

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

# Evolution— a Menace

By

53

*John William*  
J. W. PORTER, D.D., LL.D.

Author of  
"Assurance of Faith"  
"Evangelistic Sermons"  
and  
"Baptist Debt to the World"



Baptist Book Concern  
Publishers, Booksellers and Engravers  
656 Fourth Avenue  
Louisville, Ky.

Copyright, 1922  
By Baptist Book Concern,  
Louisville, Ky.

DEDICATED

To my beloved and womanly wife, on whose  
brow is stamped the likeness of Him, in  
whose "image" she was created, and  
whose pure and noble blood is  
untainted by that of insect,  
reptile, fowl, or beast.

78

Ag 26 SUS

.28

134544

Sms 15D27

575  
P84e

28  
A

## BASIS OF STUDY

Hegner's "College Zoölogy" is a textbook used in the Kentucky State University.

Davidson's "Practical Zoölogy" is a textbook used in High Schools.

Clelland's "Geology—Physical and Historical" is used in the Kentucky State University.

Herrick's "Textbook in General Zoölogy" is used in the High Schools.

Bergin and Davis' "Principles of Botany" is used in many schools.

"Outlines of European History, Part II." is used in Public Schools.

"Essentials of Biology" by Hunter, is a textbook in Public Schools.

"Biology and its Makers" by Loey, is a textbook in College.

"Civic Biology" by Hunter. Textbook in many schools.

## PREFACE

The recent general uprising against the teaching of evolution in our schools has brought forth the charge that Christians are attempting to force the Bible as a textbook upon State schools. There are those who are no doubt sincere in this contention; while others are evidently making this charge to divert attention from the real issue. Those who are protesting, and will continue to protest against the teaching of evolution in our schools, have not asked that the Bible be made a textbook in these institutions. They do not believe in a combination of Church and State. On the other hand, they are vigorously opposed to a combination of Infidelity and State. Since the Bible is not taught in these schools, those of us who believe the Bible to be the very word of God feel that we have all the more right to request that instruction in these institutions should not be contrary to and subversive of the teaching of the Bible. If Bible teaching is eliminated, we must insist that it shall not be discredited, derided and denied. We have not contended that Christ shall become a part of the curriculum, but we do earnestly contend that He shall not be crucified on the cross of a false philosophy, called evolution.

Lexington, Ky., January 10, 1922.

CONTENTS	
CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Evolution Defined by Evolutionists .....	7-25
II. Evolution Contradicts and Subverts Revelation .....	26-35
III. Evolution Falsely Explains Origin of Life .....	36-47
IV. Evolutionary Origin of Species Untrue and Unscientific .....	48-58
V. Evolution Advocates the Law of the Jungle .....	59-64
VI. Evolution Fails to Explain Facts of History .....	65-72
VII. Evolution Resurrects Bogus "Missing Links." .....	73-81
VIII. Evolution—The Tree and Its Fruits .....	82-94

## CHAPTER I

### EVOLUTION DEFINED BY EVOLUTIONISTS

In attempting to discuss the "Menace of Evolution," two preliminary questions call for consideration: What is Evolution? And how far has it been accepted by our schools and colleges? On both these questions I have determined to let the evolutionists speak for themselves.

#### 1. THE MEANING OF EVOLUTION.

What, then, is the significance of the term "Evolution?" Out of a mass of somewhat conflicting statements of the Evolutionists themselves, I call attention to the following as being fairly representative:

##### *The General Theory of Evolution.*

Le Conte says: "Evolution is (1) progressive change, (2) according to certain laws (3) by resident forces."

E. D. Cope, a noted evolutionist, says: "The doctrine of evolution may be defined as the teaching which holds that creation has been and is accomplished by the energies which are intrinsic in evolutionary matter, without the interference of agencies that are external to it."

Prof. H. W. Conn in his *Evolution of To-day* says: "Evolution, organic evolution, and the theory of descent, are practically synonymous terms and each of these is used to indicate the theory that all species of animals and plants (including man) existing to-day have been derived from others living in the past, by direct descent, and they will themselves give rise in the future to other still different species. . . . The essential idea which underlies the whole theory is that species have had a natural rather than a supernatural origin."

Dr. Marion D. Shutter, who calls himself a theistic Evolutionist, in his *Applied Evolution*, says: "Evolution means that the earth instead of being flung into space, a ready-made sphere from the hand of God, took its rise in nebulous mists and clouds, and by a process of whirling and condensing and cooling, through countless ages, became the globe of today. Evolution means that, whatever the ultimate origin of life, the plants and flowers and grasses and trees which clothe the earth, were not made at once as we behold them now, but began in the simplest and fewest germs, and by gradual changes under varying conditions, attained the variety,

luxuriance, and beauty which wreath the brow of the planet. It means that the members of the animal kingdom in all its departments were not, each kind, called into being in a moment, and in a fixed and definite and unvarying and unchanging species, but that the whole (animal) kingdom began countless ages ago in a shapeless mass of jelly, and has developed from one form to another up to man."

*The Evolutionary Origin of Life and Species*

Joseph McCabe, a noted scientist and author, in a recent book says: "I need only say here that both chemists and biologists agree that a natural chemical evolution could produce the first living things. . . . A very long evolution, with thousands of phases would be required. . . . First, the stuff of which living things are made, protoplasm, would have to be formed by a long series of chemical changes and combinations. . . . Inorganic matter was thus slowly developed into organic, and this was slowly shaped into living units ('cells'). The next great point was the division of early life into plant and animal. There is no essential difference between the two. . . . But some of the early

inhabitants (living things) continued to feed upon inorganic matter—the chemicals in the soil. . . . Thus you get the evolution of a plant world. Some of the early living things, on the other hand, formed the habit of devouring their neighbors. . . . This is the beginning of the animal. In time the (animal) cells cling together, and large animals ('many-celled') are formed."

"Up to the present time nearly a half million different kinds of species of animals have been described, and more than a hundred new species are discovered every year, so that it is probable that there are no less than a million species of animals dwelling on this planet. That a pair of each of these was created direct from lifeless material seems very improbable, though until 1859, when Charles Darwin published his *Origin of Species*, this was generally believed."—Davison, *Practical Zoölogy*, 344, 345.

"This process of developing new species is called evolution by variation and natural selection. The ancestors of the three-toed horse were four-toed animals whose remains are found in the layers of rock beneath those containing the three-toed ones. By this process of variation and natural selection the

four-toed forms were derived from a five-toed mammal with such a generalized structure that other of its progeny developed into sheep, cows, and deer in accordance with the various foods and changing factors in nature to which they were subjected. Thus, by variation and natural selection, numerous and widely different kinds of animals arose.

"Variation in the individuals of certain species, and therefore evolution, is occurring at the present time, but much more slowly than during the world's infancy, when climate, food, and other factors were changing more rapidly."—Davison, *Practical Zoölogy*, 349, 350.

"The vermiform appendix, occurring in man and the anthropoid apes, is of no use, but in their ancestors it may have played an important part in digestion, as the corresponding portion of the alimentary canal does yet in the rabbit, groundhog, and other forms. The splint bone, about ten inches long on either side of the lower part of the horse's limb, serves no useful purpose now. All of these useless structures clearly indicate that they were of larger size in the far-off ancestors in whom their presence was of

great use.”—Davison, *Practical Zoölogy*, 353.

“These facts, cited in the preceding paragraphs together with much other information discovered by the zoölogist and geologist lead to the conclusion that at first there existed on earth only a few forms of simple life similar to the amœba, and from these, acted on by the rapid changes of climate, soil, water, and food, have arisen all the varied forms of animal life.”—Davison, *Practical Zoölogy*, 354.

*The Evolutionary Origin of Man.*

In one of the earliest editions of *Descent of Man*, Darwin describes primitive man as follows:

“The early progenitors of man were, no doubt, covered with hair, both sexes having beards. Their ears were pointed and capable of movement, and their bodies were provided with a tail. . . . The foot . . . was prehensile, and our progenitors, no doubt were arboreal in their habits, frequenting some warm forest-clad land. . . . At an early period the progenitors of man must have been aquatic in their habits.”

“The family Hominidæ contains the single living species, *Homo sapiens*, or man. Man differs from the other primates in the size of the brain, which is about twice as large as that of the highest monkey, and in his erect, bipedal locomotion. The hairy covering is not well developed, and the great toe is not apposable. The mental development of man has enabled him to accommodate himself to every climate, and to dominate all other animals. Some fossil remains of a primate that were found in the upper Pliocene on the island of Java have been designated by Haeckel as ‘the last link’ between the apes and man, and the animal to which they belonged has been given the name *Pithecanthropus erectus*.”—Hegner, *Zoölogy*, 666.

“The Mammalia are of special interest, since this class of vertebrates includes man. The earliest living mammals, the Monotremata are descended from reptilian ancestors, the Theoromorpha, which are known only from fossil remains. Above the Monotremes are placed the Marsupialia, and finally the Placentalia, which are the highest of all animals. These Primates, the group that includes man, seem to have descended from the primitive Insectivora. The line of descent

within the group is probably somewhat as follows:

1. Monotremata—Egg laying Mammals.
2. Marsupialia—Marsupials.
3. Insectivora—Insectivores.
4. Lemuridæ—Lemurs.
5. Cercopithecidæ—Old World Monkeys with Tails.
6. Simidæ—Anthropoid Apes.
7. Pithecanthropus—An Extinct "Ape-man."
8. Homo Neanderthalensis—The Extinct Neanderthal Man.
9. Homo Sapiens—"Modern Man."  
—Hegner, *Zoölogy*, 695, 696.

The foregoing is the Evolutionist's Family Tree.

"Man:—As an animal, man belongs to the family Hominidæ and is known scientifically as *Homo sapiens*. As an animal, he is distinguished for his erect posture, very complete apposition of the thumb to the fingers, short canine teeth, greater length of hind, as compared with fore limbs, and the great size and complexity of the brain."—Herrick, *General Zoölogy*, 334.

Prof. Edward Clodd, in his book *The Mak-*

*ing of Man*, says: "Whichever among the arboreal creatures possessed any favorable variation, however slight, would secure an advantage over less favored rivals in the struggle for food and mates and elbow room. The qualities which gave them success would be transmitted to their offspring and while some for awhile remained arboreal in their habits, never moving easily on the ground, although making some approach to upright motion, as seen in the shambling gait of the man-like apes, others developed a way of walking on their hind legs, which entirely set free the forelimbs as organs of handling and throwing. Whatever were the conditions which permitted this, the advantage which it gives is obvious. It was the making of a man."

"A creature (*Pithecanthropus erectus*) whose fragmentary remains have been found in Pleistocene deposits of Java, associated with the bones of extinct animals, may also have been a member of a race which made coliths. These remains consist of a skullcap, two molar teeth, and a diseased thigh bone, and are remarkable because of the combination of ape and human characters. The skull differs from that of an ape, its brain capacity being about twice that of an ape of equal



bodily size.”—Clelland, *Geology—Physical and Historical*, 675.

“The progress of evolution does not, however, have a free course since, as never before in the history of animal life, the unfit do not disappear in the struggle for existence, but the life of the physically and mentally unfit is lengthened through the aid of medical science and charity. The future will, doubtless, bring solution for such vital problems, and the evolution of the human race can confidently be expected to continue, with the development of a type of man much superior to that now on earth.”—Clelland, *Geology—Physical and Historical*, 684.

The following is a portion of the genealogical tree which appears in Herrick, *Text-book in General Zoölogy*:

*Order—Chroptera*

Types of Order.

Lasiurus borealis—Red bat.

Myotis suulatus—Brown bat.

Phyllostoma—Vampire.

Pteropus edwardsi—Fruit-eating bat.

*Order—Primates*

Types of Order.

Lemur macaco—Lemur.

Cynocephalus anubis—Baboon.

Simia satyrus—Orang-outang.

Pan troglodytes—Chimpanzee.

Gorilla gorilla—Gorilla.

Homo sapiens—Man.

*Evolutionary Origin of Jesus.*

Says Dr. Marion D. Shutter, theistic Evolutionist, (*Applied Evolution*, 198): “Granted the greatness and goodness of Jesus, how do you account for him? What is the relation to him of this theory of Evolution? Do you mean to include Him and His work in the general scheme? Can it be done? And the answer is: Yes; if Evolution fails at one point, it fails utterly. We have then a case of that special intervention by a nonresident Deity, which we have repeatedly repudiated. Evolution must include Jesus, or we must abandon the theory. There is no break or flaw or chasm. The process is one, from fire mist to soul; from the soul to its highest expression. Jesus is as much the product of the laws and forces in nature and in society as Shakespeare or Napoleon.” These and the other utterances of Dr. Shutter were read and approved by no less a person and scientist than John Fiske who says in the preface: “I read the lectures,

*Applied Evolution*, which you sent me with very deep interest, and it seems to me that a volume of such lectures would be of inestimable value to the public.”

2. ACCEPTANCE AND TEACHINGS OF EVOLUTION

How far has this doctrine of evolution been accepted and gained entrance to our schools? The following statements will be sufficient answer:

“This doctrine of special creation gave way to the present belief in organic evolution, or the theory of descent, chiefly through the work of Charles Darwin, whose famous book, the *Origin of Species*, appeared in 1859. The theories of organic evolution hold that all the existing species of animals and plants have been derived, or evolved, through the geological ages from the simplest forms of life in the beginning.”—Bergin and Davis, *Principles of Botany*.

“In the early part of the last half of the century—1859—occurred what may fairly be called the most important event in the history of biological science, the publication of Charles Darwin’s *Origin of Species*. Up to this time the ideas of evolution advanced by Buffon, Lamarck, St. Hilaire, and Erasmus

Darwin had not received general recognition among zoölogists, to say nothing of the great mass of teachers, writers, and scholars. But with the *Origin of Species* began the storm of discussion and debate out of which there has arisen a calm and sane acceptance of the gradual development of the various forms of plant and animal life by a process of evolution.”—Herrick, *General Zoölogy*, 378, 379.

Says Prof. H. W. Conn in *Evolution of Today*: “It may be well to say at the outset that evolution, as we have defined the term, is almost universally accepted by scientists.”

Joseph McCabe in *The A. B. C. of Evolution* says: “By the end of the eighteenth Century it was openly suggested in England that man had ‘descended’ from an animal of the kind. There were jeers and gibes and howls of laughter everywhere. Learned and unlearned men scoffed. Now there is not a man of science in the world who does not admit man’s descent from an ape-like form; and I do not think there is a bishop in the world who would oppose them.”

“It should be the aim of every student of modern history to follow the development of

science and to observe the ways in which it is constantly changing our habits and our views of man, his origin and destiny.

“Herbert Spencer, in one of his very earliest works, gave many strong and seemingly unanswerable arguments to support the idea that the whole visible universe—the earth, the plants and animals, even man himself and all his ideas and institutions—had slowly developed by a natural process.

“The idea that all plants and animals, even man himself, had developed instead of being created in their present form, and that man belonged physically to the ‘primates,’ the group of animals which includes the apes, shocked a great many people, and the subject began to be discussed with no little heat and sometimes with much indignation by men of science, theologians, and the cultivated public in general.

“The opponents of the theory of evolution have slowly decreased in numbers. They came to feel that instead of being degraded by being put on a level with the brutes, man still remains as before, the goal toward which all nature’s work through the ages is directed.”—Robinson and Beard, *Outlines of European History*.

“We have now learned that animal forms may be arranged so as to begin with the very simple one-celled forms and culminate with a group which contains man himself. The great English scientist, Charles Darwin, from this and other evidence, explained the theory of evolution. This is the belief that simple forms of life on the earth slowly and gradually gave rise to those more complex and that thus ultimately the most complex forms came into existence. The group of mammals that includes the monkeys, apes, and man we will call the primates.”—George W. Hunter, *A Civic Biology*.

“The idea that the higher forms of life are derived from simpler ones by a process of gradual evolution received general acceptance, as we have said before, only in the last part of the nineteenth century, after the work of Charles Darwin.”—Locy, *Biology and Its Makers*.

Many of the quotations given above are from textbooks used in Kentucky State University and High schools; but these and similar treatises are used throughout the South and the nation, in the Christian schools and colleges as well as in the public schools and

State institutions. The menace of this teaching—as we believe it to be and propose now to prove it to be—is therefore nationwide and fraught with dangers to life and society, to church and state, to Christianity and civilization, beyond the mind of man to conceive.

*Teachers of Evolution Without Excuse.*

The excuse is offered for the teachers of evolution, that they only present the Darwinian hypothesis as a theory. The only objection to this statement is that it is not true. As seen in the sample quotations, this theory is taught as a fact. These textbooks in many instances were suggested and endorsed by those who teach them. The doctrine of these textbooks is taught and commended in the classroom. Granted for the sake of the argument, that it is only presented as a “theory,” the fact remains that it is the only theory presented. Not even this much respect is accorded the account of Creation as given in the book of Genesis. Why should not the teacher present the Bible account of Creation? Is this account ruled out as false and impossible? In none of these textbooks is the history of Creation, as it appears in the Bible, either suggested or referred to as pos-

sible. When mentioned in the classroom, which is seldom, it is discredited.

Is it asking too much that the authors of our textbooks accord as much respect to the Bible as they do to the books of Charles Darwin? Apparently, there can be but one reason for ignoring the Scriptural record of Creation. This reason is, that those who teach evolution utterly reject the account of Creation contained in the book of Genesis.

There is no possible theory of evolution that can be made to harmonize with the account of Creation or with any of the other references to supernatural transactions in the Bible, and no one knows this fact better than the teachers of Darwinian evolution.

It is also offered in defense of those that teach evolution that they do not teach the Darwinian theory. How flimsy is this excuse will be apparent to all who read the quotations given above. In fact, the issue is squarely drawn—Darwin and Huxley and Spencer and Haeckel are held up to our young people as the true prophets and teachers, while Moses and David and John and Jesus and Paul are back numbers, out of date!

*What Such Teaching Means*

The bearing of such teaching upon the lives of the teachers themselves and upon the lives of the young people of our nation can be forecast with unmistakable accuracy by the effect this theory had on Darwin himself. We let him tell his own story, as follows:

"I am much engaged, an old man, and out of health, and cannot spare time to answer your questions fully—nor indeed can they be answered. Science has nothing to do with Christ, except in so far as the habit of scientific research makes a man cautious in admitting evidence. For myself, I do not believe that there ever has been any revelation. As for a future life, every man must judge for himself between conflicting vague probabilities. . . . When thus reflecting I feel compelled to look for a First Cause, having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man, and I deserve to be called a Theist. This conclusion was strong in my mind about the time, as far as I can remember, when I wrote the 'Origin of Species,' and it is since that time that it has very gradually, with many fluctuations, become weaker. But there arises the doubt:

Can the mind of man, which has, I fully believe, been developed from mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animal, be trusted when it draws such grand conclusions? I cannot pretend to throw the least light on such abstruse problems. The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an agnostic."—"Life and Letters of Charles Darwin."

## CHAPTER II.

### EVOLUTION CONTRADICTS AND SUBVERTS REVELATION

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.—Gen. 1: 1.

Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God to an image made like to corruptible man, and birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.—Rom. 1: 22, 23.

My proposition is, that there is not a single fact in science, philosophy, or religion to support the theory of evolution. Dr. David Starr Jordan has well said, that "science does not comprehend a single elementary fact of nature."

First of all, then, let us consider "Evolution in the Light of God's Revelation in His Word."

No evolutionist can consistently accept the Bible as the fully inspired Word of God, directly revealed by God to man. Evolution implies a process and a growth; while the Bible claims to be a direct revelation, and a finished product. The Bible is not the result of "resident forces" in man, but is from God. The history of Creation, as given in Genesis, is flatly contradicted by every known hypoth-

## *Evolution—A Menace*

esis of evolution. It is for this very reason that evolution and destructive criticism go hand in hand. Like the Siamese twins, they are one and inseparable. If evolution is true, the Bible, or at least portions of it, are absolutely false. Evolution subjects the Bible to its theory, and not its theory to the Bible.

The Christian religion is fundamentally and essentially a supernatural religion. Evolution emphatically denies any supernatural factor in the development of life. It denies the existence of a miracle in the life-process, or as Haeckel defines it, "The nonmiraculous origin and progress of life." The moment the supernatural, or miraculous, is admitted in the scheme of development, the whole structure of evolution must collapse.

Uniformity is simply the assumption that things have always happened, and, of necessity, must continue to happen as they now occur. Such a statement is incapable of proof, involves a universal negative, and implies a universal knowledge of natural law.

It should be said, in justice to all concerned, that there are those who claim to be theistic evolutionists. This, if not a "new species," is certainly a peculiar one, and deserves, per-

haps, more than passing notice. This particular brand of evolution tries to reconcile the Bible with the false assumptions of so-called science. There can never be a conflict between real science and true religion. Evolution is not a science and is incapable of scientific demonstration. At most it is an unproved and unprovable hypothesis. The phrase "theistic evolution" was coined to overcome the odium of atheistic evolution. The meaning sought to be conveyed is, that one may believe in God and also in evolution. It is significant that they choose to designate themselves "theistic" rather than "Christian." Tom Paine was a theist, and so are Jews and Unitarians. It is but just to assume that theistic evolutionists, with their boasted wisdom, have rightly named themselves. It is possible to conceive of a theistic evolutionist, but impossible to conceive of a Christian evolutionist of the Darwinian type. Every known scheme of evolution implies uniformity, variation by natural selection, and progress by "resident forces." All theories of evolution are restricted to natural processes, and therefore must reject the miraculous. Christianity is predicated upon the fact that Jesus was the Son of God, and not a superman

developed by "natural selection" and scientific agencies. It is absolutely impossible to reconcile the fact of the bodily Resurrection of our Lord with the natural process of the theory of evolution. The Virgin Birth is also contrary to the demands of evolution.

The coining of this phrase has not been in vain, however, since it has enabled not a few to draw good salaries from institutions supported by Christian denominations while undermining the very foundations of the Christian faith.

Speaking of Christ and His resurrection, Dr. Tull, in his admirable tract, says:

"If he acknowledges Jesus then his evolution goes to the winds. If Jesus was, then Adam was, for Jesus was the antitype of Adam. It is just here that the theistic evolutionist gets in a worse mix with the Bible than the atheistic evolutionist. To say that Adam came from the anthropoid ape, and that God breathed into this beast a soul, is to make Jesus Christ the antitype of an ape." Are the theistic evolutionists ready to assert that Jesus was the antitype of an ape? Face your logic, gentlemen! Mr. Darwin's theory of evolution caused a shipwreck of his own early faith, and it inevitably produces a

like result in every man who accepts the full import of the theory. In fact, all thorough-going evolutionists must and do reject practically all the fundamentals of the Christian faith, as follows: (1) For the most part, they believe in a God of "resident forces" and are Pantheists, though some claim a sort of Theism. (2) Few, if any, believe that God made a distinct, supernatural or inspired revelation of Himself to man; "the Bible is man feeling out for the Infinite, not the Infinite revealing Himself to man." (3) According to their view, God did not create the world; at most He gave us ether, or nebula, or protoplasm, impregnated with "resident forces," and these forces evolved the world and all that is in it, including man. (4) The story of the Creation and Fall of Man, all supernatural events, all miracles, the Virgin birth, atoning death, bodily resurrection and second coming of the Saviour are legends; so also is the devil and hell and the heavenly home of the saved hereafter. But lest I should be thought to misrepresent those who hold to evolution and at the same time profess to be Christians, I quote again from *Applied Evolution* (pp. 172-248) by Dr. Marion Shut-

ter. Beginning with the story of Creation in Genesis, here are some of his well-nigh blasphemous utterances:

"The speaking serpent, the tree of knowledge of good and evil, the tree of life, the idea that eating certain kinds of fruit would give wisdom or immortality,—these are clearly legendary or mythical elements. As pictures or symbols, they may be even beautiful; but as history, they are quite as far beyond the pale of fact as the fountain of youth or the dreams of alchemy. . . . For these reasons we cannot accept the story of Eden and the Fall as history. There is no more testimony in its favor when it appears in Jewish or Christian writings—when it appears in Genesis and in the quotation from Genesis by Paul—than when we find it in Persian or Buddhist Scriptures. It is not the book in which we find a statement that gives it credibility; it is the character of the statement itself. . . . And let us remember if this account of Eden and the Fall is not history, the current creeds of Christendom, not yet disavowed or revised; the theology still assumed, even where it is not directly preached,—these have no footing in fact they are but 'such stuff as dreams are



made of,' they but cumber the intellectual ground of the Church and the world, and should no longer be allowed to impose upon the human understanding. . . .

"Let us now pass on to the evidence that man has risen and not fallen; that he did not begin perfect and deteriorate; but that he began low and imperfect, and has been slowly but surely gaining in character and in moral power.

(1) "First of all we have the testimony of Science. If anything is made clear by modern research and investigation it is that man was not created full-grown in body and mind, with established character, but that he came up through the animal and started upon his human career with simply a few instincts inherited from the orders below and behind him. . . . These are proofs which must stand unshaken against any legend from the dim, uncertain speculations of the world's childhood, about a creation in a moment, complete and perfect from the dust of the earth and the breath of a God.

(2) "And when men came up from the animals—so far were they from being holy and righteous in character, that it took them ages upon ages to learn the difference be-

tween right and wrong; and they learned it, not by direct revelation from on high, but through the experiences of their savage life, as these played upon the instinct of self-preservation and the instinct to combine with others. They learned the difference between right and wrong through animal pains and pleasures. They learned to avoid the things that hurt and do the things which brought satisfaction. They learned to live in families; they learned to live in tribes. . . . Through these processes did man first come to morality. . . .

(3) "The race began unenlightened, unmoral, and therefore without moral responsibility. Little by little it came on toward enlightenment, toward the appreciation of the distinction between right and wrong, and therefore toward responsibility. . . . And as for his knowledge of God and communion with him—the first men knew no God, but simply feared invisible beings in the natural objects about them. The idea of One Supreme, Wise, and Good Being, was the achievement of uncalendared ages. . . . This is the account that Science gives us today; and we place it over against the account preserved in Genesis, which the

scholarship of even orthodoxy itself is resolving into the 'baseless fabric of a vision.' . . .

(4) "The earth has never been cursed; human life has never been blighted; we have never been shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin. We are under no condemnation for the sins of an ancestor who never ate the forbidden fruit. If the story of the Fall is not historic, then there is no Great Tempter, the Devil, abroad in this universe. If there has been no fall and no devil and no wrath of God, there is no endless hell flaming and devouring in the future; no lake of fire and brimstone that awaits us when we die. If there has been no break in the divine order, then there is no need of an atonement to restore it—a bloody sacrifice to appease the wrath of an offending God, an innocent victim to take the place of guilty men. . . .

(5) "There is a place for Christ; but not as the incarnate God, not as the bloody sacrifice, not as the substitute for sinners; but as the human leader and example; as the one who illustrates the victory of the spiritual over the animal; as the one who is able to teach others the secret of triumph. Is there no difference between these conceptions? . . .

"If the genealogies given of him in Matthew and Luke be at all correct, what blood of saints and prophets and heroes runs in his veins! The faith of Abraham, the imagination and emotion of David, the wisdom of Solomon, may have reappeared in him, together with the gentleness and purity of Mary his mother, and the strength and integrity of Joseph his father. . . . He is the child of his own immediate family, the child of his nation, the child of all the ages that went before him! . . .

"The God of Evolution is inside of nature and not outside of it. And when we consider that man himself is a part of nature, and the best part of it, we must find God also in him, preëminently in him."

This, then, is theistic evolution! As will be seen, it cuts the heart and life out of God's revealed truth and leaves only the grinning skeleton of German Rationalism, Unitarianism and Universalism.

CHAPTER III

EVOLUTION FALSELY EXPLAINS  
ORIGIN OF LIFE

Evolution is not only contrary to the letter and spirit of Christianity, but is false in its suppositions as to the origin of life. Evolutionists have offered many explanations of the origin of life. Darwin says: "Life was originally breathed into a few forms, or one." In his earlier writings Darwin acknowledged God, and then bade Him goodbye forever. In his later writings, he did not acknowledge the existence of God, but contented himself, as he says, with being an agnostic. Dr. Buckner says: "Matter is the origin of all that exists. All natural and mental forces are inherent in it." They have ascribed the origin of life to protoplasm, spontaneous generation, star dust, fire mist, oceanic ooze—ad nauseam ad infinitum. Some claim that while God is the author of life, He is not the author of species. Prof. Edwin G. Conklin, of Princeton, is of this number. He says: "There is no longer any doubt among scientists, that man descended from the animal." Mr. Huxley said: "Protoplasm is the origin of all life." He even put forward the claim that he had discovered

protoplasm, the source and secret of all life. About this time the Challenger was sent out by the American government to gather oceanic ooze. Prof. Murray, who was in charge of the expedition, collected a number of specimens, with which he experimented. He demonstrated the fact that seawater in alcohol formed a precipitate that was identical with Huxley's protoplasm. This was shown to Mr. Huxley, and he frankly admitted that he was mistaken, and never afterwards claimed the discovery of protoplasm. Tyndall, in an address to the Royal Institute, said: "From the beginning to the end of the inquiry, there is not, as you have seen, a shadow of evidence of spontaneous generation." Spencer said: "Whatever power an organism expends, in any shape, is the equivalent of power taken in from without." Prof. Tyndall says: "Again, Science has no explanation of the origin of life. The living organism instead of being the product of physical forces, controls these forces for its higher forms, functions and purposes. I share with Virchow's opinion that the theory of evolution, in its complete form, involves the assumption that at some period or other in the earth's history, there occurred what

would now be called spontaneous generation; but I agree with him, that the proofs of it are wanting. I also hold with Virchow that the failures have been so lamentable, that the doctrine is utterly discredited."

Since the scientific evolutionists cannot agree on the origin of life, why not accept the account contained in the Scriptures? Professor Romanes well says: "If they were separately created, the evidence of supernatural design remains irrefutable. Whereas, if they were slowly evolved that evidence has been utterly and forever destroyed."

Prof. Tyndall made more experiments to prove spontaneous generation than any other man, living or dead, and we have just seen his honest confession.

Lord Kelvin, of England, who, at the time of his death, a few years since, was perhaps, the world's greatest scientist, said: "It is not in dead matter that men live, move and have their being; but in a creative and directive power, which science compels us to accept as an article of faith. Is there anything so absurd as to believe that a number of atoms, by falling together of their own account, could make crystal, a microbe, or a living animal?"

It is gratifying to know that George J. Romanes, upon whom it is claimed fell the mantle of Darwin, sometime before his death in 1894, renounced this theory, and confessed Christ as his Saviour.

Pasteur, one of the greatest scientists of all the ages, and the greatest authority on germs of all time, said: "Posterity will one day laugh at the foolishness of modern naturalistic philosophies. The more I study nature, the more I stand amazed at the works of the Creator."

Pasteur further says, that "life can only arise from the living, and from direct creation." Pasteur prays in his laboratory. Of how many evolutionists is this true? Echo answers,—"how many?"

The evolutionists should not forget that their patron saint, Mr. Darwin, said, "The inquiry how life first originated is hopeless." All evolutionists must believe that a stream can rise higher than its source.

Countless experiments have failed to produce life from dead matter and evolution is still hopelessly at sea as to the origin of life.

It is worthy of special note, that the suppositions and affirmations of evolutionists, are one and all, beyond the period of re-

✓ corded history. Not one of their theories has had even a partial fulfillment within the known history of man. To overcome this fact, they have claimed that the world is hundreds of millions of years old. According to this supposition, during the unnumbered millions of years, evolution was slowly, but constantly working. Evolutionists themselves being judges, evolution cannot, in connection with the origin of life and species, point to a single achievement for at least the past four thousand years. Surely a theory that has been unfruitful and impotent for four thousand years, can be worth but little as a working principle. History having failed him, the evolutionist was driven to prehistoric times. To prove the great age of the world, he had recourse to geology.

William Smith, a comparatively unlearned surveyor of England, reached the conclusion that rocks could be classified by the fossils they contained, and that these rocks always succeeded one another in the same relative order. He never claimed that the same law applied to rocks in other parts of the world. As his theory was the best that had been advanced, for their purpose, it was speedily embraced. This theory, which was the last

hope of evolution, has been clearly disproved. Howorth in speaking of the methods of geologists says: "They have all the infirmities of the Middle Ages."

The different layers of the rock were relied upon to justify his claim of antiquity. Unfortunately, for this contention, in wide areas certain strata of rocks are found in reverse order to that of their common classification. The supposed earlier geological formations are found on top, and later layers at the bottom. Rocks long believed to belong to a certain epoch, were later found in layers of a different epoch. The oldest fossils are quite frequently found in the latest rocks. Obviously rocks have proven sand as a basis for determining the age of the world. Dana mentions a case where the "rocks are upside down over an area of four hundred and fifty miles square."

There are numerous like examples in the Alps. It will not be denied that the strata of rocks, upon the uniformity of which depends the chronological classification of geologists, are in reverse order in different sections. Little, in *History of Geology*, says: "It has been found that there is no geological epoch whose sedimentary deposits have

been wholly safeguarded from metaphoric changes, and as this broad fact has come to be realized, it has proved most unsettling, and has necessitated a revision of the stratigraphy in many districts in the light of new possibilities."

Government surveys in the United States and Canada and other countries, have forever settled the fact that any kind of rock beds, containing any kind of fossil, may rest in perfect "conformability" on any other so-called "older" beds, and may be so metamorphosed as to resemble the oldest rocks. In Alberta, Canada, as evidenced by a government report, the Cretaceous fossils were buried before the Cambrian, Devonian or Carboniferous, though geologists have long contended that this was never true. In the mountains of Tennessee and in the Highlands of Scotland the younger rocks are on top of the older.

It is unquestionably true that the strata of rocks, upon the uniformity of which depends the chronological classification of geologists, are in reverse order in different sections. It follows, therefore, that the classification for determining the age of rocks and fossils is comparatively worthless. There is

no known method by which one fossil may be determined as being older than another. The life succession theory was built on the assumption that only certain kinds of fossils were to be found at the bottom. It is now settled that any kind of fossil may be thus located. Indeed the argument from fossil remains has completely collapsed.

Up till about 1870, it was emphatically affirmed that no man had ever seen any of these fossil forms alive, but this view has been abandoned since human remains have been found along with fossils of the Pleistocene, or Middle Tertiary, and drawings and paintings on the walls of caves in France are so perfect that they were obviously drawn from life. These fossils either painted their own remains, or man was contemporary with them. The ring-tailed lemur is now only found in Madagascar and a few localities skirting the Indian Ocean. Their fossils are found in the Eocene rocks of Europe and America. How they managed to skip all the other formations from the Eocene to the Modern and remain alive, has not yet been explained by evolution, and in the very nature of the case can never be explained.

It had long been assumed by evolutionists that all fossil types were extinct. It has been clearly proved that multitudes of living forms are identical with those supposed to be extinct. It may be safely said that no fossil can be proved older than another fossil; or older than man. Coral now working at the bottom of the ocean is identical with its original type.

Prof. Conn says: "In short, it is not clear that the study of the development of animals through the geological ages gives any light upon the origin of variations, or the relation of environment. Huxley says, "The only difference between the fossil and the animal of today is that one is older than the other." Romanes refers to the geological record as a "chapter of accidents." Prof. George McCready Price, in his admirable work, *New Light on the Doctrine of Creation*, gives the following summary: "It is true that early in the nineteenth century Sir Charles Lyell and others tried to disclaim this absurd and unscientific inheritance from Werner's onion coats; but modern geology has never got rid of its essential and its chief characteristic idea, for all our textbooks still speak of various successive ages

when only certain types of life prevailed all over the globe. Hence it is that Herbert Spencer caustically remarks "Though the onion-coat hypothesis is dead, its spirit is traceable, under a transcendental form, even in the conclusions of its antagonists." Hence it is that Whewell, in his *History of the Inductive Sciences*, refuses to acknowledge that in geology any real advance has yet been made toward a stable science like those of astronomy, physics, and chemistry. "We hardly know," he says, "whether the progress is begun. The history of physical astronomy almost commences with Newton, and few persons will venture to assert that the Newton of geology has yet appeared." Hence it is that T. H. Huxley declares, "In the present condition of our knowledge, and of our methods, one verdict,—'not proved and not provable'—must be recorded against all grand hypotheses of the paleontologist respecting the general succession of life on the globe." And hence it is that Sir Henry H. Howorth, a member of the British House of Commons and the author of three exhaustive works on the Glacial Theory, declares, "It is a singular and notable fact, that while most other branches of science have emancipated them-

selves from the trammels of metaphysical reasoning, the science of geology still remains in a priori theories.

“And thus the matter remains even today, in this second decade of the twentieth century. Geology has never yet been regenerated, as have all the other sciences, by being delivered from the caprices of subjective speculations and a priori theories and being placed on the secure basis of objective and demonstrable fact, in accordance with the principles of that inductive method of investigation which was instituted by Bacon and which has become so far universal in the other sciences that it is everywhere known as the scientific method.

“But for over seventy-five years geology has not made a single advance movement in its theoretical aspects; indeed, in all its important general principles, it has scarcely changed in a hundred years. I shall leave it to the reader to judge whether this is a case of almost miraculous perfection from the beginning, or of arrested development.”

This is amply evidenced by the widely varying ages of the existence of the world assigned by geologists. These guesses are from billions to seven thousand years, or less. The

trend among geologists generally, however, is to shorten the period hitherto ascribed to the duration of the world.”

The eminent geologist, Prof. Charles Lyell, said: “The French Institute enumerated not less than eighty geological theories which were hostile to the Scriptures; but not one of these theories is held today.”



CHAPTER IV

EVOLUTIONARY ORIGIN OF SPECIES  
UNTRUE AND UNSCIENTIFIC

Evolution in its supposition of the origin of species is untrue, unscientific and anti scriptural. The claim of evolution in this connection is clear and specific. Its contention is, that from the "primordial germ," or at most, but a few forms of life, by a process of "variation" and "natural selection," have come the myriad forms of life that now exist, or have existed, or will yet come into existence. This is the acknowledged claim of practically every known protagonist of the theory of evolution. If this theory be true, we may well ask, why have no new species appeared? Within the limits of history, there is not the record of a single new species, while there are many instances of lost species. Of the more than twenty thousand classified specimens of animals, not one of them is claimed as a new species. If variation and natural selection produced numberless species in an imaginary past, why have they not produced them for several thousand years past? Did the law of variation and natural selection cease to function with the beginning of historical records? The man who

affirms that the various species originated in this way should give examples to support his theory. The writer might claim that a man lived in the moon a million years ago. To disprove such an assertion would be impossible. Nor would there be any necessity to attempt to disprove it. The burden of proof would be upon him who affirmed it. Prof. Ritter, Professor of Zoölogy in the University of California, in dredging the bottom of the ocean, at a depth of seven and a half miles, found living creatures identical with the oldest fossils of the same species. If there be a well authenticated fact in the history of the animal kingdom it is the permanency of species. Whatever freaks "variation" may work, it has never changed a species, or originated a new species. The transmutation of species is an hypothesis that is not supported by example or reason.

For a season, we heard much about our present horse being the descendant of the "five-toed horse." Later investigation has successfully demonstrated that this five-toed animal was not a horse of any kind. The structural arrangement is essentially different, to say nothing of the difference between a hoof and toes. With equal propriety, it

might have been claimed that the cow sprang from the *five-toed horse*.

Concerning the origin of the horse, Clelland, in his *Geology*, a textbook used in the Kentucky State University, says: "From an animal less than a foot in height, with a skeleton more like that of a carnivore than a horse, the changes in structure and size have been traced step by step to the present. . . . It should be borne in mind however, that few of the so-called ancestors are truly in the direct line, but they show us rather what the actual forbears were like. . . . The earliest American horse of which we have a record lived in the early Eocene and was a small and unhorse-like animal about the size of a fox."

It is worthy to note that the picture given by the author is very much more like a fox than a horse. No wonder he refers to it as "unhorse-like." He does well to inform us, that "few of the so-called ancestors are truly in the direct line, but they show us rather what the actual forbears were like." Just how ancestors not in a direct line, can show us what the direct ancestors were like, is not easily understood. Unfortunately for this example, all the fossils of the alleged ancestors of the horse have been found in the new

world, and yet there was not, as history tells us, a specimen of the present tribe when the Spaniards reached this country some four hundred years ago. This presents a case where the true ancestors perished ages before their offspring was born. The horse, as we now have him, was imported from Europe, and the most ardent advocates of the transmutation, or transitionist theory, inform us that he is descended from the paleotherium, a creature that is supposed to have closely resembled the tapir. Surely, the scientists should agree among themselves before they ask others to agree with them. Sir William Dawson says, "It is equally certain that had we not known of the American animal, these lower forms would have unhesitatingly been claimed as our ancestors."

Prof. C. C. Everett, of Harvard said: "As he looks upon it, it is as fixed as the sphynx that slumbers on Egyptian sands. All this story of transmutation and activity is a dream." Every well informed evolutionist knows that his doctrine is unproved and unprovable, but having forsaken the Bible, he dreads to discredit his scholarship by frankly admitting his mistake. If like begets like what hope have we for a new species, except

by direct creation. According to evolution we should claim that like begets variation, and variation begets new species. Mr. Darwin says: "Natural selection acts solely through the preservation of the varieties some way advantageous, which consequently endure."

Prof. Conn, for whom all evolutionists have the greatest respect, says:

"This fact has led some of our most thoughtful and observant naturalists to question seriously whether natural selection can be a true cause, while it has convinced others that we can never find the explanation of descent by the study of natural selection." He further says: "At the outset we must notice that in attempting to build up evolution of species, the weakest point in the chain has been variation."

And yet, by common consent, there is no way to build this theory without "variation." What then becomes of the theory?

Mr. Darwin's son, in the biography of his father, says: "We cannot prove that a single species has changed." That is equivalent to saying that his father's theory has never been proved.

Herbert Spencer contended that unless acquired characteristics can be inherited, there can be no evolution. Acquired characteristics cannot be inherited, therefore, according to Herbert Spencer, there can be no such thing as evolution.

August Weisman, many years professor in the University of Freiburg in Baden, gave the death stroke to the theory of evolution, when he demonstrated, beyond all question, that characteristics acquired by a parent cannot be transmitted to the offspring. If then a parent cannot transmit an acquired possession, how can he transmit that which neither he nor his ancestors ever possessed? It has truly been said that August Weisman started a civil war among biologists. Weisman experimented by cutting off the tails of both parents of breeding mice. These experiments were carried through twenty-two generations, yet all the mice were born with tails!

Loey, in *Biology and Its Makers*, a textbook used in many colleges and universities says: "It must be confessed that there is not a single case in which the supposed inheritance of an acquired characteristic has stood the test of critical examination."

Unfortunately for their contention, evolutionists have not told us how and when the first species became extinct. Surely this is necessary before determining their age, or the age of the world by them.

No one has yet heard of a dog being turned into a cat, or a new species coming from the interbreeding of a dog and a cat. There are many varieties of dogs, but they are all dogs. You cannot fertilize the pollen of a rose from a corn stalk.

The crossing of species produces a hybrid, and the hybrid is without the power of propagation. The mule has planted himself squarely across the path of the evolutionist, and until, by process of evolution, the head of the evolutionist becomes harder than the heels of the mule, passage will be impossible. Either the evolutionist must dispose of the mule, or the mule disposes of the evolutionist.

Mr. Ethridge of the British Museum says: "In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species. The Museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of these views."

The late Dr. Virchow, the discoverer of the germ theory, said: "The reserve which most naturalists impose on themselves is sup-

ported by the small actual proofs of Darwin's theory. Facts seem to teach the invariability of the human and animal species."—*Popular Science*, 50, 52.

Certainly one should know more of his own family history than of others in no way related to him. It is, perhaps, a delicate matter to contradict one concerning his ancestry, even when he solemnly affirms that his progenitors were apes, beasts, birds and reptiles. Suppose then, for the sake of the argument, we grant the ancestral claims of the evolutionists concerning themselves. Should they not accord the same right to others? The great rank and file of God's people claim that they were created by God, and in His image, and are not at all anxious to claim kin with the evolutionists, or their forbears. Should they, then, get angry, because our ancestry was divine, and theirs, according to their own confession, inhuman reptiles and beasts? If one wishes to believe that his great-great-great-grandparents roosted in trees, with their tails wrapped around a limb, one is clearly entitled to all the comfort that comes with that belief. Just how a man can look into the face of his noble consecrated mother, and believe she descended through the wild

ferocious wolf, is to the average mind unthinkable.

If the theory of the evolutionist be true, he is eating his own kind, and to this extent stands a self-confessed cannibal. Chinese worship their ancestors, while evolutionists eat their own kin folks. Evolutionists should be vegetarians.

Mr. Davison, in his *Practical Zoölogy*, claims that "more than one hundred new species are discovered every year." This too in spite of the fact that no one else in all the world claims to have found a new species. How anyone who can make such a statement would assume to write a textbook, is well nigh unthinkable. Mr. Davison also informs us that "food and climate" will produce "new species." According to this if we put a dog in a different climate and feed him hay, he will become a cow.

Another fatal objection to the theory of natural selection and survival of the fittest is that the characters of the higher group are rarely of a nature that specially fit their possessors for the circumstances in which they are placed. In other words, the differences that separate genus from genus in the ascending scale of each, do not show supe-

rior adaptation to their surroundings. Hence it follows that superior adaptation could hardly have caused their selection in preference to other nonexistent forms. For example, a man in the cold climate of Canada is clothed by nature, in the same manner as the native of Florida. The inhabitant of Canada has not developed a hairy covering, or thicker skin, than his brother in a tropical or semitropical climate. As claimed, the different structures which indicate successional relation appear to be equally fitted for similar surroundings.

It is further true, that "the higher groups have, in each geological period, been distributed over the whole earth under all the varied circumstances offered by food and climate, and their characters do not seem to have been modified in reference to these."

It should be remembered that most of the evidence obtained by Darwin in support of his theories was obtained from domesticated animals. In such cases, it will be admitted that there is little or no struggle for existence. Food and protection are provided and, therefore, but little evidence is afforded of the method followed in nature. To say the least,

this fact doubly discounts the worth of the evidence offered by Darwin.

Naturally and logically, the more you develop a monkey, the more of the monkey he becomes. A man can come much nearer making a monkey of himself than a monkey can come in making a man of himself. To say the least, the mental cast of that man is peculiar who prefers spending his time tracing his similarity to a monkey, rather than striving to become like Him, in whose image he was created.

## CHAPTER V.

### EVOLUTION ADVOCATES LAW OF THE JUNGLE

Evolution is contrary to fact in its teaching concerning the preservation of life. According to Darwin, "Natural Selection," or as Herbert Spencer expresses it, "Survival of the Fittest," accounts for the preservation and universal improvement of species. Shrewdly enough, the average evolutionist fails to define the word "fittest" in this connection. We are left to conjecture whether he means physical, mental, or moral fitness. In the absence of restricted definition, we have a right to assume the word "fittest" is used in a general sense, that is, physical, mental, and moral fitness. The phrase "Natural Selection" is axiomatically untrue. Selection implies intelligence, and Nature does not possess intelligence, and therefore is not capable of exercising the power of choice. Obviously, the doctrine of the "Survival of the Fittest" is, that in the "struggle for existence, the fittest survive, and the less fit, or unfit perish." Fortunately for all concerned, this is a question of fact, and one easily determined by the facts in the case. The falsity of this doctrine is demonstrated in the Parable of the

Sower. In sowing the seed the best, or "fittest," seed may be devoured by birds, or fall in stony places, while the seed that are least fit may take root and in due season bring forth fruit. Unfortunately, birds and rocks have not learned to respect this theory.

The bear attacks the little child; the child is killed, and the bear survives, hence according to the doctrine of the survival of the "fittest," the bear was "fitter" than the child. In the "struggle for existence" with typhoid fever the man dies, and the typhoid germ survives, therefore the germ is the "fittest" and survives. In the last cruel war many of the strongest, noblest and best perished, and many who were less fit in these respects survived. Bullets and poison gas paid scant respect to the hypothesis of evolution.

In not a few instances, the idiotic child survives while the normally developed brother dies. The strong husband succumbs to pneumonia, while the invalid wife survives.

Charles Darwin assumes that man has greater brain power than woman, and accounts for this superiority upon the theory that the male, in fighting for the female, developed greater strength, and this strength resulted in greater brain power. Mr. Dar-

win failed to take into account the fact, that mental acumen is not the result of physical contests. In justice to Mr. Darwin, it should be said that many suppositions that were advanced by him as mere working hypotheses are now taught as established facts. It is claimed that in the "Origin of Species" and "Survival of the Fittest" the phrase, "we may well suppose," occurs more than 800 times.

If the theory of the "Survival of the Fittest" is true, then the supreme law of life is the law of the jungle. If the teaching of the "Survival of the Fittest" is true and right, why not kill the aged and infirm, that the fittest may have a more abundant survival? There is not an evil under heaven that cannot be justified by the theory of the survival of the fittest. The brute that with superior strength rapes the pure and innocent girl and then murders her in the struggle for existence may find refuge in this beastly doctrine. The superman met his deserved fate on the battle fields of France. But it is a fact, and we may as well face it, that many of our universities have been inoculated with the deadly virus of German Rationalism, and we have another war to wage. We should all wish to be found in the path

of real progress, but some of us will insist on ascertaining whether the path of boasted progress started from Berlin or Jerusalem.

It is unquestionably true that the strongest is quite frequently the least fit. With Christianity, it is not a question of the survival of the fittest individual, but the survival of the fittest in each individual. The spirit and process of evolution are contrary to the spirit and process of Christianity. Instead of self-assertion, Christianity demands self-denial. Christ commands the strong to support the weak, and prevent them from perishing. According to the law of Christ man becomes strong by lifting the weak, and not by treading them under foot, that the fittest may survive. The religion of evolution is the religion of inconceivable selfishness. According to this scholastic paganism, man must come up through the cruel and continuous clash of conflict, urged on by the ambition that he may become strong enough to crush the weak. Nero, Herod and Herodias are typical and logical examples of the survival of the fittest, while John Howard, Gladstone and Florence Nightingale were the embodiment of Christian thought and practice. Darwin predi-

ates life upon the survival of the fittest, but Christ makes us fit to survive.

The god Thor is still challenging the Son of God; but, as Longfellow presents it in his "Saga of King Olaf," the issue is certain; not Might but Right and the Righteousness of Christ will triumph.

Thus the god Thor speaks:

"Force rules the world still,  
Has ruled it, shall rule it;  
Meekness is weakness,  
Strength is triumphant;  
Over the whole earth,  
Still it is Thor's-day!

"Thou art a god, too,  
O Galilean!  
And thus single-handed  
Unto the combat  
Here I defy thee!"

And this is the answer:

"It is accepted,  
The angry defiance;  
The challenge of battle,  
It is accepted;  
But not with the weapons  
Of war that thou wieldest.



“Cross against corselet,  
Love against hatred,  
Peace-cry for war-cry!  
Patience is powerful;  
He that o’ercometh  
Hath power o’er the nations.

“Stronger than steel  
Is the sword of the Spirit;  
Swifter than arrows  
The light of the Truth is;  
Greater than anger  
Is Love, and subdueth!

“The dawn is not distant,  
Nor is the night starless;  
Love is eternal!  
God is still God  
And his faith shall not fail us.”

## CHAPTER VI

### EVOLUTION FAILS TO EXPLAIN THE FACTS OF HISTORY

Evolution contradicts the facts of history in regard to continuous universal progress.

In the lower orders of animal life, there is absolutely no evidence of improvement. The quail of today is the exact specimen of the quail of other ages. The marking of feathers, habits and food show neither change nor variation that even suggests improvement of any kind or character. The squirrel still looks and lives just as he did in the long ago. The sea urchin, one of the oldest known forms of animal life, is the identical specimen that appears in the earliest records. Whatever of improvement made in domestic fowls or animals has been by external and artificial means, and not by the development of “resident forces.” The carrion crow is the carrion crow of thousands of years ago. Not a single specimen of fish or fowl, in the course of natural history has ever changed its species, or by its own efforts in the “struggle for existence” shown any improvement. All the improvements so loudly acclaimed have been accomplished in domestic plants and animals by skilled naturalists. With not a few species

there has been marked retrogradation, and the progress has been in the wrong direction. It has been involution rather than evolution.

The physical make up of man shows no improvement through all the centuries. Is man stronger today than he was two thousand years ago? No one will have the hardihood to assert that man of today is physically superior to the Greek or Roman of two thousand years ago. A prominent scientist who carefully examined the photograph of an arm discovered in Crete, and which is about four thousand years old says: "The arrangement is identical to the smallest detail with that of the surface veins and muscles in the arm that writes these words. These statuettes in my opinion, constitute the oldest exact anatomical records in the world, and my study leads me to the conclusion, that for four thousand years there has been no change even in the minutest details of the forearm of man."

Nor has the natural quantity or quality of the human brain improved. Prof. Pierre Broca, in speaking of the Cro Magnon skull, which is one of the oldest in existence said: "The volume of the brain, the development of the frontal region, the fine elliptical profile

are incontestable evidence of superiority, and are characteristics that are usually found only in civilized nations." Prof. Huxley, speaking of one of the oldest human skulls, said: "So far as size and shape are concerned, it might have been the brain of a philosopher."

The history of nations disproves the claim of universal progress. All the nations of antiquity had their rise, development and decline. Prof. A. H. Sayce says: "The Mosaic age, instead of coming at the dawn of Oriental culture, really belongs to the evening of its decay. The Hebrew legislator was surrounded on all sides by the influences of a decadent civilization."

The Egyptians who designed and built the monuments were intellectual giants compared with their descendants of today. The same is true of ancient and modern Greece. Mexico, South America, and other countries give incontestable evidence of a decadent civilization.

The evolutionists have been hard pressed to give some plausible excuse for the failure of their hypothesis. A leading Southern exponent of the theistic theory of evolution was

reported by the Associated Press as saying in a recent address:

“There has been relatively little improvement in the human stock during all the 500,000 years of man’s occupation of this planet.” Among the reasons he assigned for this statement is the following: “The best blood of the race has been wasted in wars.” This is a pretty hard jolt for those, including himself, who survived the last war. In view of the fact that not one per cent of the world’s population has perished in wars during the history of mankind, this excuse is not worthy of serious consideration.

The good Doctor, however, hoists himself on his own petard, since evolution affirms the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. Certainly war is a struggle for existence, and hence the “fittest” should have survived and not perished, as he claimed. Surely the legs of the lame are not equal. Selah!

It was hoped that embryology would bolster up this decadent theory, but it too has failed. Prof. Conn says: “But embryology has not answered all the questions set for it, and there is a tendency at the present time to decry this study as delusive. It is

beyond question that the results have been somewhat disappointing. It was at one time hoped it would disclose with considerable accuracy the history of animals, and so completely teach us that history as to give us a very thorough knowledge of the laws of evolution. But in both respects it has failed to meet expectations.”

Prof. Edwin G. Conklin, of Princeton, and withal a supposed expert in concocting and administering this antitheistic virus, recently declared that evolution had reached its limit in the physical and mental development of man, and nothing more could be expected of it in this regard. It is enheartening to know that he admits evolution has ceased to function. And while he is traveling in the right direction, those of us who really believe the Bible have long known that evolution never accomplished anything and, at best, is but the “baseless fabric of a vision,” the iridescent and delusive dream of the scholastic highbrow, who consciously or unconsciously, has degraded God, and deified Darwin.

If atoms, by “resident forces” have been able to design their own destiny, to work out their own improvement, and to change them-

selves from one character to another, then we have countless thousands of gods and not one, as taught in the Book that has made our nation great among the nations of the earth. According to evolution, each atom is self-knowing, self-acting and self-determining. If these atoms are not controlled by the will of God, they are self-controlled and act independent of God, or are themselves gods.

It is claimed that an architect once found a remarkable plan for building houses, and the evidence of his own ingenuity was the fact that no one else ever built one in the same manner. His plan was to begin at the roof and work downward to the foundation. The evolutionist proceeds upon a more or less similar hypothesis. The man who first dreamed evolution could, at least, claim originality. The evolutionists seem to argue that the banks made the stream, and not the stream the banks. It is not the universe that is continually changing, but men's conceptions concerning it. "The solid earth beneath our feet is the same one Adam knew in the early morning of historic time. The blazing stars revolving about our head are the same centers of flame Abraham saw from the Chaldean plains. The sweet light coming

with every blessed day to guide our steps is the same that David saw arraying in beauty the flowers on the hills about Jerusalem." Man began life in a very humble way, but he began it "in the image of God," and with God's help, has worked wonders in the world.

The Hon. Thomas Dwight, professor of anatomy in Harvard University, well says: "One of our greatest curses has been the atheistic popular lecturer, the purveyor of sham science on the one hand and the hater of religion on the other. He spreads about the wildest theories as established facts, clamoring that the whole social fabric, religion and all, should be remodeled to suit the new revelation. He does not know whether there is a God or not; but he does know that man came from the ape. . . . The mischief that such men do is great indeed. The young man sees the popular lecturer praised and flattered, is dazzled by his plausibility and brilliancy. The plain fact that his hero is but a quack does not occur to him."—*Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist*, 26

Prof. G. M. Price well says: "And the prophecies of the Bible have repeatedly pointed out a special message that the church is to bear to the world, in that darkest hour

just before the breaking of eternal day, a message that we now see is wonderfully adapted to this age of evolution and science and pantheism in philosophy. Looking down along the darkening vistas of the coming years, the great Jehovah saw how a vastly increased knowledge of His created works would be perverted into a burlesque of Creation, and how this would result in a widespread apostasy in which His written Word would be derided and scorned." And that day has come!

EVOLUTION RESURRECTS BOGUS  
MISSING LINKS

Evolutionists have long been engaged in search for the "missing link." The gap between man and the ape was too great for even the evolutionist to span with his theory of transmutation of species. They could only bridge the gulf with a guess, so they guessed the "missing link" had been discovered. In September 1891, Dubois, a Dutch physician, found in the Island of Java a tooth. It was found at a depth of forty-five feet. A month later, a few feet away he found the roof of a skull. In August 1892, he found a thigh bone, 48 feet from where he found the tooth. With these scant remains was constructed what was termed the "Pithecanthropus." This was supposed to supply the long lost "missing link." If the skull and the thigh bone belonged to the same skeleton, it is rather difficult to conceive how they came to be forty-eight feet apart. As a rule, bones under the earth remain where they are deposited. The distance between is rather a strong suggestion that they did not belong to the same animal. The size and shape of the skull resembled that of an ape, much more than that of a man. According to all known laws of evi-

dence, even though the bones had belonged to the "missing link," the evidence to prove it is hopelessly insufficient. The burden of proof is upon those who affirmed that it was the missing link, and certainly it will take more than a tooth and the top part of a skull, and a thigh bone to be accepted as belonging to an animal unknown to history.

In 1894 twenty-four scientists met at Leyden and made a critical examination of these bones. Ten of the number said they were the bones of an ape; seven pronounced them the bones of a man, and seven believed them the bones of the "missing link." Prof. Cunningham, of Dublin, at the time perhaps the world's greatest authority on Comparative Anatomy, claimed that it was absolutely certain that the bones did not belong to the same animal. In spite of this, here and there, a belated evolutionist will cite the Pithecanthropus as the "missing link."

Just why the textbooks taught in our schools cite the Pithecanthropus as the "missing link," and fail to mention that it has been discredited by scientists, cannot be accounted for upon the principles of fair dealing. If those who wrote these textbooks did not

know that these scientists met at Leyden and passed judgment on the Pithecanthropus, they were too ignorant to write a textbook. If to the contrary, they knew the fact and deliberately suppressed it, then they were downright dishonest. This, however, is by no means the first instance in which evolutionists have suppressed evidence contradicting their theory.

It will be noted that Robert W. Hegner, in *College Zoölogy*, 666, says: "In some fossil remains of a primate that were found in the upper Pliocene, on the Island of Java, have been designated by Haeckel as 'the last link,' between the apes and men, and the animal to which they belonged has been given the name Pithecanthropus erectus."

The author of these words perhaps has a fellow feeling for Haeckel, as both are adepts in suppressing evidence. The man whom he quotes with such complacency is Ernest Haeckel of Jena, who was born in 1834, and was among the first in Germany to defend Darwin's theory of evolution. Mr. Haeckel has been the acknowledged leader of evolutionists for nearly a half century. Be it remembered that this same Ernest Haeckel was

proven guilty of a willful and deliberate deception. In 1868 he published his natural history of creation (*Natürlichen Schöpfungs-geschichte*) in order to prove his theory that in their rudimentary stages wholly different animals exactly resemble one another, and that they were all developments from one identical form. He printed in one place, plates which purported to be the embryos of a man, an ape, and a dog. In another portion of his book, he printed three other plates purporting to be the embryos of a dog, a fowl, and a turtle, these three being identical. But "murder will out," and it was soon observed by Prof. Ruthmeyer, of Basle, that the three plates, supposed to represent three different embryos were, in both instances the same plate printed three different times. This was proved by accidental scratches on the face of the blocks. This despicable fraud was brought to the attention of Prof. Haeckel, who did not deny the charge but referred to it as a "very foolish blunder." His only excuse for this base deception was, that since they were in fact exactly similar, it was not dishonest to exhibit them in this manner. Surely, there is ample room for evolution in such a conscience. Ob-

viously Haeckel's conscience is not an example of the "survival of the fittest."

It is a well-known fact that many of the pictures exhibited to prove the theory of evolution are mere figments of artistic fancy, without any counterpart in fact, yet these pictures are displayed as real and genuine.

In 1908, in replying to similar charges, Mr. Haeckel published a defense to put at rest what he was pleased to term "brutal fuss" and "Christian slanders." In his reply he freely confessed that a small portion of his embryo illustrations had been "faked," but this "had been done in connection with such pictures when the available data were insufficient, and that he was compelled to fill in the lacuna with hypotheses, and to reconstruct the missing links by comparative synthesis." He further stated that "hundreds" of esteemed biologists did the same thing!

Did Mr. Hegner, when he quoted Haeckel, know that he had been convicted of this fraud? Somehow evolution appears to have developed a peculiar cast of conscience. In view of the fact that the evolutionists tell us we sprang from the beast, and as beasts have no conscience, we should, perhaps, not expect too much in this regard.

81  
Mr. Haeckel was in error in stating that the embryos of different species were exactly similar. No less an authority than Prof. Lieberkupa of Marburg said:

"Prof. Haeckel of Jena maintains in his popular writings that embryos of man and beasts cannot in their earlier stages be distinguished. I can quite believe that Prof. Haeckel is unable to distinguish these embryos. It does not, however, follow that others cannot do so. Mix together in a bowl all sorts of embryos, and I will tell you the origin of each."

While Mr. Haeckel is discredited as a witness, we offer the following testimony from him, for whatever it may be worth: "Most modern investigators of science have come to the conclusion that the doctrine of evolution, and peculiarly Darwinism, is an error and cannot be maintained."

It seems all too characteristic of many evolutionists to assume that what they do not know is unknown and unknowable. If the "missing link" ever existed why should not the forces that formerly produced the "missing link" get busy and produce another? The evolutionists themselves being judges, the theory works till it reaches the monkey and

then becomes a case of "arrested progress." Obviously, the "missing link" is the most important link in the chain of evolution, and since no chain is stronger than its weakest link, much less its missing link, this broken chain should be relegated to the scrap heap.

Another bogus "missing link" which was exploited all over the world by so-called scientists, was the famous "Sussex Man." At last, however, the facts came to light and the "missing link" advocates have found themselves at sea, as is evidenced by the following statement of this case by Joseph McCabe: "I have on an earlier page mentioned a prehistoric human skull that was found at Pilt-down, in Sussex, in 1911. It must have been buried something like 400,000 years ago. There has been a great deal of controversy about this skull, as parts of it are missing, and it is possible, in reconstructing it, to make the forehead slope back like that of a gorilla or stand up like that of a modern man." The fact is, the majority of the naturalists and scientists who examined this skull pronounced it not the skull of "a prehistoric human," but the skull of "a modern man." Yet McCabe, in the quotation just cited, calls it "a prehistoric human skull" and



says that it was "buried there 400,000 years ago." Think of such handling of facts in the name of science!

Then evolutionists resort to "revolution," frankly confessing that "evolution" does not and can not explain the known facts about the world's development. Joseph McCabe just quoted above, who is a noted evolutionist of the Darwinian type, for example, has the following to say in attempting to explain the great Ice Ages, particularly the last one: "The man who says that the secret of progress is 'evolution, not revolution,' may be talking very good social philosophy—I have nothing to do with that—but he is not talking science, as he thinks. In every modern geological work you will read of periodical revolutions in the story of the earth, and these are the great ages of progress—and, I ought to add, of colossal annihilation of the unfit." The fact is, not a scientist in the world can explain the three Ice Ages which have supposedly occurred in the world's past history. It is naively suggested by most of them that these Ice Ages were brought on by a sudden elevation of the parts of the earth affected. Then how did these Ice Ages pass by after a time, and the earth in these same sections be-

come warm again? There is no evidence of any sudden and accommodating depressions of the earth occurring in these sections at the time of the returning warmth and heat.

These, however, are but a few of the many illustrations of the utter breakdown of the unproved and unprovable theory of evolution. How long will it be suffered to hoodwink and handicap science, dazzle and dethrone reason, degrade and damn civilization and deny and defy God? No class of fiction was ever produced with so little fact back of it as the amazing, alluring, and demoralizing romances which are flung off the pens of so-called scientific writers and issued in an unending stream of books under the high-sounding title of "scientific works." The time has come to accept the challenge of this uncircumcised Philistine who is defying the armies of the living God, converting man made in the image of God into a beast, and leading civilization back to the jungle.

## CHAPTER VIII

### EVOLUTION—THE TREE AND ITS FRUITS

The real test of any philosophy—and evolution is at most a philosophy which attempts to explain the development of the world—is to carefully note the effects or fruits of it. Let us therefore glance at some of the fruits of this unproved and unprovable theory of evolution.

1. The theory of evolution denies man's moral responsibility. Le Conte, who classed himself a theistic evolutionist and who was well qualified to speak in this regard, says: "What we call evil is not a unique phenomenon confined to man. It is a great fact pervading all nature and a part of its very constitution." According to this sin, or "what we call evil," existed in nature long before it existed in man, and came up through brute creation to man. A Russian author recently wrote an article in which he said: "When I kill a hen or a rat, no one says anything. Why do you say anything when I kill a man, for he is only an animal with a little higher reasoning?" Was he not right if the claims of evolution be true?

2. The theory of evolution denies the Gospel remedy for sin. According to the life succession theory, man would, apart from supernatural help, achieve his own redemption. This would be particularly true of the "survival of the fittest" in the "struggle for existence." If evolution be true, the only fall man ever had was a fall upward from the brute. In its very nature, evolution can recognize no atonement. In its scheme, there is no place for one to die for another, but to the contrary, the stronger kills the weaker in order that the stronger may survive. The only redemption that evolution offers is heredity and environment. Vicarious sacrifice is contrary to the very genius of evolution. According to the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest," Christ perished in the "struggle for existence," because the Pharisees were the fittest.

3. It destroys belief in the Bible and thus takes away from the people the greatest civilizing force known to the world. The evolutionist is quite right in saying that geology, as interpreted by him, is contrary to the account of Creation. Every evolutionist must believe the account of Creation given in Gen-

esis is either figurative or false. Concerning the account of Creation given in Genesis, Prof. Sayce, the greatest archæologist of all time, says: "The wicked serpent was mentioned in the Sumarian texts. Mr. Boscawen has lately found a Babylonian fragment, forming part of the third tablet in the Creation series, in which the fall of man seems to be described in plain terms."

Frederick Delitzsch, in *Babel and the Bible*, says: "The Babylonians divided their history into two great parts; the one before, and the other after the flood."

According to the evolutionists the command to keep the Sabbath was entirely useless, since Creation was not completed as affirmed by the Bible. The Sabbath is the memorial of a finished Creation.

Evolutionists did not discover a process of creation, but invented one. There is abundant evidence that the teachings of these textbooks is unsettling the faith of thousands of students. Many of these, through respect for their parents' faith, say but little, while many others are outspoken in their rejection of the Bible account of Creation. In a recent lecture on evolution, three heart-broken mothers told the writer of the wrecking of their chil-

dren's faith by this ruinous teaching. In a recent meeting of our State Board a prominent business man wept as he told of the damage done his daughter's faith by this teaching. This is not an unusual but an almost every day occurrence.

4. It is wrecking the faith of many students in all our state institutions and not a few in denominational schools.

The editor of the *Commercial Appeal*, of Memphis, Tenn., in an editorial says:

"The manner in which Darwin's doctrines are taught in some schools, which is that at a certain point in his upward progress God breathed a living soul into the beast and he became a man, is nothing more nor less than a concession to what is regarded as the prevailing ignorance. Those following such a course are without the courage of their convictions, otherwise their principles would carry them the full length of complete agnosticism.

"We have found but a single young person who has returned from college in the last decade who is not an outspoken disciple of Darwin, and from the discretion with which he spoke we have grave doubts about him.

"The whole matter comes to this: that responsible leaders should look the question squarely in the face and definitely adopt either one course or the other. A policy of drifting will ruin any thing. And we venture to say that if one will embody the Darwinian doctrines of Evolution in a resolution to be presented to the various Christian bodies that it will be voted down by every synod, association, conference, or other official body in the South. If this be true, then ought a company of self-important leaders be permitted to accomplish by indirection what they could not do openly?"

In another editorial the same editor, in discussing the character and Christian faith of the late Hon. Joseph Hodges Choate, after bringing out the fact that Mr. Choate was once shaken in his faith in immortality by reading Darwin's works, but recovered his faith before his death, closed the article with this comment: "From the foregoing it seems clear that the speculations of the scientists named are inconsistent with a belief in immortality; and it seems equally clear to us that if there is no hell there ought to be one for the comfort of those gentlemen and their puny imitators of the present day who so

scornfully dominate the intellectual field."

5. It undermines all the fundamentals of Christianity. It denies the supernatural in the scheme and process of life. It finds no place for a miracle, or a miracle-working God. It exalts "resident forces," and makes God a Pantheistic force in nature only. Of necessity it must deny the deity of Christ. According to the evolutionist, Christ came up through the insect, reptile, fowl, bird and beast. It denies the Incarnation, Virgin Birth and Resurrection. In spite of this, it is a fact that every nation worth while in the whole world achieved its greatness by belief in the Bible.

6. It robs man of his spiritual nature and makes him a developed beast. An evolutionist considers himself the offspring of the beast and hence with brute blood in his veins. Why should not the descendant of the brute be brutal? Nietzsche refers to his own countryman as the "blonde beast." In his brutality he would only prove true to his type and perpetuate the nature of his species. The spiritual nature of man is rarely referred to in any work on evolution.

7. It exalts the law of the jungle. If this brutal theory be true in the "struggle for existence" the weak must be killed that the strong may survive. It places a premium on murder and glorifies the demon of destruction. It builds its hope of life on the graves of others. That evolution may have free course, and may run and be glorified, there should be no physicians or hospitals. The weak and sick and unfit should be allowed to perish that the strong and fit may survive. Evolution knows neither God nor mercy, but only "variation" and brute strength.

8. Evolution logically and inevitably leads to war. Nietzsche's philosophy is the legitimate product of Darwinian evolution. In full accord with the inevitable logic of the "survival of the fittest" he crowned the superman, glorified war, expressed contempt for Christ, and decried all rule of right and right living. To his philosophical treatises, more perhaps than to all other causes, was due the late cruel war. Nietzsche claimed that Darwin was one of the three greatest men of his century. If the "survival of the fittest" is the supreme law of life in the struggle for existence, then war is the ideal agency for carrying out this

brutal theory. Pseudo scientists have sowed the seed, and they have brought forth "after their kind."

Dr. A. C. Dixon, former pastor of Spurgeon's Tabernacle, in a published sermon says: "The greatest war in history, which has drenched the world with blood and covered it with human bones, can be traced to the Theory of Evolution as its source. If the strong and the fit have the scientific right to destroy the weak and the unfit in order that human progress may be promoted, then might is right, and Germany should not be criticised for acting upon this principle.

"Nietzsche, the neurotic German philosopher, hypnotized the German mind with this pagan brute philosophy. 'The weak and the botched,' said he, 'shall perish; and they ought to be helped to perish. What is more harmful than any vice? Practical sympathy with the weak and botched Christianity.' 'Christianity,' said he, 'is the greatest of all conceivable corruptions—the one moral blemish of mankind.' And he hated it because of its sympathy with the weak and botched. He glorified his German Blonde Beast, and gave to the world a superman, one-third brute, one-third devil, and one-third philosopher.

“Under the spell of his daring brutality, Germany adopted the motto, ‘Corsica has conquered Galilee.’

“Nietzsche’s philosophy of beastliness has its roots in the evolutionary assumption that the strong and fit, in the struggle for existence, have the scientific right to destroy the weak and unfit; and now the only conscience a Prussian has is a scientific conscience. He has discarded the decalogue, thrown away the Bible, and recognizes no law of God. To him whatever is scientific according to this evolutionary teaching is right.

“Sinking the *Lusitania* was a good scientific job, neatly executed, and, as a reward, the submarine captain who did it got a knighthood and the children of Berlin a holiday.”

During the International Peace Congress at Paris in 1900, *L’Univers* in an editorial said: “The spirit of peace has fled the earth, because evolution has taken possession of it. But now that men are looked upon as children of apes, what matters whether they are slaughtered or not.”

In closing we direct attention to the warning words of Col. William Jennings Bryan:

“As the Great War progressed I became

more and more impressed with the conviction that the German propaganda rested upon a materialistic foundation. I secured the writings of Nietzsche and found in them a defense, made in advance, of all the cruelties and atrocities practiced by the militarists of Germany. Nietzsche tried to substitute the worship of the ‘Superman’ for the worship of God. He not only rejected the Creator, but he rejected all moral standards. He praised war and eulogized hatred because it led to war. He denounced sympathy and pity as attributes unworthy of man. He believed that the teachings of Christ made degenerates and, logical to the end, he regarded Democracy as the refuge of weaklings. He saw in man nothing but the animal and in that animal the highest virtue he recognized was ‘The Will to Power’—a will which should know no let or hindrance, no restraint or limitation.

“Nietzsche’s philosophy would convert the world into a ferocious conflict between beasts each brute trampling ruthlessly on everything in his way. In his book entitled ‘*Joyful Wisdom*,’ Nietzsche ascribes to Napoleon the very same dream of power—Europe under one sovereign and that sovereign the

master of the world—that lured the Kaiser into a sea of blood from which he emerged an exile seeking security under a foreign flag. Nietzsche names Darwin as one of the three great men of his century, but tries to deprive him of credit (?) for the doctrine that bears his name, by saying that Hegel made an earlier announcement of it. Nietzsche died in an insane asylum, but his philosophy has wrought the moral ruin of a multitude, if it is not actually responsible for bringing upon the world its greatest war.

“His philosophy, if it is worthy the name of philosophy, is the ripened fruit of Darwinism—and a tree is known by its fruit.

“To destroy the faith of Christians and lay the foundation for the bloodiest war in history would seem enough to condemn Darwinism, but there are still two other indictments to bring against it. First, that it is the basis of the gigantic class struggle that is now shaking society throughout the world. Both the capitalist and the laborer are increasingly class conscious. Why? Because the doctrine of the ‘Individual efficient for himself’—the brute doctrine of the ‘survival of the fittest’—is driving men into a life and

death struggle from which sympathy and the spirit of brotherhood are eliminated. It is transforming the industrial world into a slaughterhouse. Benjamin Kidd in a masterly work entitled, *The Science of Power*, points out how Darwinism furnished Nietzsche with a scientific basis for his godless system of philosophy.

“He also quotes eminent English scientists to support the last charge in the indictment, namely, that Darwinism robs the reformer of hope. Its plan of operation is to improve the race by ‘scientific breeding’ on purely physical basis. Looking heavenward man can find inspiration in his lineage; looking about him he is impelled to kindness by a sense of kinship which binds him to his brothers. Mighty problems demand his attention; a world’s destiny is to be determined by him. What time has he to waste in hunting for ‘missing links’ or in searching for resemblances between his forefathers and the ape? ‘In His Image’—in this sign we conquer!

“We are not progeny of the brute; we have not been forced upward by a blind pushing power; neither have we tumbled upward by chance. We are the handiwork of the Al

*Evolution—A Menace*

---

---

mighty and are bound to Him by the power of love—a power which finds its highest expression in Christ who promised: ‘I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.’ ”