



The Evolution Theory Examined

Evidence from the Bible, Science and Facts that the Evolution Theory is an Unproven Hypothesis

It is now over 100 years since the Darwinian evolution theory was first set forth, in London, on July 1, 1858. Its 100th anniversary was marked by the appearance of articles in magazines and newspapers, featuring its inventor, Mr. Charles Darwin, his experiments, discoveries, conclusions, *etc.*

Some evolutionists are atheists, and teach that, without an intelligent Creator, the universe and its plant and animal life produced themselves by a series of transmutations from one form into another. The theory of Darwinian evolutionists, however, is that God created matter, its forces and the first form, or less preferably, the first few forms of plant and animal life, which thenceforth developed themselves into ever higher forms, culminating in man. These evolutionists (among whom some clergymen are found) like to convey the impression that their theory that man evolved from the ape is now commonly accepted by scholars, scientists and churchmen in general. This is by no means true. Nevertheless, because this theory has been and still is being taught in schools and colleges, and even in many churches, and has been and still is being advocated in many museum exhibits, books, magazines, newspapers, radio and television programs, *etc.*, many have more or less accepted it, without ever thinking much about it, or investigating for themselves whether or not it is in harmony with reason, facts and the teachings of the Bible. It is therefore appropriate that we examine here some of the main arguments that are advanced to support it, and also set forth some strong arguments against it.

First of all, it should be stated that evolution is built on the most extravagant *guesses*, which are proven to be unreliable by the fact that there is the utmost diversity in evolutionists' guesses necessary for the theory. Some of them guess that the human race has existed 2,000,000 years; others guess it as 100,000 years; and there are almost endless variations between these two figures. Scarcely any two of them agree on these guesses. Some of them guess the age of the earth to be 50,000,000 years and others 4,000,000,000 years. Between these extremes the bulk of them fix its age, again scarcely any two of them agreeing therein. Some of them assign to the age of plant life 3,000,000,000 years and others about 40,000,000 years, with all sort of variations on the part of others between these two extremes. Some of them claim that their own manufactured *pithecanthropus* (ape-man) lived 750,000 years ago; others claim that this figment of their imagination lived 375,000 years ago. On almost everything connected with the time element they widely and wildly disagree with one another.

Of course, reasoning people, in distinction from fanciful people, at once see that on these matters they are long on guessing and short on truth, else they would be in reasonable harmony on such essential matters. Mr. Darwin in his two principal works on evolution, in making his inductions, uses terms expressive of guessage 800 times—terms like "we suppose," "if we may assume," "perhaps," "it may have been," *etc.*—*i.e.*, he built his theory on 800 interdependent guesses. Applying the rule of compound probability to this theory so constructed, and very liberally allowing an even chance to his 800 guesses being right, *i.e.*, out of one chance there is a

half chance in each case that he was right, the chance that the theory is right is one as against the number of chances that it is wrong represented by 241 digits, the product of two squared 800 times, a set of figures which, allowing for twelve to an inch, would require over 20 inches of line space the size of the type in which this article is written, *i.e.*, over 6 of our lines! A theory so extremely improbable should never be taught as science—true knowledge. Rather it should long ago have been assigned to the *hades* of oblivion as much too improbable to be considered.

While rejecting the guesswork and speculations of evolutionists, let us not go to the opposite extreme of insisting that the creation of the earth and the preparing and ordering of it for man's habitation were accomplished in a very short period. We should keep in mind that the Bible account does not tell us how long it took God to create the earth (Gen. 1: 1), nor how long an interval of time elapsed between the creation of the earth and the condition described in v. 2, when "the earth *was*," *i.e.*, *existed*, though "waste and empty," nor how long the Spirit, the power of God, moved upon, or energized, the face of the waters, as described in Gen. 1: 2, before the beginning of the first of the "days" of God's ordering matters on earth to prepare it for man's habitation (Gen. 1: 3-5).

THE "DAYS" OF GENESIS 1

Nor should we assume that these "days" were periods of 24 hours only, for the term "day," both in the Bible and in common usage, frequently denotes a much longer period. *E.g.*, in the Bible we find it used to designate a 40-year period (Psa. 95: 7-10), a 1,000-year period (2 Pet. 3: 8), *etc.*; and in common usage we speak of Luther's day, Washington's day, *etc.* We know that the "days" of Gen. 1 were not sun-days, of 24 hours each, for neither the sun nor the moon was visible until the fourth day (Gen. 1: 14-18); rather, they were long periods of time. The Bible shows that the seventh of these "days" is 7,000 years long (see *The Time is at Hand*, Chap. II and *The New Creation*, p. 19); therefore the others are logically seen to be of the same length, making a period of 49,000 (7 x 7,000) years in all. Viewed thus, there is no disagreement with the true Biblical statements (as distinct from the creedal views inherited from the Dark Ages) respecting creation and the assured results of scientific discovery of facts as such, though there is much conflict between these statements and the wild guesses and speculations of evolutionists and others.

EVIDENCE ALLEGEDLY PROVING EVOLUTION

Evolution offers certain things as alleged evidence of its truth. These evidences reveal the poverty-stricken condition of its "proofs." One of these—given by Romanes—is that an instantaneous photograph revealed an "infant three weeks old supporting its own weight for over two minutes." He claims that this proves man's descent from an ape-like ancestor. We know of an infant just a week old, whose mother lifted him up by her hands placed under his arms, and then almost unsupported he stood erect, leading his mother to exclaim, "What kind of a prodigy have I here?" Such cases cannot be connected logically with evolution, but if they have any bearing on this question, are more in harmony with the thought that their first ancestor was a man who immediately after his creation stood erect. The picture of the former infant and that of

another show these infants holding their feet in the same position as a monkey holds his when climbing a tree; and this is supposed to prove that man is descendent from monkeys! These are among the best arguments of evolutionists; but how poor they are!

The Philadelphia *Bulletin* gives the following excerpt of a Darwinian professor's lecture: "Evidence that early man climbed trees with his feet *lies* [! italics ours] in the way we wear the heels of our shoes—more at the outside. A baby can wiggle its big toe without wiggling its other toes—an indication that it once used its big toe in climbing trees [but monkeys use their other toes also in climbing trees, which proves that we are here dealing with a "wiggling" argument]. We often dream of falling. Those who fell out of the trees some 50,000 years ago and were killed, of course, had no descendants. So those who fell and were not hurt, of course, lived [How does he know that they had offspring?] and so we are never hurt in our dreams of falling."

What brilliant examples of inductive reasoning! What freak ideas! Some professors professing themselves to be wise have indeed become fools! Imagine the laws of chemistry, astronomy, physics, *etc.*, depending for proof on such nonsense as this professor offers in the above quotation! Yet some think him scientific!

FRUITLESS SEARCH FOR "MISSING LINKS"

Evolutionists have moved heaven and earth in search of so-called "missing links," particularly between man and the ape, but have never found an undoubted one. Some of them have offered four alleged "missing links" between man and the ape—pithecanthropus, the Heidelberg man, the Piltdown man and the Neanderthal man. But these will not bear close investigation and most scientists laugh them to scorn, especially now since the Piltdown man has definitely been proven by chemical tests, and also otherwise, to be a hoax.

How these alleged "missing links" originated is shown, *e.g.*, by the following: Dr. Dubois, an ardent evolutionist, in 1892 found in some sand in Java a small part of the top of a skull and a tooth, the latter three feet away from the former; and *fifty feet away* in some more sand he found another tooth and a thigh bone. He claimed that these belonged to the same animal—"the missing link!" Shortly after their discovery twenty-four of the leading European scientists examined these four fragments. Ten of these said that all of them belonged to an ape; seven said they belonged to a man and seven (evolutionists) said they were the missing link. Prof. Virchow said: "There is no evidence at all that these bones are parts of the same creature." But what did evolutionists do with these two teeth, one thigh bone and a very small part of a skull top? They had a "reconstructor" *draw on his imagination* and construct an entire image of what they thought was the missing link and called this dull figure *pithecanthropus! i.e.*, ape-man.

A very few bones were found at Piltdown, England, and likewise near Heidelberg and Neanderthal, Germany. The bones of all three of these finds combined would not fill a bushel basket, let alone fill up a complete human skeleton. The same "reconstructor" formed, *out of his imagination*, three "ape-man" figures from these few bones. These figures are exact images of evolution—*imaginations!* They are indeed monuments of infamy to evolution, the laughing stock

of biologists; yet, "as per plan," they have been used very much and some of them are still being used to inoculate immature children and poor-thinking adults with the idea of man's descent from brutes.

The folly of trying to establish anything definite as to man's origin on the basis of a few fossil fragments is illustrated very well by the incident of the "million dollar tooth" found some years ago in the bed of a stream. It was regarded by eminent evolutionists as certainly out of the jaw of the famous imaginary "missing link"—but imagine their chagrin when, a little later, *teeth exactly like it were found in the jaw of a wild pig!*

THE PILTDOWN MAN A HOAX

As to the Piltdown man, the announcement of the British Museum that the "Piltdown Skull" was a forgery caused one of the greatest sensations in scientific circles in recent years.

In exposing the Piltdown man to be a fake, the British Museum bulletin explained that some unknown "expert" had: (a) broken off the front of the lower jaw of a big ape; (b) removed all its teeth except two molars; (c) stained the jaw to make it look like the fossil skull bones found in the gravel pit at Piltdown; (d) inserted the jaw bone so treated into this gravel pit, at the spot where the bones had been found, doing it so skillfully that the two experts who came upon this jawbone when searching for fossils were convinced that the gravel had not been disturbed; (e) doctored a skull bone belonging to another skull, to make it look like the fossil bones found in the gravel pit; (f) doctored a molar tooth and filed it down to make it look like the molars in the jaw; (g) placed the doctored skull bone, the doctored molar and a fossilized bone fragment of a skull found in the gravel pit in such a position as led Charles Dawson and Dr. Smith Woodward to believe that they were all genuine fossils.

These charges were made by men of the highest scientific standing, including Dr. K. P. Oakley of the British Museum and Dr. W. E. LeGros Clark and Dr. J. E. Weiner, professors in Oxford University. Many able scientists had challenged the correctness of the "reconstruction" of this skull when it was first produced, insisting that the jawbone was that of an ape or chimpanzee, but their protests were not heeded.

As to the Heidelberg and Neanderthal men, their few remaining bones exhibit less abnormalities than can be found in many humans now living, let alone bones of dead humans disfigured by the chemical action of the earth. In fact, many able scientists from the first have claimed that these findings were bones of abnormal humans, among others not a few evolutionists so holding. Yet partly on such flimsy humbugs as evidence, shallow-thinking evolutionists have been claiming man's descent from apes as scientifically proven!

EVOLUTIONISTS' OWN TESTIMONY

Some testimonies of evolutionists, disapproving the claims made for the alleged "missing links," will be in place here, and we will therefore quote them: Prof. Wassman says: "There are

numerous fossils of apes, the remains of which are buried in the various strata from the lower Eocene to the close of the alluvial epoch, but not one connection has been found between their hypothetical ancestral forms and man at the present time. *The whole hypothetical pedigree of man is not supported by a single fossil genus or a single fossil species* [italics ours]." Darwin says: "When we descend to details, *we cannot prove that one species has changed* [italics ours]." H.G. Wells, a most fanciful evolutionist, in his history, p. 69, admits: "We cannot say that pithecanthropus is a direct human ancestor." On p. 116 he gives a diagram showing that none of the four alleged "missing links" could have been an ancestor of the human race, since that one would be the last of his species, hence had no descendants.

Dr. Osborn, another eminent evolutionist, says that the Heidelberg man "shows no trace of being intermediate between man and the anthropoid ape." Again, speaking of the teeth of the Neanderthals, he says: "This special feature alone would exclude the Neanderthals from the ancestry of the human race." Prof Cope, a great anatomist, says: "The thigh bone [of pithecanthropus] is that of a man; it is in no sense a connecting link." Dr. Orchard declares: "The remains bearing on this issue [these four fakes] which have been found are very few; and their significance is hotly disputed by scientists themselves—both their age and whether they are human or animal or mere [human] abnormalities." Prof Bronco, of the Geological and Paleontological Institute of Berlin University, affirms: "Man appears suddenly in the Quaternary period. Paleontology tells us nothing on the subject—it knows nothing of the ancestors of man." With these remarks we leave these four fakes to the credulity of those who like to be fooled, while posing as wise—in their own conceits. As Douglas Dewar, F.Z.S., writing on this subject in *World Science Review*, stated, "The whole picture is one of twisted and highly disputable evidence."

PAINTINGS IN CAVES NO EVIDENCE

Another poverty-stricken argument evolutionists offer is this: In certain deep, dark caverns, notably in Altamira, Spain, there are paintings and frescoes of various animals, some of them now not existing. They claim that these pictures are 25,000 to 50,000 years old. But on their own admission, at those times of their ape-men, fire, torches, wicks, *etc.*, were unknown. Then these paintings must have been made in the dark. But who could have done any painting that would reproduce good likenesses of animals in such darkness? Certainly not ape-men! How would ape-men have known enough to mix the paints so as to produce the brown, red, black, yellow and white that appears in these paintings? How could ape-men have produced ladders and scaffolding needed for those paintings? How could these colors have remained so clear in those damp caverns for from 25,000 to 50,000 years? Do not these objections overthrow the theory of ape-men doing such painting and point to some modern artist, using modern equipment, and drawing on his imagination, a thing allowable in art, but not in science, as the one who did it? How short of real proof must a theory be that will resort to such non-probative points!

ALLEGED VESTIGIAL ORGANS NO PROOF

Evolutionists resort to the alleged vestigial organs—organs in the human body that they allege have no use—as proofs that they were inherited from nonhuman ancestors. Their favorite vestigial organ is the appendix. This, they assert, proves that man descended from some animal that had some use for it; but, they claim, it is useless for man (except to the evolutionist who needs it to prove [?] his descent from ancestors that needed it). But as medical science and surgery have advanced, they have found a use for the appendix. Finding that those who have lost their appendixes suffer from constipation, eminent medical and surgical authorities, after exhaustive investigation, have concluded that the appendix has its place at the beginning of the large colon in order to assist elimination and thus it serves to prevent constipation. Here, certainly, a very interesting use for this so-called "vestigial organ" has been found, and that to the unhappiness of evolutionists, who are ever anxious to prove their kinship to beasts—at least they have shown their mental relationship to the ass on this point. This argument on the appendix, if it had merit at all, would favor our descent from the rat, rather than from the monkey, for the former has proportionately a larger appendix.

BLOOD TESTS NO PROOF OF EVOLUTION

Blood tests are another argument that evolutionists allege for their doctrine. They put the argument like this: Dog's blood injected into a horse kills the horse; but man's blood injected into an ape does it very little harm. Hence, they reason, the dog and horse are not nearly related, while man is nearly related to the ape. In reply we say: Dog's blood is poisonous to most animals; while the blood and blood serum of the sheep, goat and horse are not poisonous to other animals and man. Hence serums are usually made from these animals, especially from the horse. But no serums for man have been made from apes, because they do not help man. These facts would prove man to be more nearly related to the sheep, goat and horse than to the ape, if the argument under examination were true.

Again, the thyroid gland of the sheep serves man better, when it replaces his, than that of the ape, as operations have proved. This also spoils the argument under review. Vaccine matter is taken from cows rather than from apes—another fact against the argument under review. Blood tests prove that the blood reactions of the sheep, goat and horse are nearer that of human blood than is that of apes. This disproves the argument under examination. We conclude, therefore, that blood tests do not prove man's descent from apes.

THE RECAPITULATION THEORY

Evolution has invented a theory called the recapitulation theory, according to which evolutionists claim that the human embryo passes, during the first few weeks of its existence, through all the stages of the lower species, *i.e.*, the whole history of evolution is allegedly repeated in the first few weeks of human embryonic life. We ask, How could all the alleged changes of the thousands of animal species be crowded into a few weeks? This would be physically impossible. Again, changes alleged by evolution as being due to environment would

have to have that same environment present to make them—a thing impossible in an embryo's environment.

Whatever resemblance there is in a human embryo to those of other animals is due to the fact that a wise Creator has in all mammals used the same basal structure, which *as such* must appear in the early stages of all embryonic life; the variations due to differences in such species must come in later, *i.e.*, after the basal mammal structure has been developed. Certainly an inventor would make the basal parts of similar inventions very much alike. So with God. This fact is as far from proving evolution from the standpoint of the similarity of the early stages of the human embryo to other mammalian embryos as the east is from the west. This variation amid similarity we find on all hands—no two leaves, however similar, are exactly alike; nor are two human faces, two mountains, two trees, nor two of any other thing exactly alike. Like evolution, the recapitulation theory, once widely accepted, is now seriously questioned by the ablest scientists and is rejected by not a few of them. The above points certainly show that evolution cannot prove itself by the alleged recapitulation of all animal species in embryo.

THE SO-CALLED "BRAIN AGE"

Evolutionists point also to the wonderful inventions and increased knowledge of our day as a proof of evolution as working in man, ever lifting him to higher planes of being. To a superficial thinker this seems to be a strong proof in favor of evolution. But under analysis this "proof" falls to the ground. In the first place, remarkably few individuals are real inventors. So, too, remarkably few people are real inventors of *thought*, however widespread *knowledge* is. If evolution were true, the generality of the race now living would be such great inventors and thinkers. But such is not the case; the greatest works of painting, sculpture, architecture, poetry, music, oratory, statesmanship, philosophy, history and religion, do not belong to our day. We, therefore, deny that humans have greater *capacity* now than in former times.

And what shall we say as to their claims on the increase of knowledge and inventions, as a proof of evolution? We reply that this increase, because of its suddenness and rapidity, so contrary to slow-going evolution's alleged ways, must be due to extraordinary light that God here in the "Time of the End" (Dan. 12: 9), since 1799, has been giving to mankind as a preparation for two things: (1) the overthrow of Satan's empire and (2) the needs of God's kingdom on earth, soon to be established. The special knowledge of our time was in part designed to expose the rotten foundations of Satan's empire in order to dispose mankind to overthrow its present earthly status. Furthermore, in part for the purpose of furnishing men with the instruments that will accomplish this destruction, many special inventions have recently come into existence. The constructive inventions of our time are also Divinely intended to prepare conditions among men for Millennial needs and progress. It is for these reasons that we have such a great increase of knowledge and inventions peculiarly marking our times above all others in these respects. Previous knowledge, of course, became the basis of our present knowledge; for previous generations hand on their knowledge to succeeding ones. Thus we stand upon the shoulders of previous generations in our basal knowledge. Since the invention of printing, in 1440 A. D., this has been the case more than ever before.

The special increased knowledge and many inventions of our time did not come in the way that evolutionists claim evolution works, slowly and gradually, but very suddenly and rapidly, compared with the rate of progress in all the years of man's history previous to 1799. It is since 1799, beginning with the first steamboat, that the rate of discoveries and inventions has rapidly leaped forward and knowledge has been increased. These facts do not prove that man's *capacity* has increased, but rather that *his opportunities to use his capacities* have increased greatly, rapidly and suddenly since 1799. These facts, therefore, disprove evolution and prove Divine providence since 1799 (according to the Bible—Dan. 12: 4) to be working special opportunities to increase knowledge and multiply inventions, as preparations for the destruction of Satan's empire and for the needs of God's Kingdom. Hence, *not increased capacities, but increased opportunities to use one's capacities*, mark our day, which, of course, disproves evolution, which implies enlarged capacity.

MEDELISM DISPROVES EVOLUTION

Several of the more recently discovered sciences, *e.g.*, Mendelism, disprove evolution. Mendel, by a vast series of experiments in plant and animal life, has proved several natural laws of heredity. One of these is that the first offspring of a positive (dominant) and a negative (recessive) plant or animal takes after the dominant parent. In the second generation, the dominant one predominates, but the negative one appears. In the third or fourth generation both appear about equally in the descendants. *E.g.*, if a giant variety of peas is crossed with a dwarf variety, the offspring are all tall; in the second generation both appear, but the giant variety in the proportion of 3 to 1. In the third or fourth generation they are on the average equal in number; but when these dwarfs are self-fertilized all the successive offspring are dwarfs. Experiments with flowers, rabbits, cats, rats, dogs, *etc.*, proved the same thing. This law applied to man and apes should make the ape appear in some generations among men. So, too, we ought to find some men turn to apes—in the negative characters. But nothing of the kind happens, which shows that there is no taint of the ape in man.

HYBRIDS A REFUTATION OF EVOLUTION

If evolution were true, and one species would evolve into another, hybrids would be indispensable for its functioning. But hybrids are well known to be sterile, which flatly contradicts evolution. God's law that each should reproduce "after its kind" is proven by the sterility of hybrids to be the rule of reproduction. Thus nature itself destroys evolution by its only possible avenue of operation—preservation of evolved powers by propagation with other, but kindred species. Species do not change nor unite with others to produce new permanent species. *E.g.*, dogs and cats do not interbreed and produce a new species. A few nearly-related species are so much alike that we scarcely know whether they are of different species or varieties of the same species, like the jackass and the mare. These frequently interbreed, but their offspring is sterile. The same is true of the zebulon, the offspring of a zebra and a mare. The same is true of all other closely-related species. A human and an ape cannot produce offspring, which proves that they are not even nearly-related species. But if evolution were true, we would have much and similar

interbreeding with the production of fruitful offspring. Even plant hybrids, according to Darwin's own testimony, are not permanent. All this goes to prove God's law that each kind will bring forth no other species except its own. But even if species could interbreed and thus form permanent new species, a thing utterly lacking in proof, genera could not do so by the wildest stretch of imagination. Yet evolution must assume this impossibility. Surely it is a hopeless and helpless theory. The Standard Dictionary in the article on Hybridism states: "Hybridism is one of the greatest obstacles to the general acceptance of the principle of evolution."

BEES AND ANTS DISPROVE EVOLUTION

Another telling point against evolution is the fact that some insects have more skill and practical ability than apes. We instance the honeybee and the ant. These have a social organization far superior to the ape and certainly surpass it in constructive ability, government and social life. They have armies, sentinels, police, courts (which decree penalties) and executioners of such penalties. They have a highly organized society with kings, queens, nobles, plebeians, higher and lower slaves, *etc.* The bee forms a honey cell laid out geometrically along the lines of a hexagonal prism, which the mathematical science, Calculus, proves is the most economical space and material saver known to science. Each cell is perfect in itself and is perfectly adjusted to its neighboring cells. A crowd of bees build these, even in the dark, with exquisite skill.

If evolution were true, why were these qualities in ever-increasing development not transmitted to their alleged descendants in later-developed species? The ape cannot in his social life and in his activities approach the degree of excellence attained by the bee and the ant. Yet if evolution were true, the ape, being allegedly a so very much later evolved species than the bee and the ant, should be at least as much more highly developed than these, as man is more highly developed than the ape. Furthermore, the bees' and ants' skill as to work, *etc.*, does not come from their parents by heredity; for the workers are all sterile. The drones are their fathers and the queens, which, aside from laying eggs, do not work, are their mothers. Here, then, is a fact of development which is entirely apart from evolution and for which evolution can offer no satisfactory explanation. Creation is the only solution of this matter, God gifting the bees and ants with abilities that even the highest of the lower animals lack and that do not appear in the intervening species; whereas if evolution were true all alleged later species would increasingly excel the bee and the ant in these respects, which, except man, they do not do.

EVOLUTION CONTRARY TO THE BIBLE

The Bible account of man's creation, as given in Genesis, states that man was created, not as a microbe or protoplasm, nor one step removed from a monkey, but "in the image of God created he him" (Gen. 1: 27). Man was created a mental, moral and religious image of God (not a physical image of God, because God is a spirit being, while man is of another nature—human, fleshly, earthly). This thought of man's original perfection of being is borne out by many other Bible statements. *E.g.*, from the context (Gen. 1: 31) we learn that God looked upon His creature with approval, seeing him to be "very good"; from Deut. 32: 4 we learn respecting God as a Master

workman, that "His work is *perfect*"; in Psa. 8: 5-8 we read, "Thou hast made him [man, Adam] a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor [his mental, moral and religious likeness to his Creator]. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet: all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea"; in Eccl. 7: 29 we read that "God hath made man *upright*; but they have sought out many inventions," and become defiled; and in Luke 3: 38 we read that Adam "was the son of God."

But evolution, both in its atheistic and Darwinian forms, flatly contradicts this Bible testimony—it denies that man originally was created in God's image and likeness, perfect in all his faculties—physical, mental, moral and religious. This denial, of course, brings with it the denial of man's trial for life in a perfect condition and his fall from that perfection into sin and death along physical, mental, moral and religious lines. How could evolutionists but deny these Biblical teachings (Rom. 5: 12-20; 8: 18-21; 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22), since they (even some clergymen among them!) express their belief on the subject in this way: "If man fell, he fell upwards"? The impossibility of falling *upward* shows the folly of such an alleged fall and is revelatory of the unclear thinking in the evolutionists who propound such a thought.

Denying man's fall from perfection into sin and death, of necessity they must deny the Bible's antidote for man's fall: the ransom and its effect—restitution (Acts 3: 19-21; see *The Divine Plan of the Ages*, Chap. IX, particularly the part on "Restitution versus Evolution"). So surely as "all the holy prophets since the world began" spoke of the "times of *restitution* of all things," so surely the evolution theory is in violent antagonism to the utterances of God through all His holy prophets. There is no middle ground on this question, and the sooner all decide positively in accord with the Scriptures on this subject, the better it will be for them—we should all let God be true, though it make every evolutionist a liar (Rom. 3: 4).

If the first man was only one step removed from the monkey, how could a perfect man—Jesus—be required as a ransom (a corresponding price; 1 Tim. 2: 6) for him? Even the most degraded of our race, since its supposed evolution from the ape, would be more than a corresponding price for the first man. Moreover, such a degraded being could not with justice have been put on trial for life. Hence no ransom in justice could have been required for him. So, too, restitution would be an unspeakable curse to the race; for it means a return to the original estate—the condition of the ape-man *a la* evolution; whereas the Bible holds out restitution as the hope for the race to be in a return to human perfection.

As for the Bible, instead of its being an inspired revelation, to the evolutionist it is largely the product of men not far removed from the ape-man, and is far from being able to meet the evolved needs of this "brain age." Evolutionists, of course, look upon their literary products as religiously far above the Bible. Instead of the Divine plan of the Ages, evolution becomes to them the planless accident of nature, and Mr. Darwin's books become their Bible, even as he recognized this, proven by his following reminiscent words: "I was a young man with unformed ideas. I threw out queries and suggestions, wondering all the time over everything; and to my astonishment the ideas took like wildfire [yes, they were indeed figurative wildfire.]. *People made*

a *religion of them.*" Here, then, we have the actual result. It rejected the religion of the Bible and itself became a substitute for it with the evolutionist.

No real believer in the Bible can agree with the evolutionists who teach that man evolved from the brute, for their rejection of the Bible, its plan and thus also its Author, is, for the believer, the greatest argument against evolution, and he in consistency must reject it.

In the book, *Creation* (which we supply), Chapter XIV, from which much of the material in this article is taken, many more strong arguments against evolution are set forth, which space does not permit us to present here. Among these are the voice of mathematics, the estimated age of the earth, the distribution of plant and animal life, the unity of the human family, ancient civilizations, and the facts that lower species have not passed out of existence and that we do not see new species forming.

A SOLEMN INDICTMENT

We feel that we should not close our discussion of evolution, as the theory that man evolved from lower animals, without a solemn indictment of it. It has had its vogue among the "intelligentsia," though now among many leaders of science it is rejected; but among the superficially-educated and the shallow thinking it has worked, and will continue to work the direst of evils. It has made atheists, agnostics and infidels of many. It is demoralizing our youth, who by it are made to believe in their superiority to their elders and their kinship to brutes; hence their growing disrespect for law and order in the home, state, society and church, and their increased indulgence in the lower elements of their nature. From the thought of no God (or that God created only the first forms of life), no responsibility to law, no higher authority, no hereafter and a brute descent, it becomes for youth but a natural step to disrespect of religion and government, disobedience toward parents, immorality as to sex, drunkenness as to intoxicants and a materialistic outlook on life. A generation of evolutionist professors and teachers has produced much of the moral, social and religious havoc that we behold in so many of our youth today. The pessimism and indulgence of brute instincts inculcated by evolutionists have in large part produced the moral collapse everywhere manifest in church and state and contributed largely to producing the World War in its two phases, as they are also doing a large share in the work of leading the nations to Armageddon and World Anarchy. And when these shall have wrought their unexampled havoc on mankind, it will in great resentment arise and repudiate every feature of this theory, burying it everlastingly in *Gehenna*, where it belongs.