

The Commoner

ISSUED MONTHLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, CHARLES W. BRYAN,
Editor and Proprietor Associate Ed. and Publisher
Edit. Rms and Business Office, Suite 207 Press Bldg.

establish a descent from one species to another, or change from one species to another. If the hypothesis were true, evidence of its truth could be found on every square foot of the Earth's surface. Being untrue, evidence can not be found anywhere.

The active search has now been going on for more than sixty years, interrupted by "lo here" and "lo there!" but the latest word in science is that the search has so far been in vain. A year ago last December Professor Bateson of Great Britain, who crossed the Atlantic ocean and addressed the American Society for the Advancement of Science at Toronto, declared that EVERY EFFORT TO FIND THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES HAD FAILED. He concluded: "We still have faith in evolution, but we have our doubts about the origin of species." We are not so much concerned about his faith, which seems to persist in spite of universal failure, but we are interested in the fact that evolution still rests upon imagination—upon a presumption—an unproven hypothesis—a mere guess.

But the case against evolution is even stronger. Chemistry, the science with which man is best acquainted and from which he has drawn the largest practical benefit, presents what seems to be conclusive proof against evolution. Chemistry deals with the original elements, some ninety-two of which have been found on the Earth. Its business is to separate these elements from the other, to analyze them, and to reveal their differences and relationships. If the evolutionary hypothesis is true ANYWHERE, it must be true EVERYWHERE. It can not be isolated like a germ and confined to some particular portion of the universe. If it explains the heavenly bodies, the strata of rock, vegetable life, animal life, and man, linking each to every other by indissoluble ties, then surely it must exert a controlling influence over every atom of matter (and over the 1,740 electrons which make up the atom) and over every larger unit of matter, wherever it is found and whatever it is doing.

CHEMISTRY HAS NOT DISCOVERED ANY LAW OF EVOLUTION. It has registered the various gases and diagrammed the movements of the molecules, but it has discovered no pushing at work in the original elements of which all things animate and inanimate are composed. Chemistry is an exact science; it mocks the atheist and brings confusion to the evolutionist.

Let us take, for instance, the best-known thing with which man deals—water. It is the daily need of every living thing. Without it, there could be neither plant life nor animal life. It was, therefore, on the Earth before either plant or animal life appeared. It is the largest single element in man's body. Even an inebriate can not take into his stomach at any time alcohol equal in amount to the water that there is in his flesh all the time.

Water is composed of hydrogen and oxygen H₂O. Is it conceivable that two such gases as oxygen and hydrogen should just happen? And yet, according to Professor Leuba of Bryn Mawr University, in his book "Belief In God and Immortality," "more than half the prominent scientists of the United States do not believe in a personal God."

But even if it were conceivable that CHANCE could bring into existence oxygen and hydrogen, could CHANCE unite them at a certain fixed ratio so that a drop of water is always and ever the same wherever found, whether in the clouds, in the ocean, or in the veins of the Earth? Oxygen and hydrogen are inflammable when separated, but when they are united in water, they put out fire. If the evolutionary hypothesis which assumes constant progress in everything, is true, water must have developed from something. What was water before it became water, and what will it be when it ceases to be water? Or was the law of change suspended when the two gases united in the formation of water.

Take another instance. Chemistry tells us that sugar is composed of carbon-12, hydrogen-22, and oxygen-11—C₁₂H₂₂O₁₁. This is sugar wherever we find it. There is no evidence that this combination of carbon, hydrogen, and oxy-

gen was ever anything but sugar or ever will be anything but sugar. What evidence have we of evolution working on carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen? And if it does not operate on these three fundamental food elements, why are they excepted from its operation?

Every thing that man eats, wears or uses will serve as an illustration of exact and PERMANENT relationship between various forms of matter.

Chemistry has taught us the properties of matter and the way to utilize them, but they are now stationary. We can collect nitrogen from the air, but, as Slosson says, "we are dreadfully clumsy about it." He adds that man "takes a thousand-horse-power engine and electric furnaces at several thousand degrees to get carbon into combination with hydrogen, while the little green leaf in summer time does it quietly, without getting hot about it." And yet some scientists who know all about hydrogen, oxygen, and carbon seem to know nothing about God; they even deny His existence.

The natural and logical tendency of evolution is to produce agnosticism, and agnosticism is merely a way station on the road to atheism. Darwin, just before he died, declared himself an agnostic and said that "the beginning of all things is a mystery insoluble by us." A large percentage of the students in the higher classes, according to Professor Leuba, discard the cardinal principles of Christianity. He says it is due to the influence of the cultured instructors under whom they study.

In so far as chemistry proves anything, it proves that degeneration and not progress, disintegration and not construction, are the rule in nature, so far as the Earth is concerned. Uranium, for instance, degenerates through radium, that wonder-making mineral, into commonplace lead. "How are the mighty fallen!" Some of the scientists speak very knowingly of what is going on in the heavenly bodies and are quite positive that they know how old the Earth is, although the difference between guesses equally creditable is almost infinite; but they seem to ignore the lessons taught by chemistry, in spite of the fact that its lessons are easily learned.

Why, it may be asked, will "learned men" accept the evolutionary hypothesis, not only without proof, but in spite of proof? That is hardly a fair question. If we prove that they DO accept the hypothesis without sufficient evidence, it is for them to explain WHY they do so. But it may further expose the weakness of the position taken by the evolutionists to state some of the reasons that lead them to substitute Darwinism for the Bible.

The first reason was suggested by Tolstoy more than twenty years ago. He says "the cultured crowd" regard religion as a superstition, good enough for the ignorant, but think one outgrows the need of religion when he reaches a certain period of intellectual development. That is the attitude of many scientists today. They regard religion as a superstition. Some of them, when they can do so without jeopardizing their salaries, hold religion up to ridicule. They think that education can be substituted for religion. Tolstoy's rebuke to them is the strongest I have read. He says that religion does not rest on a fear of the unseen forces of nature, but upon "consciousness of man's finiteness amid an infinite universe, and of his sinfulness—which, he adds, "one can never outgrow."

Mind worship is the great sin in the intellectual world today. Romanes, when he had tired of the husks of materialism and, like an intellectual prodigal, started back to his Father's house, explained that it was evolution that led him away from the orthodox faith. (See his "Thoughts On Religion," page 180.) On page 142 he explained that his inability to pray was due to "an undue regard to reason as against the heart and will."

There is a second reason that possibly has as much influence as the first, namely—that evolution tickles the vanity of the egotist. The Christian not only admits, but declares, that the Bible is a mystery to all who do not believe in God. The miracles are mysterious; everything supernatural is mysterious to those who exclude God from their calculations.

If one believes in a God all-powerful, all-wise, and all-loving, he has a First Great Cause sufficient to explain everything.

In the first chapter of Genesis we find three verses that mean more to the race than all the books that man has written. The first gives us the beginning of all things; the 24th gives us a law governing all reproductions, and the 26th gives us the only explanation of man's presence on earth.

The evolutionist says to the student: "Here

is an hypothesis that explains everything. There need be no mysteries, because evolution is omnipotent; it is the law of development, the origin and explanation of species." The theistic evolutionist regards it as "God's method" of doing things, while atheistic evolutionists regard it as a method without any God back of it.

Of the two, the theistic evolutionist is the more dangerous. The atheist alone can do little harm because evidence of the existence of a God is sufficient to convince all except the mind-worshippers, but theistic evolution lulls to sleep; it may be defined as an anesthetic which deadens the patients pain while atheism removes his religion.

The evolutionist, to the extent that he endorses evolution, substitutes it for God. Whenever a Christian comes upon anything which seems impossible of explanation, he says "God did it." Confronted by the same situation, the evolutionist says: "It is not inexplicable; evolution explains it; but the changes can not be traced or proven because of the time required." The Christian puts his faith in the infinite power of God; the evolutionist relies on infinite time.

But there is a third reason that may explain why some evolutionists have accepted the hypothesis, viz.—it furnishes an excuse for the indolent man; it is the laziest excuse ever invented to justify inaction.

If a man believes in evolution, he can go to the zoological garden on Sunday morning and, standing in front of a cage of animals, speculate on how far he has come, on his superiority over his ancestors. There are some people who would rather boast of what their forefathers have done than to do anything themselves.

If however, one is a Christian, he feels that he should attend church and seek to know how far he has yet to go before he is "perfect, even as your father which is in Heaven is perfect."

The evolutionary hypothesis robs man's conscience of its compelling force. What feeling of duty can man have or what sense of responsibility to God if it must be strained through the blood of all the animal life below man? Religion, on the contrary, inspires to action. Christianity is not a lazy man's job. It presents the highest ideal known. It defines life as a ladder reaching from Earth to Heaven; no matter how high we climb, there are heights still above us. The Christian ideal, while in sight of the weakest and lowliest, is yet so high that the best and the noblest are kept with their faces turned ever upward.

There is a fourth reason that must not be overlooked. Evolution is the doctrine of the fatalist—the plea of the invertebrate. If man is but a "bundle of tendencies inherited from the brute," why hold him accountable if, following the instincts of his remote ancestry, he is brutish? Evolution excuses the sensualist and encourages the worshiper of the god of ease. Paul gives us the philosophy of the materialist: "If, after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die."

Evolutionists who are occupying Christian pulpits accuse the "fundamentalists" of bringing discord into the church. Who is to blame for any discord that may exist—those who hold to the "faith of the fathers" and seek to stimulate the young to realize the possibilities which God has placed within the reach of His creatures, or those who reject the Bible account of creation, link man in generations with the beast, and give him a materialistic philosophy of life? A preacher has no moral right to conceal his views from those who pay his salary.

A similar answer can be made to those teachers in the public schools and colleges who are undermining the faith of Christian students. They claim the right to teach what they please. It is no infringement on their freedom of conscience or freedom of speech to say that, while as individuals they are at liberty to think as they please and to say what they like, they have no right to demand pay for teaching that which the parents and the taxpayers do not want taught. The hand that writes the pay check rules the school.

Christians are compelled to build their own schools and colleges in which to teach Christianity. Why should not atheists and agnostics be required to build their own schools and colleges in which to teach their doctrines? Will they make the sacrifices that Christians do?

If the evolutionists deny that they are either atheists or agnostics, and contend that they are simply teaching a "scientific interpretation" of the Bible, they should receive the same answer: What right have the evolutionists—a relatively small percentage of the population—to teach AT