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THAT man was created perfect, in the spiritual image of God, not evolved from a lower order, is the express teaching of the Bible throughout, and confirmed by Jesus Christ Himself.

The Bible clearly shows an enormous gulf existing between the highest animal and the lowest man. Nine times over, it declares that each species from the beginning brought forth "after its kind." Science has neither bridged the gulf between man and animal nor yet produced the first tangible evidence that life can be developed contrary to the law laid down in Scripture.

It is being said by some today that the Bible account can be harmonized with
modern theories of evolution. The writer does not hesitate to say that it cannot be done without doing serious violence to Seripture. Men are not given to taking up the Bible to prove the truth of evolution. It does not. lend itself readily to that end.

YOUNG MAN- YOUNG WOMANyou will have to face this question sooner or later. Do it now. It is time for every young person to take soundings and ery young person to
find out where he is.

We are presenting to you in a brief way some reasons why you need not be in a hurry to throw away your Bible. If your instructors can give you tangibla your instructors can gidence that will answer the enclosed propositions, then there is reason to be propositions, then there is reason concerned about the Bible. If not-then concerned about the Bible. If not-then
you need not hesitate to take issue with you need not hesitate to take issue with them and to
Word of God.

The Bible is the sole basis of Christianity. Neither church, nation, society or home is entitled to the name "Christian" unless the teachings of the Bible are subscribed to, and above all, recognition given to Jesus Christ, as the Son of God and the Supreme Teacher.

## DO YOU KNOW-

-THAT there are two sides to the evolution question, and that as an honest seeker after knowledge you have a right to demand of your teachers the evidence that eminent scientists have piled up against evolution?
-THAT there are scores of eminent scientists who have repudiated the theories of evolution? They admit the interesting similarities between certain of the species, but they are bonest enough to admit that the proof that one has developed from the other is yet wholly lacking, that the process has never been seen in action, and that the testimony of known history refutes the idea. The testimonies of many such scientists are pubtished. (See "Must Young People Betished. (See "Must Young People Be-
lieve in Evolution?" by Dr. Arthur L. lieve in Evolution?" by
Brown. Price 20 cents.)
-THAT the writers of text-books used in many of the public schools deliberately in many of the public schools deliberately
ignore the mass of evidence against their ignore the mass of evidence against their
theories, showing that they are detertheories, showing that they are deter-
mined to maintain their scholarship and mined to maintain their scholarship
control the educational systems? come to our country from Germany, a land where recently evolution has been carried out to its logical conclusion?
(The teaching of the super-man and the survival of the fittest.)
-THAT certain so-called fossil remains advertised as "missing links" are still used as conclusive proof of evolution in our text-books; when it is known that these have been proved to be fakes? The "Pithecanthorpus," for example, was ex amined by twenty-four seientists in 1894 ten declaring it the bones of an ape sev en the bones of a man and only seven en the bones a man, and only seven a missing link, yet the text-books are a miss
silent.
-THAT the nine-fold challenge, "after his kind" (Gen. 1) is still unanswered: We are still waiting for a single instance of the reproduction of one living thing of offspring of a different species. The theory fing such a thing has happened is ory that such a thing has happened is between different plants and animals.
-THAT if evolution were a universal law of nature, it would be in operation constantly and we could see the changes constantly and we could
-THAT even the efforts to cross the ine of species artificially have totally failed?
-THAT if evolution were a universal law, the crust of the earth would be filled with, and the surface of the earth covered with specimens of the intermediate forms, showing the exact historic progress? Why is it, then, that "evidences" all have to be sought in some dences an have to be sought
lark comer or remote region?
-THAT if evolution were a miversal aw, we would find the deeper strata filled with specimens of imperfectly dereloped forms and successive strata showing up the changed forms? As a matter of fact, earliest strata contained numerous forms fully developed and not varying in the least from the present varying in the least from the present
forms of the same creatures. The only forms of the same creatures. The only
answer to this dilemma given us is that answer to this dilemma given us is th
"the records are as yet incomplete."
-THAT when, by artificial means. improvements are made in any created thing, when left to itself it soon reverts hing, when lal type, but that in all type to its original type, but that in all types as God made them, th
-THAT the fact that there is, in a sense, an evolution or progress in the realm of human affairs, is by no means proof that evolution is a universal method in creation?
-THAT the very notable tendency of things to "progress backward" instead of upward, has been a sore trial to evolutionists, leading some to take the view that apes are degenerate human beings?
-THAT the fact that there is succession and order in creation does not have to be explained by evolution? The Bible teaches that God created things in a certain order, and the findings of scientists exactly correspond with that order. Is it any more intelligent to believe that one developed from the other (on the supposition that there are millions of extinct forms yet to be discovered) than it is to believe that God perfectly designed and created each in the order specified in the Bible?
-THAT not a single human skull, or other bone ever unearthed and known to be that of a man, differs in any marked degree from corresponding parts of men now living, and that the oldest known human skulls show that the early man had a superior intelligence and was physically perfect?
-THAT the changes which occur in the embryo of the human infant as it passes through various stages of development within the mother, which evolu-
tionists claim show the changes through which the human species passed in coming from lower animals, prove nothing of the sort? These changes all take place in the short time of nine months, while evolution requires millions of years for the same changes in species. This is a miraculous thing-not evolution. Even then, the likenesses are but slight resemblances and there are vital differences. In every stage, it is still the human embrvo and never at any time develops beyond the human.
-THAT WHEN you are listening to teachers describing how creeping things developed into flying things by gradualiy, through hundreds of years, growing new organs, or how the ape lost its tail anc fur and became a man, you are lis.ening to pure fabrication, having as the oniy basis a thousand and one guesses? If the evolution of new organs required many centuries, going throuch hundreds of generations from offspring to offspring, then for many years these anima's carried useless organs, something never yet seen in creation. How can we account for the preservation through such long periods of these useless appendages?
-THAT degenerate human beings, such as the savages, have certain capaci-
ties in common with all men and possessed by no beasts? They all have some moral sense; they can reflect, reason, arrange thoughts, communicate in speech or writing; can be instructed in the way of right, and have the capacity to know God.
-THAT evolution cannot account for JESUS CHRIST, the most perfect man, who lived hundreds of vears ago?
-THAT evolution leads directly to the denial of man's responsibility for $\sin$ and his refusal of the only successful remedy for $\sin$ ? If man is coming up from the brute state, he is not responsible for what he brings with him and he should be congratulated rather than punishea. If in the veins of Jesus Christ flowed the blood of reptile, bird and beast, then His atoning death had no efficacy to save humanity.
-THAT, after all, there is nothing so reasonable and restful as faith in the Word of God, which is not contradicted at any point by an absolutely settled science?
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