A very significant cablegram is reported to have been sent across the Atlantic by officers of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. It was sent to Sir Arthur Keith, who had just taken a trip at the Bible and had come out strongly for the atheistic theory of evolution before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, meeting in Leeds, England, August 21, 1927. Sir Arthur is regarded as one of the greatest spokesmen of atheism in the world. That is no small honor. But to be numbered with atheists is no small price to pay for the same.

That cablegram raises our suspicions about the theory of evolution and about the evolutionists. At any rate it leads us to ask a few questions:

First: What kind of comparison does the theory of evolution in the habit of keeping?

We know that Thomas Huxley said: "Evolution, if consistently believed, makes it impossible to believe the Bible." But if Huxley is one of those, let us hear Mr. Huxley, president of the Science League of America. The aim of this League, according to Shipley, is "to keep evolution in the public school and to keep the book of Genesis as a counter-explanation of man's origin out of the public schools."

So, according to the modern apostle of evolution, there can be no compatibility between the theory of evolution and "the law of the Lord"—

the Bible. The compatibility between atheism and evolution seems much closer.

"Now, another question: What kind of an inference does evolution have on the world?"
in the presence of a visual life i.e. we look at the Darwinian theory as an organ of Faith. The human body is not related to the ape; but which makes that organ useless. Blood as Alleged Evidence:

The blood of a dog injected into the veins of a man will kill him there is very little reaction, whereas the monkey and the man are very closely akin in the opinion of evolutionists.

An organ not known to the blood of a dog injected into the veins of a man will have but a slight reaction. That would prove, according to Darwin, that man is a genius of the species. Do evolutionists not know that the blood of one man injected into the blood of another man may prove fatal? The American Medical Association declares a case of transfusion of blood from a wife to her husband with good results. A second transfusion from the same woman to her brother proved fatal. According to evolutionists, then, the blood test shows that man is related to the ape; but the same kind of a test shows that man is not related to the same species.
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Dr. A. J. Brown, eminent doctor and scientist, points out that in these so-called "blood tests" the blood cells have all been killed and removed, carrying from them all the important life-principle and nearly all of the chemical constituents of the blood. No individual, he says, could live for five minutes if the water field from which the tests is made replaced the normal fluid in the vessels of the body. The blood test presents no evidence of evolution.

3. Embryology as Alleged Evidence:

"Evidence from embryology," we should remember, was presented to the world by Carl Von Haeckel. Then Prof. Ernst Haeckel took it up and falsified the facts in favor of evolution. Haeckel was censured by the American Association and the charge against him was proved, with the result that 35 German and American Universities repudiated his conduct and threw him overboard. He said by way of reply, "I should declare you condemned and mutilated by the admission, were it not that hundreds of the best observers and most reputable biologists lie under the same charge. The great majority of all morphological, anatomical, histological and embryological diagrams are not true to nature, but are more or less doctored, schematized and reconstructed." And next to Darwin, according to Vance Randolph, "Ernst Haeckel was the greatest of the scientific evolutionists." Embryology presents no evidence of evolution.

4. Geology as Alleged Evidence:

The geologist tells us that the earth is very old. Kennedy says the earth is 14,000 million years old. Lowell says 400 millions. Burrows says 200 millions. Lodge says 140 millions. Kelvin says 24 millions and Tait says 15 millions.

All these millions of years should allow plenty of time for one species to change into another species. But how do geologists arrive at these millions and hundreds of millions of years in computing the age of the earth? Vance Randolph says: "The Calamooda river has cut its narrow channel a mile deep in solid rock and we know how slowly this sort of erosion proceeds.

This is exactly what he does not know—nor does anybody else. Lyell estimates that it took 100,000 years to form the delta at the mouth of the Mississippi river, but Gen. Humphrey, of the United States Survey estimated it as 4,000 years. And "one year is as good as another."

Again, it is said: "Since the crust of the earth has been gradually built up by superposed layers of sediment the relative ages of the different strata may be determined by noting the order of superimposition—the oldest rock is at the bottom and the youngest at the top."

This is the way rocks are put down in theology but not in art: they are put down in theology for millions of years. In many places the oldest rocks are found on top while the youngest are found at the bottom. A better method, says Vance Randolph, of dating the different layers is based on the fact that most stratified rock contains fossils.

What do you think of this logic? If you start out to prove the age of the earth from the age of the rocks you can at the same time turn around and prove the age of the rocks from the age of the fossils. If the rocks are to give any support to the theory of evolution there is one thing they should show: They should show that the lowest kind of fish are found in the oldest rocks and the highest kind of fish in the youngest rocks. But what they do fail in is this: They find the highest kind of fish in the oldest rocks and they find to occupy the same level during vast periods, represented by five preceding geological formations. The fossil remains show no gradual changes from one species into another.

Prof. Price says that the various kinds of fossils which were so long thought to be found in the same relative order all over the globe are now found to occur in practically every conceivable order. As we see around us today different forms of life, from the simplest one-cell animal up to and including all other animals and human forms living side by side, so the simplest and most complex lived side by side in ages gone by. There
annihilates them.

"This pressed hard on my theory," said Darwin. Yes, it presses hard on every theory; in fact it annihilates them.

5. The Horse's Family Tree:

Without zoning into details, we shall give four reasons against the alleged evidence of evolution.

(a) Its history is based on supposition. (b) A large one-toed horse was found in Utah in rock that is said to be millions of years older than the rock where the supposed four-toed ancestor was found.

(c) A one-toed horse from a five-toed or four-toed horse is not evolution, which is development from simple to complex, not from complex to simple.

(d) There is no scientific evidence to show that these so-called horses are in any way related. So the horse presents no evidence of evolution.

6. The "Missing Links!"

Vestor Randolph says: "There is a great gap between the lowest living human and the highest living ape. This is the gap which early evolutionists sought to bridge by a hypothetical Missing Link." Later researches have resulted in the discovery of at least five of these intermediate forms, known respectively as: Java Man, Fossil Man, Piltdown, Heidelberg and Neanderthal man.

Let us just take time to look at a couple of these "reconstructed" missing links! Take the Java man, Pithecanthropus erectus, of which there is a bronze bust in the Museum of Natural History, New York, with the intention of proving to every passer-by that the fact of evolution has been demonstrated. This gentleman is made up from two teeth, a fragment of a skull and a thighbone found in Java, but not all found in the same spot! Although seven scientists pronounced these remains to belong to a man and six pronounced them to belong to an ape, they are bundled together and called an ape-man, a "missing link!"

Mammals, the famous zoologist, said: "The meaning of an average chimpanzee and that of the fossil remains are so closely related that I believe they belong to the same family—so the theory!"

Now take a look at the "Heidelberg Man."

All of the "man" that was found was a broken jaw with some teeth. As Dr. Stratton says, he is one-half of one per cent original and 99.5 per cent made up. But Prof. Osborn, of the Museum of Natural History says he is a "missing link!" That fact, however, need not disturb us. Surely, Rev. P. S. Allen, in his book, "Evolution in the Bible," tells of Prof. Osborn finding a tooth in Nevada and proclaiming to the world that he had found a "missing link!" According to Prof. Allen the tooth was "reconstructed!" and in Illustrated News of June 24, 1927, there was a picture of this "reconstructed" ancestor and his writer.

It resembles us as two lolling woman sitting about their hair, "It could make a suit for a man if I saw him go around!" The title reads: "There's a chance! I could make a suit for a man if I saw the corner he went around!"

Prof. Osborn, it would seem, could almost "reconstruct" a man if he saw the corner he went around!

With reference to these so-called "missing links!" we could not do better than to refer to the pronouncements of Dr. Huldtz, of the National Museum in Washington. He spoke before the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1925 and called attention to startling reports of discoveries of skulls, bones, etc. He mentioned by way of illustration the second Java man discovered near the site where Pithecanthropus erectus was found. It was vouched for, he said, by several eminent scientists and heralded all over the world as the most important discovery of the decade. Then Dr. Huldtz added that a critical examination of the supposed million-year-old near-human skull has revealed beyond all doubt that it is an extinct elephant's knee! The alleged "missing links!" present no evidence of evolution.

In fairness to Prof. Osborn, we should state that he is now strongly opposed to the ape-brain theory of evolution, notwithstanding the "missing links!" in the Museum of Natural History of which he is the head. He says: "I regard the ape-brain theory as utterly misleading. It should be banished from our speculations and from our literature."

The alleged "missing links!" is the result of faulty evolutionary theory. He still believes that all living things have come from the common stock, although there is no evidence to prove such a theory.

Gregor Mendel, after many years of experiments...
ing proved that offspring may be given to a character possessed by either parent, but this cannot develop any characteristic whatever it were not manifest or latent in the ancestry of the progenitor in the vegetable world, give us a plan called "the peonies, an oblique Japanese plant, B. o. by within the same species. Prof. Gullier said in 221: "Varieties of many kinds we daily witness, but no origin of species.

There are two or three millions of species on earth, but not a single instance is an example of one species changing into another. That is, there are millions of evidence proving the Bible law, "after its kind," but not one piece of evidence to prove the theory of evolution.

And as a man can be scientific and at the same time stick to Bible teaching, so scientific and at the same time a Christian.

The conversion of George F. Romanes, of the University of Cambridge, is told by Dr. H. D. Johnson in his book, "Scientific Christian Thinking." Prior to his conversion Romanes was regarded as the greatest Darwinian after Darwin. One Christmas day Romanes wrote his friend Dr. Gullier, asking him why he believed in Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. Dr. Gullier replied and asked Romanes to study Jesus Christ from the standpoint of biology, which must take all life into account. He suggested that Romanes was making the mistake of believing that the intellect was the only organ of evidence in the soul, but that one gets revelations through the affections and through the will which he does not get through the intellect. Romanes studied the letter and meditated: "My mother loves me, but I can't prove it by means of my intellect; that knowledge must come some other way." Then he took Christ's words: "If any man will do His will he shall know of the teaching whether it be of God." Knowledge coming through the will. That's scientific. That's Jesus giving us an hypothesis to test. Romanes tried it—and became a Christian. No man ever tried that hypothesis, but found it true.

It is scientific to be Christian. Indeed, you can't be thoroughly scientific without being Christian.

"He that followeth Me," said Jesus Christ, "shall not walk in darkness but shall have the light of life."

Will you try this scientific method of search after truth?