarship attacks the authorship and credibility of various books of the Old Testament and the New Testament. Evolution, labeled science, attacks every fundamental of the Bible and Christianity. Evolutionists deny the miracle of the inspiration of the Bible, and this logically denies every miracle, including the Divinity of Christ, and of every blessing that He promised.

Let it again be understood that creationists make no war on applied science. It may safely be said here that there is not a single demonstrated fact in all that is called science, that conflicts in the least with any historical statement in the entire Bible. It is only against the ever-changing theories that contradict the Bible, that evolutionists themselves frankly admit are no 'more than theories, yet unproved, that creationists oppose. And if these unstable theories were applied to material things only, creationists would not be much concerned. But when the theory is applied to man, both body and soul, and to the repudiation of Christianity—only then do creationists become deeply interested.

While these attacks were being made by avowed Agnostics, the line of battle was definitely drawn. The enemy was in the open. But since a very large percentage of clergymen, who are supposed to preach Christ, are among the most zealous sowers of the seeds of unbelief, it then becomes a matter of the most serious moment. The enemies of Christ are boring from with

in. While wearing the livery of heaven, they hold communion with the camp of the enemy. Robed as the soldiers of Christ, they sit in the council of material atheists. For every solemn declaration of unwavering faith in the divine inspiration of the Bible and its recorded miracles, they have had a jest. And when the most outspoken material atheists declare that man, body and soul were begotten by natural law, conceived and brought forth from the womb of dead matter, they applaud themselves hoarse. No other enemy can do so much harm as he who is wearing the uniform of the army for whose defeat he is bending his energies.

It is argued by those who call themselves Theistic, or Christian evolutionists, that the "Bible is not a text book on science." No, but it is largely a book of history. And if its history is false, how can its moral teachings that grow out of its history be relied on? False history can only produce a false faith. Christ himself said, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." "Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree corrupt and its fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by its fruit." The historical record in the Bible is the tree; the faith and moral teachings the fruit. If the moral teachings of the Bible be accepted as good, its history must be accepted as true. False history cannot bear good moral fruit, unless it can be shown that an evil tree can bear good fruit. The history in the Bible is either the greatest truth or the greatest falsehood that the world has yet known.

The Bible not only records the history of the creation of the first man of the race, but also records the names of some of his children, and continues an unbroken line of descent down to Christ himself. One of the biographers of Jesus records his genealogy back to Adam, the first man. Every historical statement in the Bible is only an extension of the history of the creation of Adam. Take away the history of the creation and fall of Adam, as recorded in Genesis, and all that follows to the end of Revelation is meaningless. All other historical statements in the Bible are as the tree to the root from which it grew.

Jesus himself put his seal on the story of creation recorded in Genesis. He said: "Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For

this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife ... What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder." Deny the creation of man and you deny the clearest possible statement of Jesus himself. He positively affirms that God "made them male and female," and joined them in wedlock. Not only so, but he cited Moses' record in Genesis. He who, then, casts doubt on the history of the creation of man, and on the idea that Moses wrote the book of Genesis and as a truthful historian, by the same act casts doubt on the word and Divinity of Christ. To reject the history of the creation and fall of man written by Moses, is to reject Christ as the Son of God. He quoted Moses' historical record and endorsed it without a single criticism. And to the Jews he said: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings how shall ye believe my words?" This burning question, hurled by Jesus at the unbelieving Jews, stands unanswered till this hour. He links his own veracity and claim to be the Son of God with the fact that Moses not only wrote the truth but also that he wrote the book of Genesis. What Jesus has joined together let no professed believer in him attempt to put asunder.

No greater example of contradiction can be imagined than to preach and exalt the importance of faith in Christ, then in turn declaring as untrue the historical record that produces faith in him. It is sometimes declared that the history in Genesis is an "allegory." We do not believe allegory; we believe historical facts. Allegory is a figure to illustrate a historical fact. If the supposed fact does not exist the allegory is meaningless—it has no basis. If the history in Genesis is taken as allegory, simply an illustration to reach a reality, then what is the reality that it teaches? By no possible turn of the imagination can it be made to fit the theory of evolution. It has to do with the origin of man on the earth. It is impossible to twist it so as to describe the theory of evolution. Creation is the only other theory advanced to explain the origin of man. The history in Genesis either records and explains the creation of man, or it is entirely meaningless.

Creationists not only must, but are willing to rest the whole issue on the two theories, Evolution or Creation. The triumph or defeat of Evolution or Christianity rests as definitely on the story in Genesis as the fate of two armies turned on Goliath's spear and David's sling. If evolutionists can demonstrate a single fact that is clearly contradictory to the story in Genesis, the victory belongs to them.

It is affirmed that fossils of extinct animals are found that are supposed to have lived on the earth millions of years earlier than the history of creation as recorded in Genesis. If that be true, it in no way disproves the history in Genesis. The Bible history begins with the order of plant and animal life now on the earth of which man is the highest and last. What may have existed before the present order of life was created, is not stated. No one needs to believe that the present order of plant and animal life dates back to the beginning of the material earth. What is not definitely stated in history, is not a matter of faith. Opinions may be formed. But faith and opinion are quite different mental acts. How much older the earth may be than man, is a matter of the purest speculation. Nor does "creating the heavens and the earth" necessarily mean bringing these into existence out of nothing. It simply means bringing order out of chaos; organizing material substances into orderly systems. Men are said to have created governments. Creating plants and animals simply means forming the first plants and the bodies of the first animals, putting the essence of life into each and enabling all life-forms to transmit life, that in turn clothes itself with a body. The mode or process employed in forming the plants and bodies of animals is not stated. It matters not whether it was by a simple word of command or otherwise. The fact that the progenitors were fundamentally like their offspring to the present day, is the idea involved. And if it be argued that the progenitors of the present order of plants and animal life now on the earth were created a long period before man, the author would not waste time controverting the contention. That man has had no ancestors such as fish, reptiles and apes, is the vital question at issue.

Every statement made here is not only admitted but also affirmed by leading evolutionists. The remarkable statements by Dr. Austin H. Clark have already been given in a previous chapter. H. H. Newman, who is one of the very highest rank and most extreme mechanistic evolutionists, says: "None of the animals or plants of the past are identical with those of the present. The nearest relationship is between a few species of the past and some living species which have been placed in the same families." (*Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics*, p. 162). Here Newman affirms in the clearest possible language that a complete gap separates man and the present order of plant and animal life from all pre-historic, extinct plant and animal life, as it appears in the fossil record. And on this solid foundation creationists build. Whatever may have existed that is now extinct does not affect in the least what now is. And evolutionists have found no trace of man antedating this affirmed gap between the living and the extinct. The unavoidable conclusion then is that back of this gap no man existed. This being true, man has had neither reptile nor ape as ancestor. Evolutionists themselves affirm that there is no identity between the living and the extinct. And of course they deny that man has any ancestor among the living brute family. And this is all that creationists contend for, namely, that man has had no ancestor except man.

But what of the plants and animals antedating this gap? Again Newman says: "The animals and plants of each geological stratum are at least generically different from those of any other stratum, though belonging in some cases to the same family or orders." "The animals and plants of the newest (highest) geological strata are most like those of the present and help link the present with past." (*Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics*, p. 163). If evolutionists are right in this affirmation,—and doubtless they would be glad to find it otherwise—then the extinct life-forms were not only not identical with those of the present, but also different from each former stratum. It would also prove that each "brought forth after its kind," in the past geological periods as it does now in living species. If it were proven that the earth was peopled with plants and animals millions of years before the present order, it would not in the least affect the Bi

be account of the creation of man. For there is no identity between the living and the extinct, evolutionists themselves being witness. Man belongs to the present order of life, and there is no trace of man antedating the gap separating the living present from the dead past. The Bible declares that God created the first plants, animals and man that form the present order, and commanded them to "bring forth after their kind." That this command has never been violated, not only does every living plant and animal, but also every fossil in the rock bear unimpeachable testimony. The bursting into new life from seeds of plants over the face of the whole earth "after their kind"—wherever new life is born, from seed, shell or parent—there is a new witness of the truth of the record in Genesis.

CHAPTER XIII

Genesis Explains the Facts

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

Here is an example of an hypothesis confidently believed for a hundred years. Very largely earth sciences were based on it. It was the starting point from which many scientific lines were run. But it was found to be untrue and the theology of geology had to be started all over again. The Laplacian hypothesis was thought to be about as firmly settled as a starting-point from which to survey other sciences as the magnetic needle served the geographer in running his lines on plain and mountain. And in what difficulty would the map maker find himself should he discover that his compass had been pointing in another direction

than toward the magnetic pole? His surveys would have to be all run over, and new maps made. And that is just what Chamberlain says happened in some sciences when it was discovered that the almost universally accepted Laplacian hypothesis of the formation of the solar system was not true. And who would afterwards trust surveyors using compasses made in the same factory? And this is just one reason why creationists are just a little slow to follow every trail surveyed with the compasses bearing the trade mark of atheism. They are so often found not pointing true to the magnetic pole of truth. Chamberlain says entirely new surveys must be made, and plates for entirely new maps for earth sciences by reason of the fact that the Laplacian compass was found to be pointing way off from the magnetic pole of fact. It was found that many facts were contrary to the entire theory. Osborn declares, as already noted, that the entire survey of the "causes of evolution" made during one hundred and fifty years would have to be discarded, and a new start made, using as compass, his "energy concept," "for new and untried paths of exploration that may be followed during the present century." Other instances could be cited of hypotheses that were confidently accepted for many years only at last to be discarded because they were proven to be contrary to known facts. Creationists rejoice in every discovered fact, but are a little skeptical about some of the theories offered.

The theory of creation must now be rigidly tested. The theory that best explains the facts that are observed and known to exist in the plant and animal kingdoms, certainly is the more worthy of belief. Will the theory of creation explain the known facts that are observed in the order of life now on the earth? If it fails in a single important point, its credibility will be impaired.

The earth is peopled with plants, animals and man. These all had a beginning on the earth and had their origin by some process, and now have well-known attributes, and are subject to definite natural laws. Creation and Evolution—miracle and natural laws—are the two processes seriously proposed to explain the origin and present state of life on the earth. Creationists believe that life began by a supernatural process—by mir-

acle—for two chief reasons. If the same process or force were now in operation that originated the first life, most assuredly life would still be originated as at the beginning. Second, no natural law now originates life, and it is inconceivable how natural law could ever have produced life from dead matter. At any rate, no natural law is now operating that can produce life. Most assuredly, then, that power which originated the first life on the earth has been suspended—has, ceased to operate. That being true, whatever power or force which originated that first life, was supernatural when compared with any power or force now operating. Take either position, that of natural law or of miracle, and you have a power or force that is super-natural when compared with any force now operating. Therefore creationists accept the view that God by a super-natural process—a miracle-originated the first life to appear on the earth, and endowed it with power to transmit life to offspring. And this theory must now be tied by the same rigid rule of critical analysis as that which has been applied to the theory of evolution.

"And God said, let the earth bring forth grass, herbs yielding seed, and fruit-trees bearing fruit after their kind, wherein is the seed thereof, upon the earth: And God said, Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth. And God said, Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind." (Genesis, 1st chapter.) Here is a brief historical statement of the beginning of the present order of plant and animal life now on the earth. It is not stated whether a male and female of each kind of animal was formed from which all others are descended, or whether the command, "Let the earth bring forth," caused the first generation of plants and animals suddenly to appear largely over the earth's surface. On these ideas each one may freely "interpret" for himself. The fundamental thought is that the first forms came by miracle, at the command of God, in contravention of natural law, and that all now on the earth have been "brought forth" after the original kind. It is a historical statement of an affirmed fact, and can only be believed or disbelieved. It is as clear as it is possible to make it. The fundamental statement is, that God specifically

created families or major groups of plants and animals distinct from each other, and commanded them to "bring forth after their kind," must either be accepted as true or rejected as false. The whole issue turns on this one vital point. Creationists are willing to rest the whole issue on which will best stand the crucial test.

The countless numbers of plants, insects and animals that swarm in the oceans, rivers, air and on the earth bear irrefutable witness to the miracle of the divine command, "Let them bring forth after their kind." From the tiniest microscopical plants to the giant oak; from the invisible disease germ to the leviathan of the deep and the beast of the jungle—all are from parentage of "their kind." Evolutionist W. C. Allee tells us, "there are some 600,000 classified species of invertebrates and 36,000 known species of vertebrates." (*The Nature of the World and of Man*, p. 261.)

What a "cloud of witnesses?" There are full 636,000 families of witnesses and the number of individuals making up these families is innumerable. The gaps separating these species are never crossed. The command, "Let them bring forth after their kind," is as immutable as the eternal verities. There are variations in plenty, but all are within the limits of each major group. There has been no observed instance of the appearance of a single new species. No two plants or animals are exactly alike, but the offspring are "after the kind" of their parents. We have the beef and dairy types of cattle. By crossing, selecting and rejecting, these can be greatly modified. But they are all still cattle, with the split hoof and other fundamental characteristics. So with all other plants and animals. But these variations and modifications never produce new species. The existence of 636,000 distinct species, with separating gaps that are never crossed, bear witness that, within the knowledge of man, the command to "bring forth after their kind" has never been violated.

Evolutionists teach that natural law acting on plants and animals will eliminate the inferior and preserve the superior, and thus improve both plants and animals. So far as the observation of man extends the reverse is true. We know that grasses,

grains, fruits and animals are far superior to serve man's need today than one hundred years ago. How has this great improvement come about? By leaving nature to work alone? Most assuredly not. It has come wholly by the toil of man rejecting the inferior and preserving the superior, that this great improvement has been made. Let man cease his mental and physical toil and leave Nature to work unguided, and the gain of a hundred years will quickly be lost. If left alone to Nature, the best plants and animals not only do not improve but rapidly deteriorate. Some three hundred years ago the Spanish turned loose some well-bred horses on the plains of the Southwest. The small worthless range ponies are the result of the deterioration when left alone to Nature. The worthless wild hogs of the Southern states are the direct descendants of at least fairly well-bred domesticated swine. Doubtless in each case by long hard toil in feeding, breeding, rejecting and preserving the descendants of both ponies and swine could be made useful for man's needs. Improvement in the products of nature is paid for in serious thought and patient physical toil. Cease to toil and all gain is quickly lost.

And what do these facts, plainly read and known by 411 men, prove? The theory of evolution? Nay, verily, but creation. Listen: "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good." "Behold, I have given you every herb yielding seed, which is upon the face of the earth, and every tree, yielding seed; to you it shall be for food." (Genesis, 1st chapter.) The declaration that the vegetable products of the ground were 'very good' and given to man for food, was made while man was yet sinless. But man sinned. What change took place? "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee: in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the ground; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." (Genesis, 3rd chapter.) While man remained obedient he was promised food without the penalty of toil attached. When he transgressed, the earth was cursed and its products degraded. Henceforth the "sweat of his face" was to be the price of his bread. And this price must still be paid. It is well known that

it is with great toil that man gains his food. Governments spend millions of dollars combating insects and diseases that prey upon food plants and animals to the end that man may eat bread. Scientists are often speculating as to which will more likely win—man or his tiny insect enemies. Scientists of the highest rank are constantly engaged in study and toil, trying to improve the products of the ground for man's welfare. Every nook and corner of the earth is being searched. From the interior of China and the plains of Persia have been brought a few bugs and wasps each costing many times its weight in gold, to combat injurious insects, to the end that man may eat more and better fruit. Man throughout the habitable earth is engaged in a titanic struggle with harmful insects, fungus diseases of plants and noxious weeds, in fulfillment of the declaration recorded in Genesis, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." The curse placed upon the ground because of man's sin has so filled it with enemies to man's ease, that by far the greater part of his arduous toil is to gain bread. And yet perhaps half the world goes to bed hungry.

Every unquestioned fact here cited is proof incontestable of the truth of the creation and fall of man as recorded in Genesis. Because of man's transgression all the products of the ground were degraded and the earth was filled with harmful plants and insects that were to be enemies to his ease. The duty of toil became the price of bread. By great toil of brain and muscle, man can bring the products of the ground part way up to where they were when pronounced "very good," and given to man for food, Cease to pay the penalty; cease to toil and they quickly sink to their degraded level. The knowledge of these facts is almost universal. Their mute testimony is felt in every weary muscle, scintillates from every sweat-drop of toil, and confronts man at every meal. It is an agreed axiom that they who eat honest bread shall have toiled for it in field, factory or some other worthy labor. These evidences of the truth of the history in Genesis are not buried deep in the rocks, about the age and interpretation of which scarcely no two agree, but are present, seen and experienced universally. All know and admit the facts. Creation explains these facts.

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

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

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

It must also be admitted that the history of creation and fall of man as recorded in Genesis perfectly explains these facts as all know them to exist. But not a single fact here cited is explained by the theory of evolution. The theory of evolution and the universally known facts are in opposition at every point.

Was Moses inspired to write what actually took place in the beginning as recorded in Genesis? Or did he unaided by inspiration formulate a theory that perfectly explains the facts, that now exist nearly four thousand years after he wrote the theory! Which of the two conclusions is the most reasonable? Evolution fails to explain the facts that now exist. The history in Genesis agrees with every discovered fact. Evolution offers no explanation why plants and animals can be so rapidly improved by toil, and why all gain is so quickly lost when toil ceases. It teaches that plants and animals "bring forth" contrary to "their kind" to the extent that fish "bring forth" reptiles; and reptiles "bring forth" birds, and that some "ape-like form" brings forth MAN.

CHAPTER XIV

Origin of the Soul

EVOLUTIONISTS deal with the shape or form of the body and ignore the soul. Why spend so much time speculating about the garment and ignore the wearer of the garment? Why be so concerned about the house and disregard the indweller? Is not the wearer of the garment and the indweller of the house of far greater importance than the garment and house? These are only the cover and shelter of the body in which the soul dwells. These are in reality important only as they relate to the soul. The body is material. The soul is spiritual. The body is at best decaying and must suffer dissolution, while the soul is eternal. All good springs from the soul. Take away the soul and he would be but an animal, without a moral restraint or spiritual aspiration. Why, then, are evolutionists as silent as the Sphinx as to the origin of the soul? The answer is their theory is soul-less. Their theory does not recognize a soul that will live, after its house, the body, has returned to the dust. They do not believe the Bible doctrine, "Then shall the body return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to the God who gave it," nor the declaration of Paul, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." (II Cor, 5:1.) To admit that man has a soul, from which springs all moral good, and that will survive the body, would wreck their whole theory. That would place upon them the burden to explain how man came to have a soul. To affirm that he inherited a soul from the reptile and other animals, would be to admit that animals have souls, and so have a moral responsibility, and hence are on an equality with man. More still, the question, From

what source did the lower animals receive a soul to transmit to their lineal child—man—would have to be answered. And as they affirm that life, which means all that is in man, originated by natural law acting on dead matter, the logical conclusion would be that the soul was begotten by natural law, conceived and brought forth from the womb of dead matter. If to escape this conclusion, should they affirm that when some ape-like animal gave birth to man, then man received a soul, that would be to admit a miracle. And so the leading evolutionists remain silent.

It is the robbing youthful students of the belief that they have a soul, which is the source of the greatest joy as well as the basis of all morals, against which creationists enter their protest. If there be any who deny that the theory of evolution is a soul-less, heavenless, materialistic theory, then let that one name any leader among evolutionists who teach a future life for the soul. A few preachers, who am trailing far in the rear, may try so to teach. But these neither exert influence nor command respect from either creationists or evolutionists.

The first article in the creed of the evolutionists rules God entirely out. They admit no creative agencies except unthinking, unreasoning, unfeeling natural law acting on dead matter. The most ingenious and fertile imagination is unequal to the task of formulating a theory as to how the soul of man could have been born of the parents of natural law and dead matter. Yet these are the only creative agencies that they recognize. Natural law and dead matter are evolutionists' only progenitors; their Adam and Eve of the whole race of man.

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

earth, then creationists will discard the history in Genesis which says: "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

What is the soul? The question is as hard to answer as the question, What is life? In the absolute neither question can be answered. But we consciously feel life, and observe its manifestations, which proves the fact of life. We just as definitely feel and observe the functions of the soul. Physical energy proves its existence by its effects on material bodies and substances. The soul proves its existence as a moral and spiritual entity or personality by its moral and spiritual experiences, and by its moral and spiritual fruits of purity and goodness of character. The actual existence of the soul is as clearly and unmistakably attested by the plainest proof as is life itself. In truth the soul is the highest part of life in man. Take away the soul, and man, as man, ceases to be. For it is the soul that removes man out of the realm of all other creatures on the earth.

A comparison between the animal and man may aid in a clearer conception of the soul. The horse has a body of flesh and blood, animated in some way by life. Life seizes the muscles and moves the body, in which is seated instincts and appetites, related solely to the body and its needs, that causes it to secure nourishment, body comfort and to reproduce its kind. Man has all these just like the animal. The animal has some measure of memory and intelligence, and some attribute to the animal some measure of reason. But certain it is that the animal stops here, short of any moral and spiritual attributes. just where the animal stops, the soul of man begins. From here upward are the moral and spiritual attributes of the soul, that exalts man as high as the heavens above the brute creation, and leaves him but a little "lower than the angels."

Faith belongs to the soul. Faith is the basis of confidence, without which all orderly relations between individuals and groups would cease. Hope, the desire and expectation of future good, the magnet that draws man onward and upward, is rooted in the soul. When hope ends, all effort ends and life is no longer tolerable.

Love, that begets sympathy, kindness, benevolence, and that inspires to the greatest service and sacrifice in behalf of the weak and suffering, belongs to the soul. Love seeks not to receive but to give; seeks not to be served but to serve. Love cleanses every motive from selfish design; sanctifies every appetite of the body to its proper use; cements friendships; supplants hate and strife with peace and happiness. It is the one attribute above all others that shows most plainly man's kinship to God, from whom his soul came.

Conscience, the monitor of behavior; the arbiter of every act and the kind of thought entertained; that approves what is believed to be right and censures what is believed to be wrong, belongs to the soul of man. Remove from the mind of man a conscious sense of accountability to God, and there remains only an intellectual animal. Justice between individuals and groups would cease. All morality would perish from the earth.

A desire to worship a Deity is as universal as man. But few individuals deny the worship of Deity. And say what one may, all men do pay homage to some object, or ideal. Worship and a desire to live again in a better habitation are as inherent in the soul as the desire for food is in the body.

These are some of the moral and spiritual attributes in the soul of man that separate him from any animal on the earth. They are not more fully matured and more highly cultivated qualities that are also in the animal in a less mature state. They are super-added attributes. The soul is an entity or personality, not a trace of which is found in any animal.

What was the origin of this spiritual entity or personality called the soul? Creationists believe that God breathed into man the breath of life and he "became a living soul." Representing the view of evolutionists, H. F. Osborn says: "The more modern scientific opinion is that life arose from a re-combination of forces pre-existing in the cosmos—that life does not represent the entrance either of a new form of energy or of a new series of laws—that when life appeared on the earth some energies pre-existing in the cosmos were brought into relation with chemical elements pre-existing." (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, p. 2.) In fewest possible words he denies that life came on the

earth from God by miracle, and affirms that natural law chemically produced life from dead elements. Which theory is the more reasonable, that the soul came from God, or that it was chemically created by natural law from dead matter?

Osborn's reasoning leaves him with the plainest possible contradiction. He clearly declares that life originated by the laws, energies and elements pre-existing, that is, were here before life appeared. Well, the "energies laws" and "elements" now on the earth do not produce life from dead matter. What has happened that life is not still being originated from dead elements as at the first? Have any of these "energies," and "elements" ceased to be present on the earth, or have any of the "laws" that first chemically produced life been suspended and ceased to operate? Or do the proper elements no longer "re-combine" as at the first? If life, with the soul, first originated in this manner, as Osborn believes, then some radical, vital change has occurred, or life would still be produced as at the beginning. That any such vital changes have occurred, no evolutionist has affirmed, nor has any effort been made to explain why life is no longer appearing. If the same "energies" and "elements" were present, and the same "re-combination" taking place, and same "laws" operating, then life would most certainly still be appearing, that is, if life appeared by these agencies at the beginning.

If it is admitted that God exists, then it is easy to believe that the first life and soul came from him by a miracle. The miracle was suspended and life is now reproduced by natural process. "Energies," "laws," and "elements" are all present and now operating as at the beginning, and their function is to reproduce or transmit life from life to offspring in plant and animal. But they cannot produce, create or quicken dead matter into life. For this, a miracle was required. Elements and forces are now as always. Their work is not now, and never was to start life, but to transmit life.

But is it reasonable to conclude that the soul originated by natural law operating on dead matter? Material elements may be so mixed as to form a compound, but no new element is produced. Base metals like iron and copper, when mixed, cannot produce gold. Limestone and shale cannot be so blended as to

form diamonds. The compound can rise no higher in refinement than the average of the elements forming the compound. How, then, is it possible that any "re-combination" of material elements and energies can produce an entirely new element, that is, life and soul, purely spiritual entities? It is either this, or a miracle.

Natural law is the controlling physical force throughout the universe. Whether natural law is thought of as one harmonious whole, of which each minor action is a part, or of various minor laws harmoniously operating, each in its sphere, the result is always uniform. Whatever natural law once did with material elements, it will and still does with the same material elements. Natural law enables the germ in the plant and animal to reproduce As kind. Or shall we say that life calls to its aid natural law and weaves for itself a garment to wear, or a body in which to make its temporary habitation? Is natural law greater than life, making of it a servant? Or rather, is not life greater than natural law, making it a servant? Surely life, thought, mind, soul are greater than material forces. There must be mind and life back of natural forces.

Can the sightless create vision? Can the unthinking dead create thought? Can the unfeeling produce tenderness, sympathy, love? Did the hope that springs eternal in the heart come out of the clod of clay? To put the whole two theories tersely: The soul came down from God, or it came up from the clod.

Man either has a soul or he does not. And if he has a soul it either came from God by a miracle, or it came up from dead elements by the chemical operation of natural law. One must choose between the two theories.

Osborn's manner of reasoning in reaching his conclusion is certainly not often employed. He says that, "no new form of energy or of a new series of laws" entered the cosmos, yet there occurred a "re-combination of forces pre-existing in the cosmos," from which life arose, something never before on the earth. There was no change, either of "laws," or of "forces," yet two new effects occurred, (a) A "re-combination of forces," (b) Life appeared. There is no formula in logic more definitely settled, than that there can be no effect except when produced

by a cause. Every logician will freely assent to the proposition, that it is mechanically impossible for a new effect to appear except when produced by a new cause. Yet Osborn boldly declares as his opinion that no new "energies" nor "elements" came on the earth, and no "new series of laws" operated, yet 'the greatest fact of all time occurred, namely, life was originated. How was it possible to "re-combine forces," clearly a new effect, and produce life, the greatest effect ever to occur on the earth, all without the introduction of a single new element, new force, new series of laws—in short, without the least change in the existing order? The author is strongly persuaded that the serious student of today will demand more convincing reasoning than this before believing that man's soul was chemically produced by natural law from dead matter.

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

good parent who has tenderly loved and cared for it, so the soul pours out itself in praise, thanksgiving and worship to its Father of love. The soul came from God and yearns to return to God.

This explanation of the origin of the soul meets every requirement of reason and of fact. It fully reveals man to himself in body, mind and soul. It explains the origin of the soul and points the way to satisfy its every desire so as to elevate man to the noblest heights of morality, and to secure to him the greatest measure of happiness. It is the Sun of Righteousness that has illumined the pathway of the noblest characters that have graced the earth since the dawn of time down to the present day.

Evolution has no explanation of the origin of the soul. And not one of its aspirations does it satisfy. It offers nothing as an object of the universal attribute of worship higher than the clod of clay. It neither sheds a beam of light in the tomb, nor points to even one flickering star of hope. Like a mocking specter, it hovers over the couch of the dying saint, and whispers not one word of cheer. It is faithless, joyless, loveless, and as devoid of comfort as the miasma of death—all because it is soul-less.

Shall we here close this chapter with a few words uttered, when nearing the portals of the unseen world, by illustrious representatives of each theory, creation and evolution? Is it not well to pause in the morning of youth and interrogate the masters seeking our service, and ask: When my life-day of service shall have been faithfully given, what shall be my wage? Herbert Spencer was great both in intellect and opportunity. His life-day of service given to evolution's cause was long and faithful. Few men have served evolution's cause so long or so efficiently. What fruit had he as a reward for his service? In his eighty-third year he wrote: "The intellectual man, who occupies the same tenement with me, tells me that I am a piece of animated clay equipped with a nervous system and in some mysterious way connected with the big dynamo called the world; but that very soon now the current will be cut and I will fall into unconsciousness and nothingness. Yes, I am sad, unutterably sad, and I wish in my heart I had never heard of the intellectual man with his science, philosophy and logic." (*The Other*)

Side of Evolution, p. 14.) At the end of his life-day of faithful service in the cause of evolution Spencer's soul cried out in bitter anguish because it gave him not the faintest ray of hope. The theory of materialistic evolution at last overwhelmed him with unutterable sadness. He regarded himself as "but a piece of animated clay," and that he would soon "fall into nothingness."

The mariner, after having sailed tempestuous seas, as he nears his home port, gives a shout of joy as he visions safety and rest. The soul came from the Father of Spirits; it voyaged tempestuous seas of trial and sorrow, and as it draws near the home-port, like David, the creationist breaks out in ecstatic joy: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." And like Paul: "Death is swallowed up in victory; O, death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" Reader, is it possible that believing and serving truth, (if evolution be the truth) that it would desert its faithful servant at the end of four score and three years, and leave his soul in despair? Is it conceivable that believing a falsehood, (if creation be a falsehood) could fill its servant with inexpressible joy when ready to go out into the unseen world? "By their fruits ye shall know them," is as true as the eternal verities.

CHAPTER XV.

Fulfilled Prophecy

MANY miracles are recorded in the Bible. The purpose of miracles in most instances, is to confirm the word spoken or written. If one speaks and writes, and can work a miracle, it proves that the speaker or writer is supernaturally aided. Nicodemus stated the matter fairly when he said to the Master: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these signs that thou doest, except God be with him." Nicodemus admitted the miracles and was fair enough to admit that Jesus who performed the miracles was from God. Should one perform a miracle today, it would prove that one was aided from God, and what he said would be true.

Those who reject the miracle of the creation of man declare that they see no evidence of any miracle ever having been performed; that natural law has never been superceded by miraculous intervention. They say if there were any undoubted evidence of any miracle in the past, they could believe the other miracles recorded in the Bible. No well informed person claims that such miracles as healing the leper, giving sight to the blind, and raising the dead, are now occurring. Such miracles were clearly given at first to "confirm the word" spoken, and it was clearly stated that they should cease. (I Cor. 13:8). But there are two classes of evidence that may justly be called miracles, that to many minds are even stronger evidence of supernatural agency than healing the sick. Healing the sick and the leper are quickly done, and there is the possibility that the eyes might be deceived. But the evidences now to be introduced are subject to no such dangers of deception. They are present everywhere, have been carefully observed, and examined and criti-

cized for centuries. One of these is prophecy, and the other is the character of the contents of the Bible itself. This chapter will be devoted to a very brief examination of prophecy. The character of the contents of the Bible itself as evidence of its Divine origin, will be discussed in following chapters.

Suppose that a man should appear today and specifically predict what would happen one hundred years in the future. And suppose a careful historical record should be kept of the prediction. In one hundred years from now the prophecy is literally fulfilled. Who could then doubt that the one who made the prediction was aided by supernatural power? That such a test would be fair, perhaps all will agree. Have we any such evidence of the divine inspiration of the Bible? Many of the writers declared that the things they wrote were to be fulfilled long in the future. Surely we should now be able to know whether these predictions have been, and are still being fulfilled in our presence.

Nearly four thousand years ago God called Abraham and said: "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house and I will bless thee, and make thee great and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." (Gen. 12:1-2, 22:18.) This is a promise in prophecy, embracing all future nations, and clearly implies it will continue as long as time itself. If this prophecy had behind it no higher authority than man, it would stand out as the greatest example of audacious presumption, perhaps, in history. In that case, it would fail of the least evidence of fulfillment. The very thought of a prophetic promise of such immense magnitude is overwhelming. If this promise has been, and is still being fulfilled, it must then be regarded as unquestioned proof that it was divinely inspired.

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

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

1. There is only one God who is the creator of all things.
2. That one God created Adam and Eve, in his own image, the first of the race of man; and joined them in matrimony as husband and wife and commanded them to keep the marriage state in fidelity. And thus the monogamous family was established.
3. He wrote the decalogue, or ten commandments.
4. Moses also wrote the prophetic promise to the Jews: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee: and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." (Deut. 18:17-18.) This promise refers to Christ and the gospel. All that is worthwhile in modern civilization grows out of the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." In fact, the present civilization, or all that is good in it, grows out of the five basic ideas in that promise. These ideas are, (a) one God of holy attributes, (b) man, created in the likeness of God, (c) the family of one husband and one wife, faithful to each other, (d) the moral power of the ten commandments, (e) Christ and the gospel. These are the foundation on which all true and permanent progress of the race is based. Remove from the mind the idea of one God, infinite in wisdom, mercy and love, and no worthy object of worship remains. All that is left are the deities of man's invention, to which are ascribed debased passions, the worship of which plunges man deeper into the depths of degradation. Destroy the monogamous family—one wife, one husband, in chaste union—and the very pillars of morality and civilization itself are gone. It began in the morning of creation, and was taught by Moses and commanded by Christ. The monogamous family has been the foundation of all good and stability in people and nations since history began. just to the extent &at the family has been kept pure. to that extent have peoples and nations advanced. And perhaps when it is stated that the chief cause of the decline and

fall of all nations in past history was due almost entirely to a violation of the chastity of the family relation, the statement will be approved. And were it possible to mate chaste, virgin young men and young women in marriage, and have them keep this union in fidelity for three generations, the larger part of human sorrows and body-ills would disappear. That more sorrows grow out of sexual sins, in wedlock and out of wedlock, than any other cause, probably all will agree. That many of the ills of the body are a result of the same cause, any physician will testify.

Remove the belief that man came from God, was made in his likeness, and implant the belief that he came up from the animal, and the greatest restraint against evil and incentive to good is removed. Destroy the knowledge of the ten commandments and even modern business would collapse. A sense of accountability to God, a due regard for property rights, of the sanctity of agreements, support business relations with some measure of certainty. Remove from the earth the record of the life of Jesus, the sermon on the mount and the rest of the gospel, and mercy would largely perish from the earth. What nation not under the strong influence of these live ideas has ever engaged in works of human sympathy and service? Where did any people ever give their money and service to relieve suffering and sorrow, except those in whose hearts Jesus had first been enshrined as an object of veneration? Even hospitals are unknown except as established by those who are largely influenced by these ideals. Where did political liberty ever exist except where the "nations were blessed" by the five ideas already mentioned that came in fulfillment of the promise, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed?" During the last two thousand years nearly all the nations have been blessed in fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham. At the present time there is no nation and but few people who have not been benefitted in some measure by Moses and the law, and by Christ and the gospel. The prophetic promise made to Abraham nearly four thousand years ago is still being literally fulfilled in the lives of the most highly civilized peoples of the world. It is not a theory but a living fact, known to all men of discernment.

Out of the promise made to Abraham came Moses who revealed one God, who created the first two of the race in his own image; joined them in chaste wedlock, and thus established the monogamous family; the moral law; Christ and the gospel. From these come all that make life worth living on the earth. Destroy these ideas and their fruits and evolutionists themselves would wish to migrate to another planet, or at least get away from the conditions that would prevail. We enjoy the "blessings" growing out of the promise. Why accept the blessings and deny the Divine inspiration of the promise?

The prophetic promise made to Abraham was of a general character, yet sufficiently specific that its fulfillment has been demonstrated. just a few of the many specific, definite prophecies will now be given. Moses led the Israelites or Jews out of Egypt and gave them the law. The reward promised for keeping the law was to be peace and prosperity in the land of Canaan, their future home. But he prophesied that they would fail to keep the law and would suffer from invasion of other nations. He prophesied the coming of the Roman army, described its appearance, and the utter destruction of the city of Jerusalem almost as minutely in many particulars, and as vividly as Josephus did after having been an eye witness of the most horrible spectacle recorded in history. Read carefully the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy and the record given fifteen hundred years later of what actually occurred, and then decide whether one not aided by inspiration could have foretold such a catastrophe years in advance.

Concerning the future of Babylon at the time it was the capital of a great empire, Isaiah prophesied: "And Babylon, the glory of the kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldeans' pride, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabians pitch their tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their flocks to lie down there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and ostriches shall dwell there; and wild goats shall dance there. And wolves shall cry in their castles, and jackals in the pleasant palaces: and her time is near

to come, and her days shall not be prolonged" (Isaiah, 13th chapter). This specific prophecy of the utter destruction of the greatest political capital existing at that time on the earth was

made many years before it occurred. But most convincing of all, the prophecy declared that Babylon should remain an utter desolation. So complete was its destruction that for many years its site was perhaps in doubt. How could anyone not divinely inspired not only foretell the doom of a great political capital, but also vividly describe its conditions more than two thousand years in the future? Of course many cities have been entirely ruined, but they were generally rebuilt to some extent. But Babylon still remains in utter desolation. From the point of view of human reason and lack of foreknowledge of future events, it would be no more unreasonable should some one write a similar prediction concerning Washington, the capital of our nation. A few sentences from the New International Encyclopedia: "Alexander made Babylon his capital, and it was there he died. After this the glory of Babylon departs. She rapidly sinks into insignificance, and long before the Arabs overran Mesopotamia, all traces of Babylon and of the great centers of Babylonia had disappeared." For many long years the only sign of industry and activity on the desolate site of the once most glorious city of the earth, that was the "pride and glory of the Chaldeans," has been the sound of the pick and shovel of the archaeologist.

Concerning the future of the Jews, Jeremiah prophesied: "Fear not thou, O Jacob my servant, saith Jehovah; for I am with thee: for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee; but I will not make a full end of thee, but I will correct thee in measure, and will in no wise leave thee unpunished" (Jer. 46:28). This specific prophecy was that the nations among whom the Jews were driven should have a "full end made" of them. But while the Jews were to be chastised, yet they should remain a distinct race. It was made some two thousand even hundred years ago, and has been, and is still being fulfilled to the letter. Every nation among which the Jews were scattered before, and at the destruction of Jerusalem has long ceased to exist as a distinct nation. The Jews were very nearly destroyed in the year seventy two, when Jerusalem was razed to

the ground. They have been scattered among many nations, persecuted beyond belief and still they remain one of the most virile races, numbering nearly twenty millions, and are exerting a tremendous influence on world affairs, both economic and political.

Many similar specific prophecies could be cited together with the historical record of their fulfillment, but the brevity of this volume forbids. These are merely suggestions for the further study of this rich field of evidences of the inspiration of the Bible.

CHAPTER XVI

Harmony of the Bible

THE truth of a proposition may be argued from several different points, but in the final analysis it is found to rest on a specific fact. This is especially true of the theories of creation and evolution. The specific fact is this: Was the Bible divinely inspired? In other words, did the Holy Spirit dictate to the writers of the Bible the things that they wrote? If the answer be yes, then the Bible as originally given was not only true but infallible. And in so far as it has been correctly transcribed and translated, it is still true and infallible. And the evidences of its inspiration must be sought chiefly in the Bible itself. The fruits that its teachings bear in the lives of men are sound arguments, but are secondary to the internal evidences.

That Moses, the Old Testament prophets and the writers of the New Testament represent God, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, as speaking through them, is well known. If God therefore is the author of the Bible, it must bear evidence in its contents worthy of such an author. But if men unaided could have produced the Bible, then it must be judged as having originated with man.

If a painting is exhibited as the work of a world-famed artist, the painting itself must be the chief source of proof. If it is in every way sufficiently high in character of workmanship to be worthy of the famed artist, it argues strongly for its genuineness. But if its character is such that an ordinary artist could have produced it, then it could never pass as the work of a master-artist.

Now if men, unaided by divine power, could have written such a book as the Bible, then it must be regarded as the work of men.

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

Starting with Genesis and ending with Revelation, about forty men had part in writing the Bible. The time from the first writing to its completion was about sixteen hundred years. The writing was done in different countries, under different forms of civil governments, surrounded by different forms of religions, varying greatly in their ideals and ceremonies, and constantly changing from one epoch to a later period. And it is well known that the ideas and ideals of the people of these different countries underwent great changes during the some sixteen hundred years that the Bible was in process of being written. And every idea and ideal in religion held by the rest of the world other than the writers of the Bible was not only different from those recorded in the Bible, but was unalterably opposed to them. Yet the combined influence of the rest of the world was powerless to shape the thought of the writers of the Bible. And this fact is a marvelous thing, unequalled in all history. The writings of uninspired men are always highly colored by the thought, customs and religions of the countries and periods in which they write. The form of government, religious ideas, social customs—all creep into the writings of historians, moralists and writers on other matters. No man unaided by divine power has ever been able to throw off entirely the effects of his immediate environment. The most learned critics affirm that they can tell very nearly the exact date of any ancient writing, merely by its style of composition, contents and general characteristics. They know that the prevailing thought of the period, and the environment leave their imprint on the writings of the men of such periods and environments.

And no two men, outside of the Bible, have ever been able to write history or doctrine without many disagreements and often contradictions. More than this, every man who has written voluminously over a period of yens, has left discrepancies in his history, and modifications in his philosophy. And not at all in

frequently writers have abandoned views held in early life and adopted other views quite different. That these statements are true is abundantly witnessed by the writings of all men who have left writings behind them. It has never happened for a number of men, or even one man with himself, so to agree that their writings are entirely harmonious. As much as it is to be desired, men do not entirely agree in their application of Bible teaching and practice. And it is perhaps always true that men who write on Bible subjects, modify in some measure their ideas later in life. Variation, change, and fallibility are written large on all that man does.

The Bible is composed of sixty-six smaller books, written by about forty different men, covering a period of about sixteen hundred years; transcribed many times; translated from one language to another by religious partizans, and yet there is not a contradiction in it, and but few seeming discrepancies. It begins with one historical fact, that man was created complete in the moral likeness of God, without any ancestors, as the head of the race. The second historical statement of fact is that man sinned, and was separated from God. Out of these two historical statements of facts the Bible grew to its end. The one and only purpose held in view through its pages was to redeem man, bring him back again into spiritual fellowship with his Creator, and at last, as Revelations declares as accomplished, to the habitation of God himself. The thread of the purpose ultimately to bring man back to immortality, runs straight through the entire Bible. No novelist ever wrote straight through his book to the revelation of his plot as We forty writers of the Bible during the period of about sixteen hundred years held in view man's eternal redemption in a glorified state.

There is not a single contradiction in its historical statements nor a single discrepancy in its moral teachings. The moral standards were raised as the plan of redemption unfolded from the Patriarchal into the Mosaic dispensations, and finally into the fullness of the spiritual teachings of the gospel of Christ.

About forty men contributed to its pages. The most of them were unknown to each other. There was no possible chance for agreement among them as to the plan and purpose of the one

book of sixty-six parts. About sixteen hundred years elapsed from its beginning to its completion. The different writers lived in different countries, during many changes, politically, socially and religiously. But every writer held to every fundamental principle; one God of holy attributes; man's creation in his image, his sin and God's purpose to redeem him. The combined influence of the rest of the world was powerless to corrupt the writers of the Bible, by injecting into its pages any modification, to say nothing of outright corruption, of any of these fundamental teachings. The practice of the religion enjoined in the Bible, during each dispensation, has often been perverted and corrupted by those into whose hands it was committed. But it is marvelous that the teaching in its text as originally revealed has remained uncorrupted. The fact that not only the Jews to whom the law was given, but also Gentiles who professed to be followers of Jesus, have often taught a perverted theology, and a shamefully corrupted practice, and yet did not corrupt the text of the Bible in a great measure, is sufficient to challenge the consideration of all seriously thinking men. How often it has been transcribed since the original copies were written is not known. Part of it has been carried to foreign and hostile lands, yet it has returned. It has often been in the custody of those who were its enemies. The Jews to whom most of it was first given perverted its doctrine and degraded its services to the level of idolatry.

For nearly two thousand years Gentile believers have been the custodians of the Bible. And it has often fared no better at their hands than with the Jews. They have likewise perverted its teaching and practice. Yet the purity of its matchless doctrine, its unity of purpose—the salvation of man—and the harmony of its history remains unharmed. What has protected the Bible from being corrupted while passing through so many evil hands when being preserved, transcribed and translated? Why did not those who transcribed the ancient copies pervert the text so as to harmonize with their personal views? What power overshadowed it so as to prevent those who preserved, transcribed and translated it, from corrupting its text so as to justify their perverted practices? The Presence that dictated the first copies has overshadowed its pages to protect the purity of its text. Not

that those who transcribed and translated it were inspired, but if God inspired the first copies, most assuredly He would so guard it that it should not be corrupted, but be preserved to accomplish his purpose. "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isa. 55:11). The harmony of its history; the oneness of its purpose—the salvation of man—the unity and perfect agreement of its moral teaching; wrought by forty men covering a period of sixteen hundred years, proves that it was inspired, or that these forty men, unaided by divine guidance, performed a feat amounting to as great a miracle as inspiration. The superhuman was accomplished. The miraculous was attained. Since these forty men accomplished a unity and harmony never before or since achieved by any company of men or by one man with himself, who can doubt that the original copies were inspired by the Holy Spirit?

CHAPTER XVII

Impartiality of the Bible

HISTORIES of nations and biographies of men make up a large part of our literature. Partiality is without a doubt the most outstanding characteristic of their contents. National histories magnify the virtues, and omit or minimize the faults of their favorites, and magnify the faults, and omit or minimize the virtues of those toward whom they do not feel so kindly. It has often been said that a fair, true history has never been written of the war between the two sections of the United States. Neither Northern nor Southern historians are able to rise to the high plane of exact fairness and impartiality. In spite of themselves their histories are all colored by their prejudices creeping in. And what historian has ever admitted and recorded the least fault of our own nation in any dispute or war with any foreign nation? To deny any mistake by our nation is to assume perfection. And what nation engaged in the World War has voluntarily admitted any fault whatever for beginning that war? Historians on both sides have labored hard to clear their own nations of all guilt for the outbreak of hostilities. Of course one nation signed a document admitting full responsibility for starting it. But while tracing admission of guilt with the pen, with the lips it was vehemently denied, and has been denied till this day. It is not intimated here that all the nations involved were equally guilty of starting the World War, or of any other war. The point is that in all national disputes and wars, neither side is impartial enough to admit any mistake on its part, nor to grant to the other side any measure of justification for its course. All virtue and fairness assumed, and all blame denied, predominate in the histories dealing with international matters. Partiality characterizes every page written by the parties directly interested.

Biographies of men are largely made up of exaggerated eulogies of the virtues, and omission of the faults of the subjects. Biographers of Napoleon were all rank partizans. His enemies maligned him and would have him appear as the very incarnation of evil. His friends praised him above the deserts of man.

Who has written impartial biographies of our own good and great statesmen? Who has recorded the faults as well as the virtues, the mistakes as well as the virtues of such noble characters as Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and a host of other admirable statesmen?

It is not implied here that the faults of such men as those whose names have just been given should be laid bare on the pages of their biographies. We are most likely right in thinking it not best to do so in human productions that it is not done too vividly. No judgment on the wisdom of the course of uninspired men in writing biographies is intended to be expressed by the author. The thought expressed is that in all human writings, partiality is noted on every page. And in past ages, this partiality was far more notable than in our own day. Writings that were recorded during the period when the Bible was in the process of being written, are so unreliable in their statements, that it is a great task of modern historians to separate the fact from the fiction.

Both creationists and evolutionists are rank partizans. Not one in either company is able to rise to a plane of impartiality when writing concerning men of the opposite party. H. H. Newman, professor of Zoology in the University of Chicago, was the most noted evolutionist who attended the Scopes' trial in Tennessee. The two outstanding men at the trial were Clarence Darrow, the nationally known agnostic, and William Jennings Bryan, one of the noblest characters and most unwavering creationists of the last century. Referring to Mr. Darrow, Newman says: "Though he has brought upon himself the scorn of fundamentalists by classing himself as an agnostic, he has a personality and character that made such an appeal to the scientists associated with him in the trial that they presented him with a memorandum testifying to their respect for his ability, integrity, high-mindedness, and moral sensitiveness" (*Evolution, Genetics and*

Eugenics, p. 48). This was indeed very high praise of Mr. Darrow. Was the great spiritually-minded Bryan, Darrow's equal in high character? Yet evolutionists gave him no "memorandum" attesting such high esteem for him. On the other hand, Newman has in his book enough slurs against Bryan to make a fairly long chapter.

The history in the Bible is impartial beyond the power of man unaided to attain. The good and the bad are stated in a simple, unadorned manner, with neither praise nor blame. The sin of Adam and of his son Cain are simply stated and the penalties pronounced. Noah's disobedience and shame are both recorded. The faithfulness of Abraham received no eulogy, was just plainly stated, and his deception was not omitted. Jacob's act in deceiving his father in order to obtain his blessing, and the deception of his own sons in order to account for Joseph's absence, are the simplest recitals of facts. No tirade of abuse nor effort to excuse appears in the record. David's commendable acts and traits of character, and his weakness, sin and bitter repentance are recorded just as impartially as though he were a bond-servant, even though he was the beloved king. The wise choice of Solomon in asking for wisdom, his good start in his reign, his apostasy, even going into idolatry, his sin and folly, are stated as free from exaggeration or excuse as if the statements were being made about inanimate objects, rather than about the most regal king that ever reigned over Israel. The idolatry and sins of a long line of kings are recorded with neither acrimonious censure nor explanatory excuses.

These records were all made by the Jews about themselves. When they were defeated in war, they just stated the simple facts. When their capitol city, Jerusalem, was destroyed and many of their number carried to foreign lands, they made no extenuating apology. They just frankly stated the facts and admitted that their misfortunes were due entirely to their own sins. Where is there a line in all other history in which the writers charged themselves with being at fault when they were defeated in war? The historians of no other people have approached the degree of impartiality shown in the history of the Jews written about themselves. They not only recorded their

misfortunes, but often predicted beforehand the coming of calamities, and in every instance placed the blame on themselves. In every instance, they admitted that their misfortunes were because of their own sins.

The rivalry among the twelve while Jesus was still with them is recorded without excuse. Peter's denial of Jesus and repentance is not shielded nor excused. The contention between Peter and Paul, two leading apostles, stands in the record as a superhuman example of impartiality. The strife and parties in the church at Corinth and their degrading the communion to the level of revelry is recorded by Paul. Jesus, and a number of apostles foretold the fact of a general apostasy from the model of the first church and the simple gospel as first preached by the apostles. The whole book of Revelation is devoted nearly entirely to a prophetic description of the foretold apostasy, the persecution and martyrdom of countless numbers because of their fidelity to Jesus. When did those who set in motion enterprises, or organized governments, ever foretell their troubles and fall, as has happened to all political governments? How can this the only such case in all the annals of history be explained on any other ground than of the inspiration of the Bible?

Why did the writers of the Bible record the evil as well as the good in the lives of individuals and nations? Doubtless to show that though these were good men, yet they were human, and liable to mistakes even as good men now make mistakes. Had they been pictured as perfect men, their mistakes left unrecorded, it would have been the strongest kind of evidence that the characters were fictitious, for the best men now make mistakes. While the Bible records the sins of the men whose lives are portrayed, yet there is not a line that indicates that the Author of the Bible approved the wrong deeds.

The Bible is not the work of one man, but of about forty; it is not a record of a short period of time, and isolated persons and happenings, but includes many different countries, and embraces a period of about sixteen hundred years. And the writers in every instance were as fair and impartial toward their enemies as they were toward their own nation and personal friends. How can this impartiality, nowhere else attained, be explained? The answer is left with the reader.

CHAPTER XVIII

The Life and Teachings of Jesus

THE value and source of the origin of any material object or mental ideal is proved by its contents, or by what it assays. The value and source of the origin of the lump of ore is determined, not by the verbal testimony of its owner, but by what it assays. If it assays only iron, then its iron content sets its value, and indicates its origin. If it assays gold, then its value must be measured and its origin determined by its gold content.

Whatever may be said about the Bible, its value and origin must at last be determined by its contents. If its contents have been, or can be, equaled by men unaided by divine power, then it must be judged to have had only a human origin. But if the Bible is clearly seen to surpass in some vital feature the work of any man or company of men, it is but logical, then, to believe that it had a divine origin. Could a fairer test be offered?

That Jesus the Christ is the center to which the entire Bible points, and from whom it radiates, is perhaps universally, admitted. His Divinity and the inspiration of the Bible are inseparably linked, and both must stand or fall on the life he lived and the doctrine he taught.

Four unlearned Jews, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, wrote four biographies of Jesus, and four records of his teaching. Each of the four described a life and affirmed that it was lived by Jesus. Each of the four recorded a moral and spiritual doctrine and affirmed that it was taught by Jesus. These biographies and teachings of Jesus, have been without a doubt more intensely and critically examined than any others ever written. Many of the keenest intellects among men, whose purpose and desire was to

discover faults in the life and doctrine, have been more intensely focused on these record, than the astronomer's telescope on the most interesting constellation of the heavens. If there had been faults in the life pictured, or in the doctrine recorded, they would have been discovered a thousand times. No other life and doctrine have ever been subjected to so intense partisan, critical tests, as have been the life and teaching of Jesus. It is safe to say that not a single fault has ever been discovered in the life so vividly portrayed by his four unlearned biographers. When measured by the highest standards set by the wisest and best men of the earth, the verdict is that no wrong word or act is discovered. For nearly two thousand years the universal verdict of friend and foe has been that which was first uttered by Pilate, the Roman Governor: "I find no fault in him." The universal decision is that his life as recorded is without a fault. And it is admitted that if his teachings were lived up to, it would cure the moral ills of the world.

Here are four biographies of a life, purporting to be the life and teaching of Jesus, and the world has been unable to discover a fault in either the life portrayed or the doctrine recorded. If Jesus lived the faultless life and taught the perfect doctrine, then he was Divine, and his biographers were supernaturally guided in describing the life and recording the doctrine. If he did not live the faultless life and teach the perfect doctrine, then his four unlearned biographers invented and described the faultless life and invented and recorded the perfect doctrine. In this view, four unlearned Jews invented and wrote the only faultless biographies, forged and recorded the only records of a perfect doctrine the world has ever known. To deny that Jesus was Divine, lived the life and taught the doctrine, is equal to affirming that the four unlearned Jews attained a perfection never before nor since reached in history of literature. Each of these four described a faultless character. No other biographer, in real life or in the field of fiction, has ever portrayed a faultless life. That feat has been achieved only by the four unlearned Jews and ascribed to Jesus. Novelists have had the liberty to draw on their imagina-

tions, unhampered by reality, yet none have drawn an imaginary picture of one in whose life was found no fault.

Some may possibly set up the claim that the life of Jesus is not now present as a reality, that we only have the biographies of him. Most assuredly no such objection can be urged against the moral and spiritual doctrine ascribed to him as its author. The doctrine is still with us. It has been and still is being subjected to the most critical examination. The doctrine is a living reality. And its faultlessness remains unchallenged.

Each of the four unlearned Jews achieved a perfection in literature that has never been approached by any other men in the history of letters. Each of the four wrote a biography describing a faultless life, and each of the four recorded a doctrine without a fault. Here are eight features achieved by four unlearned men never before nor since equaled by any others in recorded literature. Many of the greatest men of the earth have written splendid doctrines to guide men to a better life. But every one of them has been found faulty and susceptible of improvement. The moral and spiritual doctrine recorded by the four unlearned Jews is faultlessly adapted to the needs of every race and for all time. As a remedy for moral ills, it is as broad as the human family and as enduring as time. Its universality surely is an evidence of its divine origin. Countless biographies have been written of the great and good, by the most skillful and partisan friends, who either modified or entirely omitted the faults, and magnified virtues, yet many serious faults are plainly seen in the lives of the subjects. Failure has been written large across every attempt to portray in words a perfect character, except the one here considered.

The unavoidable conclusion is one or the other of the two following:

- First: That Jesus did not live the faultless life and teach the faultless doctrine attributed to him by his biographers. In that case, they invented the life and doctrine, which is equal to affirming that they were divinely aided in

order to write the only faultless life-story, and to record the only perfect doctrine the world has ever known.

Second: That Jesus is Divine, lived the faultless life and taught the faultless doctrine attributed to him, and that his biographers were supernaturally aided in recording his teaching and portraying his life.

CHAPTER XIX

Anno Domini

ANNO DOMINI, signifying, In the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and thirty-eight. In the briefest possible manner it is expressed by four simple characters written in this order, 1-9-3-8. The number of times these four simple characters will be written in this order today will doubtless run into the billions. And the number of times they will be written in this order during the present year will be very nearly innumerable. Arranged in any order but 1-9-3-8, they could have had but little influence on the daily lives of perhaps one thousand two hundred million people. But written in this order, they affect every phase of the daily lives of perhaps three-fourths of the people of the whole world. We are so familiar with their use, that we do not stop and ask the great question: Written in this order what do these four simple characters signify? Primarily they mean date in time.

Erase from all printed and written documents that date, 1938, and all of its related dates, as 1930, 1910, and on back, and civilization itself would perish, The thought of the consequences is appalling. Letters of correspondence would be very nearly meaningless. Newspapers and other periodicals would lose their interest. Erase this and all related dates and every contract, agreement and obligation between persons, firms and other associations of men would be void. For unless dated, no agreement in business is enforceable. Without date no criminal can be prosecuted, and no prisoner held behind bars. Date of crime and date of indictment must precede trial. Date of conviction, and date of expiration of sentence must be present, else no prisoner can be held behind bars. Unless deeds are dated no one can lay claim to

real estate. And as appalling as it may seem, yet it is true that if date as expressed in 1938, and all its related dates were destroyed, by the same act law itself would be destroyed. Under civilization, unless dated, laws are not enforceable. There would be an end to all legal rewards, and all penalties for crime. Government as we know it, would no longer exist. Treaties between nations would be void. The orderly intercourse of nations would end.

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

If the date, 1938, and its related dates were erased from all printed and written documents, three-fourths of the people of the whole world would be in the utmost confusion and disorder. All social life is based on date. All business transactions, agreements, rights to real estate have no value unless dated. All laws, their rewards and penalties, are without effect unless dated. The power of date binds people together in every active phase of their lives. Its destruction would reduce them to the state of confusion of savages who live without date.

What event created this date? The birth of a child. Because of a lack of a better lodging place for his mother, he was born in a stable. The date, 1938, and all its related dates point to the birth of that child in Bethlehem. The influence of that birth had within it the power so to influence men and nations so that three-fourths of the most advanced people of the world date every important event of their lives, even of their own birth, pointing to that birth. No other event of time has ever so deeply interwoven itself into the very fabric of the lives of so many people.

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

Without pointing to the birth of Jesus, history would be practically meaningless. The distinctions between ancient, medieval and modern history would largely disappear. The birth in Bethlehem is the center of recorded time. All history is written as B.C. or A.D., which means so many years before Christ's birth, or so many years after his birth. Time is reckoned from that birth; so many years before that birth or so many years after that birth. Remove the influence of that birth and time would be very nearly meaningless to three-fourths of the people of the world. How long till the people of the whole world will in every important transaction of life sign his birth certificate? Was he only man? Or was he God manifested in the flesh? How can the influence of his birth be accounted for otherwise than that he still lives and reigns from his throne in heaven?

CHAPTER XX

Can One Believe Both?

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

A few evolutionists talk about a God and religion. Upon a careful examination, it will be found to be a far different conception of God than the God revealed in the Bible, and an entirely different idea of religion than the religion of Christ. Their idea is that man has inherited from his animal ancestors a religious instinct, probably a vestige of some abnormal fear complex, that has not been entirely lost in his upward progress. The religion of Christ is designed wholly to bring man back as far as possible to the sinless state from which Christianity teaches he has fallen, and ultimately to a full immortality. The two chief stones on which the whole superstructure of Christianity is built, are man's fall from a sinless state, and the Divine inspiration of the Bible. Both of these, leading evolutionists categorically deny. Whatever religion one may believe in, while believing the theory of evolution, must be a religion without the following fundamentals that form the basis of Christianity: (a) that man was created in the moral likeness of God, (b) that man sinned and fell, (c) that Christ was miraculously born of a virgin, (d) that his death in any way atoned for sin, (e) that Christ was raised from the dead, (f) that he will come again, raise all the dead, reward the faithful, and dwell with them forever. Every one of these fundamen-

tals, evolutionists deny. Whatever religion one may embrace along with true evolution, will lack every one of these fundamentals. If man was not created sinless, he did not fall by sinning. If he has not fallen, then he needs no redeemer. If the Bible was not inspired and from God, by what law or standard can man be judged a sinner? And to what sort of a God can man be justly held accountable, unless that God has revealed a law by which he may be justly judged a sinner? If God has not revealed himself in the Bible, and given man a law by which to be governed, then what becomes of any responsibility of man to God at all? Unless God has revealed to man a law for his guidance, then most assuredly he cannot be justly held accountable. For if God has not given man a law in the Bible by which to be governed, then man can have no law except that of his own making, that fixes its own rewards and penalties, and his accountability ends with his obligations to civil government.

And if man is not to be raised from the dead and rewarded in a future life, then why have any religion at all? Of what value can any religion be, if not to save man from sin, and give him a better life in the world to come? Hear Paul: "But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised; and if Christ hath not been raised, then our preaching is vain, your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God: because we witnessed that God raised up Christ; whom he hath not raised up, if so be that the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, neither hath Christ been raised: and if Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." (1 Cor. 15:13-17.) Paul here bases all the value of Christianity in this life, and all hope of future life on the truth or falsity of the declaration that Christ was raised from the dead. When one can believe at the same time both evolution and Christianity he can run east and west with the same stride.

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

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

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

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

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

H. H. Newman, University of Chicago, wrote his answers with pen at bottom of page of questions as follows:

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

Mr. Newman is an evolutionist of the first rank, and it is safe to say he represents very fairly the position held by the leading evolutionists of the present day. It will be noted that he emphatically declares his disbelief in the inspiration of any part of the Bible, the virgin birth of Jesus, the atonement of Christ's death, any resurrection, future judgment, in short, that man will live apart from the body in which he now dwells.

Mr. Newman quotes, with approval, from Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, the pastor of what is usually referred to as the Rockefeller church in New York City. Rev. Fosdick, it may be safely said, is the leader among clergymen who call themselves evolutionists. The quotation is as follows: "They insist," says Rev. Fosdick, "that we must all believe in the historicity of certain miracles, pre-eminently the virgin birth of our Lord; that we must believe in a special theory of inspiration—that the original documents of Scriptures, which of course we no longer possess, were inerrantly dictated to man a good deal as a man might dictate to his stenographer; that we must believe in a special theory of atonement—that the blood of our Lord, shed in a substitutionary death, placates an alienated Deity and makes possible welcome for the returned sinner; and that we must believe in a second coming of our Lord upon the clouds of heaven to set up a millennium here as the only way God can bring history to a

denouement" (*Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics*, p. 62). Fosdick here attributes some things to creationists not held by most of them. It is not the purpose here to enter into a scriptural and logical refutation of Rev. Fosdick's position. The chief aim is clearly to show the utter impossibility of believing both evolution and Christianity at the same time. It will be noted here that in this short paragraph Fosdick denies by implication the following: (a) the virgin birth of Jesus, (b) the inspiration of the Scriptures, (c) the atonement of the blood of Christ, (d) and that Jesus will come again upon the clouds of heaven. Take these five truths out of Christianity and there is no more left than what is found in the teaching of heathen philosophers. His declarations eliminate every vestige of supernatural intervention in man's redemption. In fact, if the Bible is not inspired, the whole of what is called Christianity is only the work of man unaided by God. In that case it would be the work of men, and subject to man's revision and improvement. And this brings us to the very heart of the whole theory. Evolutionists hold that man was evolved from the lowest form of life, upward to his present state, and in the same way, religion has been evolved from the lowest form of heathen worship up to the more enlightened form known as Christianity.

The two theories, evolution and Christianity, are so diametrically opposed to each other in every item, that it is utterly impossible to harmonize them. This fact is keenly realized by evolutionists themselves, and when off their guard, they frankly make the admission. Mr. Newman was undoubtedly the outstanding evolutionist present at the famous Scopes' trial at Dayton, Tennessee. After returning to Chicago, he propounded to himself a number of questions, among them the following: "Was it a fight to the death between Christianity and agnosticism with Bryan as champion of Christianity as opposed to Darrow the arch-agnostic?" Following his list of questions he comments as follows: "Since my return from the trial I have heard most of these questions propounded and have asked them of myself. The situation still remains indefinite in my mind after earnest reflection" (*Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics*, p. 47). A chapter of similar quotations could be made. But these are sufficient. Mr. Newman has been selected as among the leading evolutionists

who are avowed agnostics, and Rev. Fosdick as easily the outstanding evolutionist among preachers. Both these leaders, among their respective associates, talk of religion. They argue that evolution and religion both may be believed and accepted at the same time. But the religion they talk about is entirely different from Christianity. They emphatically deny the following fundamentals held by all creationists:

1. The inspiration of the Bible.
2. The creation of man in the moral image of God.
3. That man sinned and fell.
4. That Jesus was miraculously born of a virgin.
5. That his death in any way atoned for sin.
6. That he was raised from the dead.
7. That he will come again and raise all the dead.
8. That there will be any general judgment when the righteous will be rewarded.

Any religion that emphatically denies these eight fundamentals certainly cannot be called Christianity. And what salvation could a religion stripped of these bring to man? The question brings us to the very heart of the whole theory of religion, held by the leading evolutionists. They do not believe for a moment that man is lost. Hence he needs no salvation. They deny any future judgment and rewards. And Paul says: "If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable." Their idea is that man has inherited a religious sense or instinct from the brute creation similar to his esthetic tastes. If he is so disposed, let him exercise his religious inclination. But they hold that religion is not necessary to save man, for they deny any future state of existence, either of salvation or of being lost.

The leading evolutionists, both among clergymen and those who call themselves scientists, deny every fundamental here stated. The whole theory in its every vital point, is diametrically opposed to every vital truth taught in Christianity. Evolutionists reject every thought of supernatural intervention, either in man's creation or his redemption. Burriss Jenkins, a noted preacher of Kansas City, succinctly expressed the idea of leading evolutionists when he said: "Christianity is not the truth,

but a search after the truth." The two theories, evolution and Christianity, cannot be harmonized. The choice must be made between the two theories. Our Creator has made us free moral agents. He favored man above all the rest of his creation. Man is the noblest work of God, bearing his image, and should join David in saying: "Bless the Lord, O my soul and forget not all his benefits: Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; Who healeth all thy diseases: Who satisfieth thy mouth with good things; so that thy youth is renewed like the eagle's."

CHAPTER XXI

Two Monuments and Life

FAITH in past events is based on credible evidence. Evidence is of two kinds, written narrative and monuments. Monuments are of two kinds, fixed statues or pillars, and movable commemorative observances. Written history bears witness to the fact of the life and work of George Washington. The granite shaft, erected to his memory in Washington, D.C., is a fixed monument, remaining in one place to be seen, also bears witness to his life and work as a statesman. It confirms written history. Without the life and work of Washington as a soldier and statesman, who would have erected such a monument to his memory?

Written history testifies to the signing of the Declaration of the Independence of the thirteen American colonies. The observance of the Fourth of July is a movable monument testifying to the fact of the signing of that Declaration. It is a monument and confirming witness testifying to a past event. It is movable because it may be observed in many different places. Had no such declaration ever been signed, how could so great a monumental observance have ever been established? Both kinds of monuments are properly regarded by many as the surest character of evidence of the truth of the historical fact to which they point and commemorate. If there be any difference between written historical statements, and historical monuments, of the kind here described, the monuments are the more reliable—subject to the least doubt.

The evidences attesting the claim of Jesus as the Son of God are of two kinds. The first is the written history of his life and work. The second is observances that commemorate events in

his life and work—movable monuments—that may be observed in different places.

Certain types of keenly inquiring minds ask for some evidences outside of the written history of the life and work of Jesus. They ask for some present evidence, that may be critically examined, and that will unmistakably confirm the written record of his life and work. They contend that the affirmed miracles recorded in the New Testament are no longer observed, and therefore, there is now no evidence of the claim of Jesus as the Son of God except the unconfirmed historical record. It is here admitted that miracles, in the common meaning of that word, are no longer occurring. The New Testament Scriptures plainly declare that miracles were performed for the special purpose of confirming the word spoken. But when the revelation should be complete, miracles would cease. (See Acts 2:22, 1 Cor. 13:8-13, 11 Cor. 12:12, Heb. 2:4, and many similar passages).

While miracles served their first purpose in confirming the spoken word, they still confirm the written word. Yet we have with and around us, evidences that still confirm the historical record of the life and work of Jesus. The present evidences are regarded by many as being as strong as miracles. A miracle was seen, was quickly past. But the evidences presently to be named, are still present, have been among men for hundreds of years, and have been and still may be subjected to the greatest possible critical examination. Of this character of evidence, the date in time, created by the lowly birth of Jesus, that has already been considered in a previous chapter, is one such example. Two other examples of monuments, confirming the written history of the life and work of Jesus, will now be considered.

The Lord's Supper

Jesus was with his twelve unlearned disciples in a borrowed upper room at night. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the new covenant, which is poured out for many unto the remission of sins" (Math. 26:26-28). His brief admonition was, "This do in remembrance of

me." Out of a small bit of bread, and a cup of grape juice, Jesus erected to his memory the greatest and most far reaching monument this world has ever known. It has been observed by almost countless millions, representing almost every nation on the earth. Many have died, and multitudes would die, rather than forsake this memorial. It is the simplest observance known among men. It makes no appeal to the fleshly appetite and vanity of man. When observed unperverted and in the simple manner that Jesus gave it, it has aided in lifting multitudes to a higher plane of love, kindness and purity of character. It is not here contended that A has at all times been observed in the manner, and for the purpose that Jesus gave it. It has often been degraded from its high and holy purpose, in which case it is not beneficial. Its purpose is to "keep in memory" the death of Jesus on the Roman cross between two thieves, and to prophesy that he will come again. Wherein lies the power of a small bit of bread, and a cup of the juice of the grape, commemorating the death of an obscure person, over so many people of the highest intelligence and character? It is the unwavering belief that the death of Jesus on the cross made possible the remission of sins, and finally immortality. Take away the belief that through obedience to Jesus, by reason of his death on the cross, the forgiveness of sin is obtained, and the hope that he will return to bestow immortality, and the Lord's Supper would be meaningless, and utterly lose its influence over millions of people. It would cease to be observed. To the Christian, in the simple manner in which Jesus gave it, uncorrupted by human tradition, the Lord's Supper stands between the two greatest events of time; pointing back to the death of Jesus on the cross, from which remission of sins is secured by the obedient, and forward to his return to bestow immortality. It is a monument, seen and observed by millions, rising to the plane of equality with that of a miracle, and bearing irrefutable testimony to the one claim of Jesus—that he is the Son of God.

Sunday — The Lord's Day

One day in three hundred sixty-five, the Fourth of July, has been made a legal holiday commemorating the signing of the Declaration of the Independence of the thirteen American Colonies. It is a yearly observance, that stands as a monument to

that fact. Had no such declaration ever been signed, who can believe that millions of intelligent Americans would ever have been influenced to keep one day in the year in commemoration of an event that never occurred? Those now living rightly accept the Fourth of July as an unquestioned evidence confirming the written history of the signing of the Declaration of the Independence of the colonies. With the historical record, confirmed by the monument of the Fourth of July, one would be thought unreasonable indeed to disbelieve the fact of the signing of that declaration. But that document is only about one hundred and sixty years old; the event is only observed by the people of the United States, and for but one day in the year. Yet the two witnesses taken together, are universally accepted as unquestioned proof that the declaration was signed.

We have another day that stands as a monument of a past event, also confirming the written historical record. Sunday, one day in seven, has been kept sacred by many millions for nineteen hundred years. During much of this long period, in Europe, the Americas, and in some other countries, Sunday has been legalized as a day of rest in memory of a past event recorded in history. In recent years laws regulating Sunday observance have been modified in many instances, and those on the statute books are not being so rigidly enforced. But even with the loosing of the legal restrictions in regard to the observance of Sunday as a day of rest, there yet remain many millions who sacredly keep Sunday, one day in seven, in memory of a past event. Is it possible to conceive of so many people, of the highest intelligence and character, representing so many different nations, and for so long a period as nineteen hundred years, keeping one-seventh of the time in holy memory of a forged event—celebrating that which never occurred? The monument of Sunday dates back to the historical event that it commemorates. If the event did not occur, how could the commemorative observances have been started? The first ones who began the observance had every opportunity to know whether the event occurred. They had no earthly advantage to gain by declaring the event to have occurred, and then keeping one day in seven to commemorate the event, but they had to sacrifice every earthly advantage and final

ly give up their lives because they refused to cease declaring that the event occurred. Is it not more reasonable to believe that the event which Sunday commemorates did occur, than to believe it was forged? Those who first observed Sunday had every possible opportunity to know whether it was true or false. In fact they affirmed that they had personal knowledge that the event actually did occur.

What historical event does Sunday commemorate? The disappearing of the body of Jesus from the tomb. Sunday points as directly to the disappearing of the body of Jesus from the tomb as the needle points to the magnetic pole. All admit that Jesus lived in Palestine about nineteen hundred years ago. Both believers and unbelievers admit that he died on the Roman cross; that he was buried, and that on the morning of the third day his body was missing from the tomb. Up to this point, there is entire agreement between believers and unbelievers. The only difference is as to how his body disappeared from the tomb. In the last analysis, this is the only point of disagreement. The unbelievers say his body was stolen from the tomb, and decayed as all other human bodies. The believers say he arose from the dead. Which is true? One day in seven is sacredly kept in memory of the disappearing of his body from the tomb—either the stealing of his body, or of its resurrection. There is no other point at issue. The whole controversy turns on the answer to this question: How did his body leave the tomb? Was it stolen, or was it raised from the dead? If he did not rise from the dead, his claim to be the son of God is false. If he arose from the dead, his claim to be the son of God is true, and he still lives.

The twelve apostles had spent more than three years with him day and night. They witnessed his death and burial. When he was buried, their hopes perished and they returned to their labors for a living. Fifty days later they arose in the great temple in Jerusalem, but a few stone throws distant from where he was crucified and buried, and declared he had been raised from the dead. They affirmed that they had seen him a number of times alive, and that about ten days before, they had seen him ascend up out of sight in the clouds. No such a story had ever before been heard on the earth. The leaders of the Jews who

secured the verdict of death against Jesus, were very likely present. If what they declared was false, what audacity on the part of these twelve unlearned men! And how could any one be led to believe the story if it were false? Their hearers had every opportunity to judge of the truth or falsehood of the story. Yet the first time the story of his resurrection was told, about three thousand believed it, embraced it, and in so doing brought upon themselves the cruelest persecution. Soon the twelve were beaten, imprisoned, and commanded not to tell the story that Jesus was raised from the dead any more. But neither prison bars nor stripes could stop them from telling, on every possible occasion, that he was alive from the dead. Declaring that the body of Jesus was not stolen from the tomb as his enemies said, but was raised from the dead, was their sole offence for which they suffered imprisonment, stripes and at last death itself. Could they have been deceived in believing that Jesus was raised from the dead? With every possible opportunity of knowing whether his body was stolen or raised from the dead, it is not conceivable that they could have been deceived. Yet if Jesus (Ed not rise from the dead the twelve were deceived or they were dishonest. No one can believe that they were dishonest and knowingly testified to a falsehood, for they gave the highest possible evidence of their sincerity by giving up their lives rather than cease telling the story of his resurrection. Can one believe that the act of stealing the body of an imposter from the tomb could have in it the power so to influence millions of the wisest and best people of the earth, covering a period of nineteen hundred years, and embracing many nations, to keep one day in seven in holy memory of the stealing of that body? Surely so to believe is not only to believe without evidence, but against abundant evidence of the most sublime and trustworthy character. How can the monument of Sunday, the first day, the Lord's day, be explained on any other basis than that Jesus arose from the dead and now reigns from his throne on high? Was his body stolen? Or did he arise from the dead?

One Lone Life

The moral and spiritual teachings of Jesus have long been judged the highest and best the world has ever received. Many

are willing to concede that he is the world's greatest teacher, but are not willing to admit his claim to be the Son of God. They attribute his power to what he taught. But the overshadowing power of his matchless personality cannot be explained on the basis that he was only the world's greatest teacher. His personality has permeated the thought, feeling and actions of many of the whole race of man, even many of those who deny his claim to Divinity. None who have heard of him can remain uninfluenced by his personality.

Here is an individual who was born in a little village, the first born of a peasant woman. Because of the lack of a better lodging place for his mother, he was born in a stable. Almost nothing is known of his life, except that he worked in a carpenter shop, till he was thirty years old. At the age of thirty he chose twelve unlearned men from the common walks of life and started out as an itinerant preacher. For three and a half years he traveled and taught, sometimes thousands heard, often only the twelve and again a lone person. He never went to College. He never had a family or owned a home. He never did any of the things that usually accompany greatness. All that we know that he ever wrote was with his finger in the dust on the ground, and we do not know what he then wrote. All the actual words attributed to him that have been recorded would perhaps not make more than one hundred pages of a book. Yet more has been written about him, perhaps, than any other hundred persons who ever lived. He never held a public office, nor sat in a legislative body, Yet it is very likely that he has influenced the enacting of more laws than any other large number of men. He never was able to give but little money for charity, but perhaps has influenced more gifts than any other—who can venture a comparison in the giving that his life and personality has inspired.

His only credentials were what he said, what he did and his overpowering personality. Into whatever gathering he went, he at once became the center of interest. Now his life, teaching and personality form the center of the chief thinking of mankind.

Very early in his ministry popular opinion turned against him. He had no friends among the great in wealth or the chief rulers

of his people. He suffered the most cruel persecution., chiefly because he said he was the Son of God. Near the close of his life, in the midst of the most powerful leaders of his own nation, he said: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself. But this he said, signifying by what manner of death he should die." (Jno. 12:32-33.) It is probable that this stands as the most remarkable statement ever uttered in human language. He predicted his own death on the Roman cross, the most shameful death to be inflicted, and that as a result of that death he would draw all men unto himself. Fifty millions have been so powerfully drawn to his personality that they gave up their lives rather than be separated from him.

Soon after this declaration he was arrested and turned over to his enemies. His friends deserted him. One of them betrayed him for a few pieces of silver, and the leader among the twelve denied him. He went through the mockery of a trial, and was nailed upon a cross between two thieves. While he was dying, he prayed for his executioners, who were gambling for his coat, the only piece of property he had on earth. Pitying friends begged his body from the Roman governor and buried it in a borrowed grave. Three days later his body was gone from the tomb. His enemies said it was stolen while the Roman guards slept. His friends said he was raised from the dead. His friends soon began to tell the story that he was alive from the dead. They were beaten, imprisoned and commanded to cease to tell the strange story. Yet they continued to say he was alive from the dead till they suffered martyrdom for telling the story.

Nineteen hundred years have now been added to the past, and at this hour the influence of that lone life has more influence than ever before, and like the sun in mid-forenoon, is still increasing in brilliance and power. The light that his matchless personality sheds down the pathway of time, surpasses and dims the light of all other personalities, even as the sun in its power causes the twinkling of the stars to go out. His personality has lighted the stony pathway, trod by the fact of countless numbers of weary pilgrims. It has lighted the hitherto dark pathway through the "valley of the shadow of death," so that its terrors are no longer feared. Verily, it has shed a light incomparable

even in the tomb itself, the charnel house of death, and turned it into the gateway of incorruptible immortality. By the power of his personality, the saint can shout defiance to all that is evil. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Even as it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. 8:35-39.)

Man's body came from the ground; his soul came from God. His duty while here is to live righteously.

His destiny is to be the kind of habitation for which his life has fitted him. The most ennobling thought of the mind; the most inspiring hope of the heart; the strongest aspiration of the soul of man is the anticipation of spending eternity in the presence of God.