

ADVERTISING A HOBBY AND NEC,ESSITY
IT recommend the study of religious advertising as
by and as a necessity", said Rev. Dr. Clinton Wunder, a short time ago ite, It is with direct advertising that we are especially coneerred. . Thave found by checking my experience with others,
that the tollowing orm oo direct adverising are of value
in about the order stated. I would pat first the space secured In about the order stated I would put tirst the space secured
in the newspapers, particularly where it appears adjoining
reading matter. Next to this advertising,
tive nature.
 he loose collection is the index of the presence of strangers
nnd ivisitors in the congregation.
Our averaged 2000 per Sunday, which is an estimated increase of
four times over the period when there was no systematic .

## DOES EVOLUTION DENY EXISTENCE OF GOD?

(copptrigumber of The Chese Mercury.) wo letters, the one from astudent who declares that he has religious nature except an agnosticism which he frankly anser recognizes no evidence or a God, The other letter is an
answe this student misisie by Prof John Wrivht Buck-
hat of the Pacific School of Religion, which attempts to combat the agnosticiem of the student by drawing entirely
opposite conclusions from the scientific facts cited by the bered that in that the vast parent's letter: "Let it be rememresided potentially -very thing from skyscrapers to dreams,
In some hot-bed, when the earth had coled off sufficiently to existence. This amesa the parent organism of all living organisms that we know today.
Continuing the studd with and an temple to the unknown god. They were wiie. They did not protess to know the unknowable. What seien-
tifice evidence have wor fod? None at all. He in then, an
hypothesis to explain the ultimate nature of things, accordanpothesis to explain the
ing tomodetimp philosophy.
onn
 sophical hypothesis-an explanation of that which is beyond
wisdom he has developed laws of moratity and ethics. In his
wealmeess he has linked them up with God for sure enforce. Dr. Buckham admits that much of the student's state
ment is in accord with modern seience, and as such is to be accepted. But he points out that much that passes for difference between even a, well established hypothesish and a
complete demonstration." The professor answers the stud nuts osesumption that God cannot have ruch to do owith the
evolutionary process by deelaring truthfolly that many of
 Wallace, George J. Romanase, N. S. Shaler, Joseph Le Conte
J.Arthur Thompon and very. many others, have reache
guite the onpoite con quite the opposite conclusion.
The trouble with this young student philosopher is the
same as that of the early evolutionists. He is drawing his conelusions strom too superficial, too one-sided an investigg-
tion of scient $f$ ic fecta. Absorbed in and carried away by the purely physical phenomena with which they exclusively deal
these acinostic evolutionits persist in ignoring or dening the existence of all superphysical phenomen. OThey even re
fuse to admit the conclusions that inevitably follow their own array or armitted facts. Fore sate tate the of this student that
"man is simply, evolved, rationalized mud." Whence came

 character as that which makes up the rest of the creation
Whenee comes the power of orree or law that has evoved
from one small portion of this matter a man, from another a dog, a horse, a bird or a fish, from another a tree ar flow-
er?
erphese would-be seientists persist in denominating the these wonders to a creative power and intelligence as a a pure
hypotheisi. They do not, however, balk at setting up hypo theses of their own to account for sets of physical facts
which their researches disclose. But anything that points unerringly to a Creator or God behind it in the creation- they
simply refuse to see it. or seeing it, ilike the student they
sicher God or Creator int creationg this, there is no evidence of any the mirace of creceintion has mind it does not mat matter whether
ong line of evolution
ary stages from the mud, as decared by the ary stages from the mud, as declared by the student quoted vitalizing this mud into the varied forms of created life just
 eise we know or see, and so perfectly manifest, that to deny
its existence marks the agnostic as woefully lacking in thos
 seeing in creation no evidence of a God is on a par with the the
blind bigot who persistently shuts his etes to patent facts. Let it not be supposed, however, that all scientists, and
especinly all evolutionists, become agnostics or infidels, dis believing in God and His power. Quite the reverse, T
miost of them have come to recognize a "living God," one $c$
nost or tnem have come to recognize a "living God," one c
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stantly present in His creation. And certainly many evolu-
tionists reocngize a superpysicical or or spiritual element in
creation, and believe as firmly in God as the most devout evolu
epption
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fiere are the words of one of the most distinguished
tionists in this country: 'The basis for all mature col
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