

ing to say that he taught this doctrine. I cannot quite see the difference between teaching a thing and hypothecating it, for the advancement of a hypothesis is, in a sense, teaching."

Prof. Burlingame says that Darwin "had no intention of asserting that man was evolved from any living anthropoid but merely that apes and man trace back to a common ancestry."

Prof. Murlin says: "My opinion is that Darwin's position was purely a 'speculative hypothesis.'"

Prof. Bolton says: "My opinion is that Darwin taught that man and the apes had a very remote common ancestry."

Prof. Booker says: "I have always taught that even Darwin himself was misunderstood by the ordinary reader and misrepresented by the careless reader. Darwin has never asserted that man originated from the monkey."

Dr. Schreckengast will not attempt to "interpret Darwin as a whole."

Dr. McVey answers the second question by saying, "Answer is neither."

It will be seen, first, that these educators believe that man **EVOLVED FROM AN ANIMAL**, though they are not willing to admit that that animal was an ape. Nearly all of them deny that Darwin ever taught that man was a descendant of the ape.

Dr. Barry O'Toole, of St. Vincent's Archabbey, says that all modern zoologists and anthropologists have completely abandoned the theory of man's direct descent from the ape; but affirms that "many scientists still continue to uphold the theory of so-called Indirect Descent." "In other words the modern theory regards man, not as a descendant of the monkey, but as the offspring of some undiscovered bestial ancestor of the Tertiary period, common to apes and men." Dr. O'Toole then proceeds to quote from Darwin as follows: "Charles Darwin categorically taught the descent of Man from the Monkey. To quote his own words from the second edition of the 'Descent of Man': 'The Simiadae then branched off into two great stems, the New World and the Old World monkeys; and from the latter, at a remote period, Man, the wonder and glory of the universe, proceeded.' '(Descent of Man,' 2d edit. chap. vi. pp. 220, 221). Note that he does not say 'Probably,' his language is not the language of hypothesis, but of unhesitating affirmation."

As Darwin's "Descent of Man" is within the reach of all the above named educators, we must conclude that they have not studied Darwinism but have merely accepted it without understanding it, or that they are not candid in their answers. It is only fair that we should take the more charitable view, namely, that they have accepted Evolution without knowledge of what it is or what its implications are, and that they have followed Darwin blindly, expressing admiration of him without knowing what he taught.

But it does not matter so much whether Darwin taught that man descended directly from the "Old World Monkey" or descended from a tree that had several branches, among others the man branch and the monkey branch. In other words, it does not matter materially whether the ape is a grandparent or merely a collateral relative; the real question is whether man is a descendant by blood from any animal instead of being made by separate act and in the image of God. The educators above quoted have discarded the Bible account of man's creation and have accepted evolution as an explanation of man's presence on earth. They are teaching it to the students who attend the colleges and universities over which these educators preside. They are unwilling to trace man's ancestry directly to the monkey, the ape, or the gorilla; they think it is more reasonable to believe that in the distant past there was a **COMMON FAMILY TREE** from which several limbs branched out, one of which developed into man and another into the animals that most resemble man.

We have made some progress when we have shaken these professors off of the ape limb, even if they are still clinging to another imaginary limb of the same imaginary tree. But they cannot hold on to the new limb long; IT REQUIRES MORE CREDULITY TO BELIEVE THAT MAN CAME FROM A LIMB, NOT A PARTICLE OF WHICH CAN BE FOUND, IN LIFE, ON THE EARTH'S SURFACE, OR IN THE ROCKS BELOW THE SURFACE, THAN TO BELIEVE THAT HE CAME FROM ANIMALS THAT BEAR SOME RESEMBLANCE TO MAN. What a prodigious imagination an evolutionist must have if he can bridge the infinite gulf between man and that form of life from which these evolutionists believe man and other animals developed. If an engineer plans a bridge

across a stream, he welcomes an island upon which he can build a pier, because two short spans are preferable to a single long span. What engineer would disregard an island and go above or below it in order to unite the banks of the stream by a single span? And yet, this is exactly the unreasonable thing of which the above named educators are guilty. They are not willing to trace man back to the "common tree" through the ape or monkey, as Darwin was willing to do; they reject the ape island, so to speak, and throw a span through infinite time, hoping to connect man with some distant ancestor without an intervening link—without a trace of life upon which to rest the arch.

Evolutionists today reaccept Darwin's **CONCLUSIONS** as to man's animal ancestry while rejecting every stone of the foundation upon which he built his guess. Physical similarity between the simonidae and man was one stone that is now rejected by the evolutionists; natural selection is another stone that has been practically discarded as an explanation of change of species. Sexual selection has been laughed out of the school room. Darwin believed in the ape theory and thought resemblances, natural selection, and sexual selection sufficient explanation of change in species; he rejected the Bible account of creation and wandered away into agnosticism, denying the inspiration of the Bible and declaring that "the beginning of all things is a mystery insoluble by man." The evolutionists quoted by the Dearborn Independent reject the ape ancestry, sexual selection, and to a large extent, natural selection, and yet they accept the evolutionary hypothesis **WITH NOTHING WHATEVER UPON WHICH TO REST THE HYPOTHESIS; THEY SUBSTITUTE A RIDICULOUS GUESS FOR THE WORD OF GOD.** Without proof that any species ever came from another, they ask students to believe that **ALL** species came by gradual change from one or a few forms of life.

If anyone questions the correctness of the views of these educators, they at once attempt to discredit the questioner on the ground that he lacks information. Bolton says: "Let Mr. Bryan and the clergy go into the laboratories, the experimental gardens, and breeding stations and spend months in close observation of what is being done. In that way they may know." Bristol says: "The sad thing about Mr. Bryan and his colleagues is that they have not kept up to the times in their discussions."

The real difference between the opponents of evolution and these educators is that the former prefer to accept the Bible rather than to accept the unsupported guesses advanced in the name of science.

Christians need not be afraid of any truth, no matter from what source it comes. All truth is of God and truths cannot be inconsistent one with another. With guesses it is different; the air is full of guesses; each professor has a broadcasting station and throws guesses to those who have receivers adjusted to his wave length. But why should Christians discard the Bible, the long established station for the disseminating of truth, and attempt to listen in on the fantastic imaginings of agnostic scientists?

Whenever truth is established the world accepts it and we may rest assured that no real truth will ever do the world harm. But who will estimate the damage done to the religious faith of students by guessing teachers who have led them away from belief in the Bible and in the Bible's God?

Twenty years ago the following editorial appeared in L'Univers:

"The spirit of peace has fled the earth because evolution has taken possession of it. The plea for peace in past years has been inspired by faith in the divine nature and the divine origin of man; men were then looked upon as children of one Father, and war, therefore, was fratricide. But now that men are looked upon as children of apes, what matters it whether they are slaughtered or not?"

Since then we have seen learning turned to the development of instruments of war; college graduates designed battleships and dreadnaughts, and then still more learned men with post graduate degrees designed superdreadnaughts. Scientists mixed poisonous gases and made war so hellish that civilization was about to commit suicide.

A tree is known by its fruits and we are now gathering some of the fruits of the doctrine of "Evolution" applied to business, society and government. A cruel and selfish doctrine, fashioned after the "survival of the fittest," is stifling conscience and paralyzing morals. Human life instead of becoming more precious is losing its value. The materialistic evolutionists know no

God and, therefore, recognize no responsibility to a Creator. The theist evolutionists put God so far away that He ceases to be a controlling influence; a sense of responsibility that must be strained through all the lower forms of life has no coercive power. The Bible is discarded as an authority because it deals with miracles and the supernatural—things inconsistent with the guess of the evolutionists. When evolution excludes the miracle it excludes the virgin birth of Christ and His resurrection as well as all of the mighty works performed by Christ.

The world must have a God; the evolutionists' God is either non-existent or so far away as to be no present help to man. The world needs a Bible as a guide; the evolutionists' Bible is only "a scrap of paper." The world needs Christ; evolutionists rob the Saviour of the glory of a virgin birth, the majesty of His deity, and the triumph of His resurrection. No pigmy Christ is sufficient for the needs of today; we need the full-statured-Christ of whom the Bible tells.

The Fort Dearborn Independent has rendered a service in disclosing the confusion that exists among the worldly wise men who have substituted the changing hypotheses of presumptuous scientists for the unchangeable word of God—guesses for truths. When the Christians of the nation discover the irreligious influence which dominates many of our state institutions of learning and some of our Christian colleges there will be an overhauling. Those who support the Christian colleges can be trusted to purge denominational schools of the poison that has been doing its deadly work among the students, and the taxpayers can be trusted to restrain those who, while drawing salaries from the public, abuse their privileges and undermine Christianity.

Christians, Protestant and Catholic, build their own colleges and employ their own teachers for the teaching of Christianity. If atheism and agnosticism are to be taught, let them be taught in schools built for the purpose and known to the public as places where these doctrines are propagated. Or, to make the statement still broader, if there are those who desire to interpret the Bible in such a way as to rob it of its divine authority, let them build their own schools; they have no right to impose their doctrine upon the children of Christians, whether openly taught as irreligion or disguised as a scientific interpretation of the Scriptures.

Whether the Bible is true or false—whether it is the word of God or the work of man—is the supreme issue. If there are honest differences of opinion they should be discussed candidly and openly. The small percentage who boast of a brute ancestry do not deserve special privileges in church or school. W. J. BRYAN.

BRYAN ON ABSTINENCE

William J. Bryan has an editorial in The Commoner, suggesting a great total abstinence campaign to be pushed by all organizations interested in the suppression of the liquor traffic, by Sunday schools, churches, colleges, professors and teachers and all others who can be enlisted in its aid.

Mr. Bryan is on the right track. A generation is growing up uninstructed and unpledged as to total abstinence. It is true that in our schools, the effect of alcohol on the human system is taught, but there is a lack of moral fervor attaching to it and generally no effort is made to pledge the students against touching or tasting the stuff.

If we raise a generation uninstructed and unpledged on this issue, it need cause no surprise if it results in laxity in the enforcement of prohibition.

Total abstinence and prohibition for the state are like the two wings of a bird,—both are necessary for flight. In the days when the saloon was a legal institution, it was not unusual to hear of drinking bouts by high school and college boys. It was a logical process. The state licensed the sale of the stuff and their fathers drank it. So they too drank. Now the state forbids the sale of drink, but we hear too frequently of young men who could hardly be said as yet to be the victims of appetite, who indulge by drinking that which has been illegally with a transported and sold.

Why not follow Mr. Bryan's suggestion with a great pledge-signing crusade?

It would be a good move.—National Enquirer.

The United States chamber of commerce is building a two and a half million dollar home at Washington. There is one thing to be said for big business men, they know what is a proper location for any business enterprise in which they are engaged.