

## William Jennings Bryan



Nebraska's greatest hero in the U.S. Capitol's Statuary Hall, State's National Hall of Fame, **William Jennings Bryan (1860-1925)** was chosen by the citizens of Nebraska to represent them, among the greatest heroes of every other State in the Union – two from each State. His life-like bronze statue is the workmanship of great master sculptor, Rudolph Evans of New York, who also executed the masterful bronze statue of Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence in the capital city's Jefferson Memorial. The Honorable William Jennings Bryan's statue was accepted by Congress in 1937 and has adorned the U.S. Capitol's Statuary Hall for eighty-one years. Nebraska's current governor has seen fit – with a deft stroke of his pen<sup>1</sup> – to remove this American son, thrice-chosen by his party for U.S. President – and replace him with the statue of an Indian Chief. The latter bears an animal's name, and is adorned with a necklace of bear claws, officially described as “representing the strength and healing power of that sacred animal,”<sup>2</sup> his tomahawk and spear in hand. It behooves Americans to be apprised and alerted to this insidious plan to abolish their cherished foundational Christian history from the Statuary Hall Collection in the U.S. Capitol.

Why would **William Jennings Bryan** be a threat to the current revisionist agenda? Firstly, in 1896, Bryan defended the laborer and farmer against all who would exploit them, by delivering one of the most brilliant speeches in the history of American politics – his “**Cross of Gold**” speech. It concluded thus:

“...You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns, you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.”<sup>3</sup>

Secondly, after his two-year appointment as Secretary of State, during which he negotiated thirty treaties with world nations, Bryan returned to full-time Christian work, specifically taking a stand against the **theory of Evolution** being forcibly introduced into the United States educational system; and which, he maintained, was leading America’s youth away from God. Bryan was successful in securing laws in Florida and Tennessee forbidding the teaching of this godless Darwinian theory in schools.<sup>4</sup>

The matter came to a head in the **John T. Scopes “monkey’s” Trial** in Dayton, Tennessee, in which a High School principal admitted he had taught the theory of Evolution, and a fourteen-year old student, that he had been taught. Attracting nationwide attention, crowds of people forced the court in Dayton into the courtyard. The American Civil Liberties Union attacked Tennessee’s anti-evolution law – however, Bryan heroically won the case, the teacher being fined \$100.00. It is a tragedy that William Jennings Bryan died suddenly in his sleep a few days later. His funeral took place at the *New York Avenue Presbyterian Church* in the nation’s capital (Abraham Lincoln’s Church), and he was buried at Arlington National Cemetery, leaving a magnificent legacy to his State and nation.<sup>5</sup>

What was William Jennings Bryan’s background and formative years, which made him such a shining light in his career as soldier, lawyer, orator and statesman: member of the House of Representatives, 1891-95; three times candidate for President of the United States; Colonel in the Spanish-American War, 1898; founder of *The Commoner* newspaper, 1901; zealous worker in Christian and civic interests, and Secretary of State, 1913-15?

Bryan’s father being gravely ill as a young man, he made a vow to the Lord that if he recovered, he would worship three times daily, keeping his vow in his family throughout his life. As a boy, Bryan was adept at expounding upon the Scriptures in Sunday School and church gatherings. A member of the Presbyterian Church, he continued to preach and lecture throughout his life, maintaining his stance upon the Divine inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures. At college, Bryan was the President of the debating society, led prayer meetings and was valedictorian of his graduating class.<sup>6</sup>

He became a lawyer, and was elected to the Nebraska State Legislature at age twenty-nine. The following year he took his seat as a delegate in the U.S. House of Representatives, later becoming Editor-in-Chief of the *Omaha World Herald* newspaper. This outstanding statesman mastered penmanship.

In addition, of equal threat to the revisionist agenda, are William Jennings Bryan’s incomparable published works, *The Menace of Darwinism*, *The Bible and its Enemies* (1921), and *In His Image* (1922). The following is an extract from *In His Image*:

## **In His Image**

By William Jennings Bryan

**Dedicated** to the memory of my beloved parents Silas Willard Bryan and Mariah Elizabeth Bryan to whom I am indebted for a Christian environment in youth during which they instilled into my mind and imprinted upon my heart the religious principles which I have set forth and applied in the lectures contained in this volume.

### **Preface**

...My desire is to aid those who are passing from youth to maturity and grappling with problems incident to this critical age. Having spent eight years away from home, in academy, college and law school, I have reason to know the conflicts through which each individual has to pass, especially those who have the experience incident to college life. I never can be thankful enough for the fact that I became a member of the Church, the Sunday School and Christian friends during these trying days.

In these lectures I have had in mind two thoughts, first, the confirming of the faith of men and women, especially the young, in a Creator, all-powerful, all-wise, and all-loving, in a Bible as the very Word of a Living God and in Christ as Son of God and Saviour of the world; second, the applying of the principles of our religion to every problem in life. My purpose is to prove, not only the fact of God, but the need of God, the fact of the Bible and the need of the Bible, and the fact of Christ and the need of a Saviour.

Therefore, I have chosen "**In His Image**" as the title of this series of lectures, because, in my judgment, all depends upon our conception of our place in God's plan. The Bible tells us that God made us in His image and placed us here to carry out a Divine decree. He gave us the Scriptures as an authoritative guide and He gave us His Son to reveal the Father, to redeem man from sin and to furnish in His life and teachings an inspiring example by the following of which, man may grow in grace and in the knowledge of God. "Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer."

Miami, Florida

**William Jennings Bryan**

### **"In the Beginning – God"**

Religion is the relation between man and his Maker – the most important relationship into which man enters. Most of the relationships of life are voluntary; we enter into them or not as we please. Such, for illustration, are those between business partners, between stockholders in a corporation, between friends and between husband and wife. Some relationships, on the other hand, are involuntary; we enter into them because we must. Such, for illustration, are those between man and his government, between man and society, and between man and his Maker.

**Tolstoy** declares that morality is but the outward manifestation of religion. If this be true, as I believe it is, then religion is the most practical thing in life, and the thought of God the greatest thought that can enter the human mind or heart. Tolstoy also delivers a severe rebuke to what he calls the "cultured crowd" – those who think that religion, while good enough for the ignorant (to hold in check and restrain them), is not needed when one reaches a certain stage of intellectual development. His reply is that religion is not superstition and does not rest upon a vague fear of the unseen forces of nature, but

does rest upon “man’s consciousness of his finiteness amid an infinite universe and of his sinfulness.” This consciousness, Tolstoy adds, man can never outgrow.

- I. The *a priori* argument which seeks to demonstrate the Being of a God from certain first principles involved in the essential laws of human intelligence.
- II. The cosmological argument, or that one which proceeds after the *posteriori* fashion, from the present existence of the world as an effect, to the necessary existence of some ultimate and eternal first cause.
- III. The teleological argument, or that argument which, from the evidence of design in the creation, seeks to establish the fact that the great self-existent first cause of all things is an intelligent and voluntary personal Spirit.
- IV. The moral argument, or that argument which, from a consideration of the phenomena of conscience in the human heart, seeks to establish the fact that the self-existent Creator is also the righteous moral Governor of the world. This argument includes the consideration of the universal feeling of dependence common to all men, which together with conscience, constitutes the religious sentiment.
- V. The historical argument, which involves: 1. The evident providential presence of God in the history of the human race. 2. The evidence afforded by history that the human race is not eternal, and therefore not an infinite succession of individuals, but created. 3. The universal consent of all men to the fact of His existence.
- VI. The Scriptural argument, which includes: 1. The miracles and prophecies recorded in Scripture, and confirmed by testimony, proving the existence of a God. 2. The Bible itself, self-evidently a work of superhuman wisdom. 3. Revelation, developing and enlightening conscience, and relieving many of the difficulties under which natural theism labours, and thus confirming every other line of evidence.

A reasonable person searches for a reason and all reasons point to a God, all-wise, all-powerful, and all-loving. On no other theory can we account for what we see about us. It is impossible to conceive of the universe, illimitable in extent and seemingly measureless in time, as being the result of chance. The reign of law, universal and eternal, compels belief in a Law Giver.

We need not give much time to the agnostic. If he is sincere he does not *know* and therefore cannot affirm, deny or advise. When I was a young man I wrote to Colonel Ingersoll, the leading infidel of his day, and asked his views of God and immortality. His Secretary sent me a speech which quoted Colonel Ingersoll as follows: “I do not say that there is no God: I simply say I do not know. I do not say that there is no life beyond the grave: I simply say I do not know!” What pleasure could any man find in taking from a human heart a living faith and putting in the place of it the cold and cheerless doctrine “I do not know?” Many who call themselves agnostics are really atheists; it is easier to profess ignorance than to defend atheism.

What is the first question an atheist asks a Christian? There is but one *first* question: Where do you begin? I answer: I begin where the Bible begins. “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” I begin with a Creative Cause that is sufficient for anything that can come thereafter.

Having answered the atheists’ first question, it is now my turn, and I ask the first question of the atheist: “Where do you begin?” And then his trouble begins. Did you ever hear an atheist explain creation? He cannot begin with God because he denies the existence of a God. But he must begin *somewhere*; it is just as necessary for the atheist as for the Christian to have a beginning point for his philosophy.

Where does the atheist begin? He usually starts with the nebular hypothesis. And where does that begin? "In the beginning?" No. It begins by *assuming* that two things existed which the theory does not try to explain. It assumes that matter and force existed, but it does not tell us how matter and force came into existence, where they came from, or why they came. The theory begins: "Let us suppose that matter and force are here," and then, according to the theory, force working on matter created a world. I have just as much right as the atheist to begin with an assumption, and I would rather begin with God and reason down, than begin with a piece of dirt and reason up. The difference between the Christian theory and the materialistic theory is that the Christian begins with God, while the materialist begins with dull, inanimate matter. *I know of no theory suggested as a substitute for the Bible theory that is as rational and as easy to believe.*

If the atheist asks me if I can understand God, I answer that it is not necessary that my finite mind shall comprehend the Infinite Mind before I admit that there is an infinite mind, any more than, it is necessary that I shall understand the sun before I can admit that there is a sun. We must deal with the facts about us whether we can understand them or not.

If the atheist tells me I have no right to believe in God until I can understand Him, I will take his own logic and drive him to suicide; for, by that logic, what right has an atheist to live unless he can understand the mystery of his own life? Does the atheist understand the mystery of the life he lives? No; bring me the most learned atheist and when he has gathered all the information that this earth can give, I will have a little child lead him out and show him the grass on the ground, the leaves upon the trees, the birds that fly in the air, and the fishes in the deep, and the little child will mock him and tell him, and tell him truly, that he, the little child, knows just as much about the mystery of life as does the most learned atheist. We have our thoughts, our hopes, our fears, and yet we know that in a moment a change may come over any one of us that will convert a living, breathing human being into a mass of lifeless clay. What is it, that, having, we live, and having not, we are as the clod? We know as little of the mystery of life today as they knew in the dawn of Creation and yet behold the civilization that man has wrought.

And love that makes life worth living is also a mystery. Have you ever read a scientific definition of love? You never will. Why? Because a man does not know what love is until he gets into it, and then he is not scientific until he gets out again. And even if we could understand the mysterious tie that brings two hearts together from out the multitude, and on a united life builds the home, earth's only paradise, we still would be unable to understand that larger mystery that manifests itself when a human heart reaches out the links itself to every other heart.

...But our case is even stronger: Everything with which man deals is full of mystery. The very food we eat is mysterious; sometimes man-made food becomes so mysterious that we are compelled to enact pure food laws in order that we may know what we are eating. And God-made food is as mysterious as man-made food, though we cannot compel Jehovah to make known the formula.

We encourage children to raise vegetables; a little child can learn *how* to raise vegetables, but no grown person understands the mystery that is wrapped up in every vegetable that grows. Let me illustrate: I am fond of radishes; my good wife knows it and keeps me supplied with them when she can. I plan radish seed – put a little seed into the ground, and go out in a few days and find a full-grown radish. The top is green, the body of the root is white and almost transparent, and around it I sometimes find a delicate pink or red. Whose hand caught the hues of a summer sunset and wrapped them around the radish's root down there in the darkness in the ground? I cannot understand a radish; can you? If one refused to eat anything until he could understand the mystery

of its growth, he would die of starvation; but mystery does not bother us in the dining-room – it is only in the Church that mystery seems to give us trouble.

In travelling around the world I found that the egg is a universal form of food. When we reached Asia the cooking was so different from ours that the boiled egg was sometimes the only home-like thing we could find on the table. What is more mysterious than an egg? Take a fresh egg; it is not only good food, but an important article of merchandise. But loan a fresh egg to a hen, after the hen has developed a well-settled tendency to sit, and let her keep the egg under her for a week, and, as any housewife will tell you, it loses a large part of its market value. But be patient with the hen; let her have it for two weeks more and she will give you back a chicken that you could not find in the egg. No one can understand the egg, but we all like eggs...

Sometimes I go into a community and find a young man who has come in from the country and obtained a smattering of knowledge; then his head swells and he begins to swagger around and say that an intelligent man like himself cannot afford to have anything to do with anything that he cannot understand. Poor boy, he will be surprised to find out how few things he will be able to deal with if he adopts that rule. I feel like suggesting to him that the next time he goes home to show himself off to his parents on the farm he address himself to the first mystery that ever came under his observation, and has not yet been solved, notwithstanding the wonderful progress made by our agricultural colleges. Let him find out, if he can, why it is that a black cow can eat green grass and then give white milk with yellow butter in it? Will the mystery disturb him? No. He will enjoy the milk and the butter without worrying about the mystery in them...Who taught the tomato vine to fling its flaming many-mansioned fruit before the gaze of the passer-by, while the potato modestly conceals its priceless gifts within the bosom of the earth?

I learned years ago that it is the mystery in the miracle that makes it a stumbling block in the way of many. If you will analyze the miracle you will find just two questions in it: Can God perform a miracle? And, would He *want* to? The first question is easily answered. A God who can make a world can do anything He wants with it. We cannot deny that God *can* perform a miracle, without denying that God is God. But would God *want* to perform a miracle? That is the question that has given the trouble; but it has only troubled those, mark you, who are unwilling to admit that the infinite mind of God may have reasons that the finite mind of man does not comprehend. If, for any reason, God desires to do so, can He not with His infinite strength, temporarily suspend the operation of any of His laws, as man with his feeble arm overcomes the law of gravitation when he lifts a stone?...

When Job asked, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" a negative answer was implied, but we can see manifestations of God's power everywhere; in the suns and planets that, revolving, whirl through space, held in position by forces centripetal and centrifugal; we see it in the mountains rent asunder and upturned by a force not only superhuman but beyond the power of man to conceive. Captain Crawford, the poet-scout, in describing the mountains of the West has used a phrase which often comes into my mind: "Where the hand of God is seen."

We see manifestation of God's power in the ebb and flow of the tides; in the mighty "shoreless rivers of the ocean"; in the suspended water in the clouds – billions of tons, seemingly defying the law of gravitation while they await the command that sends them down in showers of blessings. We behold it in the lightning's flash and the thunder's roar, and in the invisible germ of life that contains within itself the power to gather its nourishment from the earth and air, fulfill its mission and propagate its kind. We see all about us also, conclusive proofs of the infinite intelligence and fathomless love of the Heavenly Father...

**The Bible's proof of God** becomes increasingly necessary to meet the agnosticism and atheism that are the outgrowth of modern mind-worship. I shall speak of the Bible in my second lecture; I refer to it here merely for the purpose of pointing out the harmony between the spoken word and the evidence furnished by God's handiwork throughout the universe. The wisdom of the Bible writers is more than human; the prophecies proclaim a Supreme Ruler who, though inhabiting all space, deigns to speak through the hearts and minds and tongues of His children.

**The Christ** of whom the Bible tells furnishes the highest evidence of the power, the wisdom, and the love of **Jehovah**. He is a living Christ, present today in the increasing influence He exerts over the hearts of men and over the history of nations.

We not only have God in the Bible and God in nature, but we have God in life and accessible to all. It is not necessary to spend time in trying to comprehend God – a task too great for the finite mind; we can “taste and see that the Lord is good.” We can test His grace and prove His presence. The negative arguments of the atheist and the indecision of the agnostic will not disturb the faith of one who daily communes with the Heavenly Father, and, by obedience, lays hold upon His promise.

Belief in God is almost universal and the effect of this belief is so vast that one is appalled at the thought of what social conditions would be like if reverence for God were erased from every heart. A sense of responsibility to God for every thought and word and deed is the most potent influence that acts upon the life – for one man kept in the straight and narrow way by fear of prison walls, a multitude are restrained by those invisible walls that conscience rears about us, walls that are stronger than the walls of stone.

At first the fear of God – fear that sin will bring punishment – is needed; “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom” But as one learns to appreciate the goodness of God and the plenitude of His mercy, love takes the place of fear and obedience becomes a pleasure; “His delight is in the law of the Lord; and in His law doth he meditate day and night.”

The paramount need of the world today, as it was 1900 years ago, is a whole-hearted, whole-souled, whole-minded faith in the Living God. A hesitating admission that there is a God is not sufficient; Man must love with *all* his heart, and with *all* his soul, and with *all* his strength, - and to love he must believe. Belief in God must be a conviction that controls every nerve and fibre of his being and dominates every impulse and energy of his life.

Belief in God is necessary to prayer. It is not sufficient to believe that there is an Intelligence permeating the universe; nothing less than a *personal* God – a God interested in each one of His children and ready to give at any moment the aid that is needed – nothing less than this can lead one to communion with the Heavenly Father through prayer. **Evolutionists** have attempted to retain the form of prayer while denying that God answers prayer. They argue that prayer has a reflex action upon the petitioner and reconciles him to his lot. This argument might justify one in thinking prayer good enough for *others* who believe, but it is impossible for one to be fervent in prayer himself if he is convinced that his pleas do not reach a prayer-hearing and a prayer-answering God. Prayer becomes a mockery when faith is gone, just as Christianity becomes a mere form when prayer is gone. If the words of the Bible have any meaning at all one must believe that God “*is*, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.”

Belief in God is necessary to that confidence in His providence which is the source of the Christian's calmness in hours of trial. We soon reach the limitations of our strength and would despair but for our confidence in the infinite wisdom of God. David expresses this when he says,

“Unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness. He...shall not be afraid of evil tidings: his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord.” (Psalm 112).

Belief in God gives courage. The Christian believes that every word spoken in behalf of truth will have its influence and that every deed done for the right will weigh in the final account. What matters it to the believer whether his eyes behold the victory and his voice mingles in the shouts of triumph, or whether he dies in the midst of the conflict!

“Yea, tho’ thou lie upon the dust, When they who helped thee flee in fear, Die full of hope and manly trust, Like those who fell in battle here. Another hand thy sword shall wield, Another hand the standard wave, Till from the trumpet’s mouth is pealed, The blast of triumph o’er the grave.”

Only those who believe, attempt the seemingly impossible, and, by attempting, prove that one, with God, can chase a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight. I can imagine that the early Christians, who were carried into the Coliseum to make a spectacle for spectators more cruel than the beasts, were entreated by their doubting companions not to endanger their lives. But, kneeling in the center of the arena, they prayed and sang until they were devoured. How helpless they seemed, and measured by every human rule, how hopeless was their cause! And yet within a few decades the power which they invoked proved mightier than the legions of the emperor and the faith in which they died was triumphant o’er all the land. It is said that those who went to mock at their sufferings returned asking themselves: “What is it that can enter into the heart of man and make him die as these die?” They were greater conquerors in their death than they could have been had they purchased life by a surrender of their faith.

What would have been the fate of the Church if the early Christians had had as little faith as many of our Christians of today? And if the Christians of today had the faith of the martyrs, how long would it be before the prophecy were fulfilled, - “every knee shall bow and every tongue confess”?

Belief in God is the basis of every moral code. Morality cannot be put on as a garment and taken off at will. It is a power within; it works out from the heart as a spring pours forth its flood. It is not safe for a weak Christian to associate intimately with the world because he may be influenced by others – instead of influencing others. But one need not fear when his morality derives its energy from connection with the Heavenly Father. Just as the water from a hose, because it comes from a reservoir above, will cleanse a muddy pool without danger of a single drop of pollution entering the hose, so the Christian can go into infected areas and among those diseased by sin without fear of contamination so long as he is prompted by a sincere desire to serve and is filled with a heaven-born longing for souls.

Joseph gives us a splendid illustration of strength inspired by faith. Reason fails when one is punished for righteousness’ sake; only a belief in God can sustain one in such an hour of trial and make him enter a dungeon rather than surrender his integrity.

### **The Bible**

JESUS CHRIST not only endorsed the Old Testament as authoritative, but bore witness to its eternal truth. “Think not,” He said, “that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” (Matthew 5: 17, 18).

When one’s belief in God becomes the controlling passion of his life; when he loves God with all his heart, with all his soul, with all his mind and with all his strength he is anxious to learn God’s will



and ready to accept the Bible as the Word of God. All that he asks is sufficient evidence of its inspiration.

After so many hundreds of millions have adopted the Bible as their guide for so many centuries, the burden of proof would seem on those who reject it.

The Bible is either the word of God or the work of man. Those who regard it as a man-made book should be challenged to put their theory to the test. If man made the Bible, he is, unless he has degenerated, able to make as good a book today.

Judged by human standards, man is far better prepared to write a Bible now than he was when our Bible was written. The characters whose words and deeds are recorded in the Bible were members of a single race; they lived among the hills of Palestine in a territory scarcely larger than one of our counties. They did not have printing presses and they lacked the learning of the schools; they had no great libraries to consult, no steamships to carry them around the world and make them acquainted with the various centers of ancient civilization; they had no telegraph wires to bring them the news from the ends of the earth and no newspapers to spread before them each morning the doings of the day before. Science had not yet unlocked Nature's door and revealed the secrets of rocks below and stars above. From what a scantily supplied storehouse of knowledge they had to draw, compared with the unlimited wealth of information at man's command today! And yet these Bible characters grappled with every problem that confronts mankind, from the creation of the world to eternal life beyond the tomb. They gave us a diagram of man's existence from the cradle to the grave and set up warning signs at every dangerous point.

The Bible gives us the story of the birth, the words, the works, the crucifixion, the resurrection, and the ascension of Him whose coming was foretold by prophecy, whose arrival was announced by angel voices, singing Peace and Good-will – the story of Him who gave to the world **a code of morality** superior to anything that the world had known before or has known since.

Let the atheists and the materialists produce a better Bible than ours, if they can. Let them collect the best of their school to be found among the graduates of universities – as many as they please and from every land. Let the members of this selected group travel where they will, consult such libraries as they like, and employ every modern means of swift communication. Let them glean in the fields of geology, botany, astronomy, biology, and zoology, and then roam at will wherever science has opened a way; let them take advantage of all the progress in art and in literature, in oratory and in history – let them use to the full every instrumentality that is employed in modern civilization; and when they have exhausted every source, let them embody the results of their best intelligence in a book and offer it to the world as a substitute for this Bible of ours. Have they the confidence that the prophets of Baal had in their god? Will they try? If not, what excuse will they give? Has man so fallen from his high estate, that we cannot rightfully expect as much of him now as nineteen centuries ago? Or does the Bible come to us from a source that is higher than man?

But the case is even stronger. The opponents of the Bible cannot take refuge in the plea that man is retrograding. They loudly proclaim that man has grown and that he is growing still. They boast of a world-wide advance and their claim is founded upon fact. In all matters except in the "science of how to live," man has made wonderful progress. The mastery of the mind over the forces of nature seems almost complete, so far do we surpass the ancients in harnessing the water, the wind and the lightning.

For ages, the rivers plunged down the mountainsides and exhausted their energies without any appreciable contribution to man's service; now they are estimated as so many units of horse-power,

and we find that their fretting and foaming was merely a language which they employed to tell us of their strength and of their willingness to work for us. And, while falling water is becoming each day a larger factor in burden-bearing, water, rising in the form of steam, is revolutionizing the transportation methods of the world.

The wind, that first whispered its secret of strength to the flapping sail, is now turning the wheel at the well, and our flying machines have taken possession of the air.

Lightning, the red demon that, from the dawn of Creation, has been rushing down its zigzag path through the clouds, as if intent only upon spreading death, metamorphosed into an errand-boy, brings us illumination from the sun and carries our messages around the globe.

Inventive genius has multiplied the power of a human arm and supplied the masses with comforts of which the rich did not dare to dream a few centuries ago. Science is ferreting out the hidden causes of disease and teaching us how to prolong life. In every line, except in the line of character-building, the world seems to have been made over, but these marvelous changes only emphasize the fact that man, too, must be born again, while they show how impotent are material things to touch the soul of man and transform him into a spiritual being. Wherever the moral standard is being lifted up – wherever life is becoming larger in the vision that directs it and richer in its fruitage, the improvement is traceable to the Bible and to the influence of the God and Christ of whom the Bible tells.

The atheist and the materialist must confess that man should be able to produce a better book today than man, unaided, could have produced in any previous age. The fact that they have tried, time and time again, only to fail each time more hopelessly, explains why they will not – why they cannot – accept the challenge thrown down by the Christian world to produce a book worthy to take the Bible's place.

They have begged to their God to answer with fire – appealed to inanimate matter with an earnestness that is pathetic; they have employed in the worship of blind force a faith greater than religion requires, but their God is asleep. How long will they allow the search for strata of stone and fragments of fossil and decaying skeletons that are strewn around the house to absorb their thoughts to the exclusion of the architect who planned it all? How long will the agnostic, closing his eyes to the plainest truths, cry, "Night, night," when the sun in his meridian splendor announces that noon is here?

Those who reject the Bible ignore its claim to inspiration. This in itself makes them enemies of the Book of books, because the Bible characters profess to speak by inspiration, and what they say bears the stamp of the supernatural. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter 1:21).

"Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (I Corinthians 2: 13-14).

Those who reject the Bible ignore the spirit that pervades it, the atmosphere that envelopes it, the harmony of its testimonies and the unity of its structure, despite the fact that it is the product of many writers during many centuries. Its parts were not arranged by man, but prearranged by the Almighty.

Those who reject the Bible also ignore the prophecies and their fulfillment – “History written in advance” – proof that appeals irresistibly to the open mind.

Those who reject the Bible even disparage the testimony which the Saviour bore to the inspiration of the Old Testament, and yet what could be more explicit than His words? “And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.” (Luke 24: 27).

As Canon Liddon says:

“For Christians, it will be enough to know that our Lord, Jesus Christ, set the seal of His infallible sanction on the whole of the Old Testament. He found the Hebrew canon as we have it in our hands today, and He treated it as an authority which was above discussion. Nay, more; He went out of His way – if we may reverently speak thus – to sanction not a few portions of it which modern skepticism rejects.”

Besides open enemies, the Bible has enemies who are less frank – enemies who, while claiming to be friends of Christianity, spend their time undermining faith in God, faith in the Bible, and faith in Christ. These professed friends call themselves higher critics – a title which – though explained by them as purely technical – smacks of an insufferable egotism. They assume an air of superior intelligence and look down with mingled pity and contempt upon what they regard as poor, credulous humanity. The higher critic is more dangerous than the open enemy. The atheist approaches you boldly and tries to blow out your light, but, as you know who he is, what he is trying to do and why, you can protect yourself. The higher critic, however, comes to you in the guise of a friend and politely inquires: “Isn’t the light too near your eyes? I fear it will injure your sight.” Then he moves the light away, a little at a time, until it is only a speck and then – invisible.

Some who have used the title “**higher critic**” have approached their subject in a reverent spirit and labored earnestly in the vain hope of satisfying intellectual doubts, when the real trouble has been with the hearts of objectors rather than with their heads. Religion is a matter of the heart, and the impulses of the heart often seem foolish to the mind. Faith is different from, and superior to, reason. Faith is a spiritual extension of the vision – a moral sense that reaches out toward the throne of God and takes hold of verities that the mind cannot grasp. It is like “the blind leading the blind” for a higher critic, however honest, to rely on purely intellectual methods to convey truths that are “spiritually discerned.”

As a rule, however, the co-called **higher critic** is a man without spiritual vision, without zeal for souls and without any deep interest in the coming of God’s Kingdom. He toils not in the Master’s vineyard and yet “Solomon in all his glory” never laid claim to such wisdom as he boasts. He does not accept the Bible nor defend it; he mutilates it. He puts the Bible on the operating table and cuts out the parts that he thinks are “diseased.” When he has finished his work the Bible is no longer the Book of books: it is simply “a scrap of paper.”

The higher critic (I speak now of the rule and not of the exceptions) begins his investigations with his opinion already formed. After he has discarded the Bible because **he cannot harmonize it with the doctrine of evolution**, he labours to find evidence to support his preconceived notions. In matters of religion the higher critic is usually a “dyspeptic.” The Bible does not agree with him; he has not the spiritual fluids in sufficient quantity to enable him to digest the miracle and the supernatural. He is a doubter and spreads doubts.

Dr. Franklin Johnson, in Volume 2, of "Fundamentals" says (pages 55, 56, 57): "A third fallacy of the higher critics is the doctrine concerning the Scriptures which they teach. If a consistent hypothesis of evolution is made the basis of our religious thinking, the Bible will be regarded as only a product of human nature working in the field of religious literature. It will be merely a natural book."...

Again: "Yet another fallacy of the **higher critics** is found in their teachings concerning the Biblical miracles. If the hypothesis of evolution is applied to the Scriptures consistently, it will lead us to deny all the miracles which they record."...

And: "Among the higher critics who accept some of the miracles there is a notable desire to discredit the virgin birth of our Lord, and their treatment of this event presents a good example of the fallacies of reasoning by means of which they would abolish many of the other miracles."

Professor Reeve, in a strong article in Volume 3 of "Fundamentals" (pages 98, 99) tells us of his own excursion into the fields of higher criticism, of his disappointment and of his glad return to the interpretations of the Bible that are generally accepted. Speaking of his first impressions, he says:

"The critics seemed to have the logical things on their side. The results at which they had arrived seemed inevitable. But upon closer thinking, I saw that the whole movement, with its conclusion, was the result of the adoption of the hypothesis of evolution."..."It became more and more obvious to me that the great movement was entirely intellectual, an attempt in reality to intellectualize all religious phenomena. I saw also that it was a partial and one-sided intellectualism, with a strong bias against the fundamental tenets of Biblical Christianity. Such a movement does not produce that intellectual humility which belongs to the Christian mind. On the contrary, it is responsible for a vast amount of intellectual pride, an aristocracy of intellect with all the snobbery which usually accompanies that term. Do they not exactly correspond to Paul's word, 'vainly puffed up in his fleshly mind and not holding fast the head, etc.' They have a splendid scorn for all opinions which do not agree with theirs. Under the spell of this sublime contempt **they think they can ignore anything that does not square with their evolutionary hypothesis.** The center of gravity of their thinking is in the theoretical, not in the religious; in reason, not in faith. Supremely satisfied with its self-constituted authority, the mind thinks itself competent to criticize the Bible, the thinking of all the centuries, and even Jesus Christ Himself. The followers of this cult have their full share of the frailties of human nature. Rarely, if ever, can a thoroughgoing critic be an evangelist or even evangelistic; he is educational. How is it possible for a preacher to be a power of God, whose source of authority is his own reason and convictions? The Bible can scarcely contain more than good advice for such a man."

In Volume 2 of "Fundamentals" (page 84), **Sir Robert Anderson** has this to say:

"The effect of this '**Higher Criticism**' is extremely grave. For it has dethroned the Bible in the home, and the good old practice of 'family worship' is rapidly dying out. And great national interests also are involved. For who can doubt that the prosperity and power of the nations of the world are due to the influence of the Bible upon the character and conduct? Races of man who for generations have been taught to think for themselves in matters of the highest moment will naturally excel in every sphere of effort or of enterprise. And more than this, no one who is trained in the fear of God will fail in his duty to his neighbor, but will prove himself a good citizen. But the dethronement of the Bible leads practically to the dethronement of God, and in Germany and America, and now in England, the effects of this are declaring themselves in ways, and to an extent, well fitted to cause anxiety for the future."

The experience of **Rev. Paul Kanamori**, known as “**Japanese Billy Sunday**” furnishes an excellent illustration of the chilling effect of higher criticism. He was converted when a student and, after a period of preaching, became a professor in a theological seminary in Japan. Dr. Robert E. Speer, in a preface to a published sermon of Mr. Kanamori, thus describes the great evangelist’s temporary retirement from the ministry and its cause:

“He began to read upon the most recent German theology, with the result that he was completely swept off his feet by the rationalistic New Theology, Higher Criticism, etc. Not long after that he published his new views under the title, ‘The present and future of Christianity in Japan,’ and retired from the ministry...He remained in this state of spiritual darkness for twenty years, until the death of his wife brought him and his children into great trouble, but after passing through these deep waters he came out again with a clear and firm belief in the old-fashioned gospel.” (“The Three-Hour Sermon,” page 8).

Since Mr. Kanamori’s return to the ministry he has been the means of leading nearly fifty thousand Japanese to Christ – probably more than the total number of souls brought into the Church by all the higher critics combined.

**Rev. T. De Witt Talmage**, one of the great preachers of the last generation, thus speaks of the higher critics:

“When I see ministers of religion finding fault with the Scriptures, it makes me think of a fortress terrifically bombarded, and the men on the ramparts, instead of swabbing out and loading the guns and helping to fetch up the ammunition from the magazine, are trying with crowbars to pry out from the wall certain blocks of stone, because they did not come from the right quarry. Oh, men on the ramparts, better fight back and fight down the common enemy, instead of trying to make breaches in the wall.”

It is a deserved rebuke. The higher critics throw ink at a Book that has withstood the assaults of materialists for centuries, and are vain enough to think that they can blot out its vital truths. Although their labours against the Bible have consumed years, they expect the public to accept their conclusions at sight. If they require so much time to formulate their indictment against Holy Writ, surely the friends of the Bible should be allowed as much time for the inspection of the indictment.

The destructive higher critic is, as a rule, opposed to revivals; in fact, it is one of the tests by which he can be distinguished from other preachers. He calls the revival a “religious spasm.” He understands how one can have a spasm of anger and become a murderer, or a spasm of passion and ruin a life, or a spasm of dishonesty and rob a bank, but he cannot understand how one can be convicted of sin, and, in a spasm of repentance, be born again. That would be a miracle, and **miracles are inconsistent with evolution**. It shocks the higher critic to have the prodigal son come back so suddenly after going away so deliberately.

Most of the higher critics discard, because **contrary to the doctrine of evolution**, the virgin birth of Jesus and His resurrection, although the former is no more mysterious than our own birth – only different, and the latter no more mysterious than the origin of life. The existence of God makes both possible; and the proof is sufficient to establish both.

If the higher critic will but come into the presence of Christ and learn of Him he will express himself in the language of the father (whose son had a dumb spirit), who, as recorded in Mark (9:24), “cried out and said with tears, Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.”

If he would only mingle with humanity he might catch the spirit of the Master; if his sympathies were broad enough to take in all of God's people, he would be so impressed with the religious needs of sinful man that he would hasten to break to him the "Bread of Life" instead of offering him a stone. The Bible, *as it is*, has led millions to repentance and, through forgiveness, into life; the Bible, as the higher critics would make it, is impotent to save.

Enemies of the Bible have been "blasting at the Rock of Ages" for nearly two thousand years but in spite of attacks of open and secret foes, God still lives, and His Book is still precious to His children.

The Bible would be the greatest book ever written if it rested on its literary merits alone, stripped of the reverence that inspiration commands; but it becomes infinitely more valuable when it is accepted as the Word of God. As a man-made book it would compel the intellectual admiration of the world; as the audible voice of the Heavenly Father it makes an irresistible appeal to the heart and writes its truths upon our lives. Its heroes teach us great lessons – they were giants when they walked by faith, but weak as we ourselves when they relied upon their own strength.

**The Bible starts with a simple story of creation** – just a few words, but it says all that can be said. The scientists have framed hypotheses, the philosophers have formulated theories and the speculators have guessed – some of them have darkened "counsel by words without knowledge" – but when the smoke of controversy rises we find that the first sentence of Genesis, still unshaken, comprehends the entire subject: "**In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.**" No one has been able to overthrow it, or burrow under it or go around it.

**And so when we set out in search of a foundation for a statute law;** we dig down through the loose dirt, the mould of centuries, until we strike solid rock and we find the Tables of Stone on which were written **the Ten Commandments**. All important legislation is but an elaboration of these few, brief sentences, and the elaborations are often obscuring instead of clarifying.

If we desire rules to govern our spiritual development we turn back to the Sermon on the Mount. In our educational system it takes many books on many subjects to prepare a mind for its work, but three chapters of the Bible (Matthew 5, 6 and 7) applied to life, would have more influence than all the learning of the schools in determining the happiness of the individual and his service to society.

If we want to understand the evils of arbitrary power, we have only to read Samuel's warning to the children of Israel when they clamoured for a king (I Samuel 8: 11, 17).

If we would form an estimate of the influence that faith can exert on a human life, and, through it, upon a world, we follow the career of **Abraham**, "the friend of God," and see how his trust in Jehovah was rewarded. He founded a race, than which there has never been a greater, and established the religion through which today hundreds of millions worship God.

**David** showed us how a shepherd lad could become the "warrior king" and the "sweet singer of Israel," with virtues so big that, in spite of his enormous sins, he is described as "a man after God's own heart."

And what varied instruction we draw from the life of **Moses**! Hidden in the bulrushes on the banks of the Nile by a mother who, by instinct or by Divine suggestion, previsioned a high calling for her son; found, under Providential direction, by a daughter of Pharaoh; reared in the environment of a palace and with the advantages of the most enlightened court of his day; compelled to flee into the wilderness because of an outburst of race passion; called to a great work by a Voice that spoke

to him from a bush that “burned but was not consumed”; modestly distrusting his ability yet dauntless as the spokesman of God – dispenser of plagues – wonder-working man! Born of an obscure family and buried in the Land of Moab in a sepulcher which “no man knoweth,” and yet between these two humble events he rose to a higher pinnacle than any uninspired man has ever reached – leader without comparison – lawgiver without a peer.

He teaches many lessons that, like all truths, can be applied in every generation in every land. Race sympathy made it possible for him to lead his people out of bondage – no one not of their own blood could have done it. This lesson needs to be heeded today. Our part in the evangelization of the world will be done through native teachers, educated here or in our missions, rather than directly. The reformer, too, finds in the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart the final assurance of success; when the “fullness of time” has come and any form of bondage is ripe for overthrow, the taskmaster’s demand for “bricks without straw” gives the final impulse and opens the way.

**Joseph** has made the world his schoolroom. He enables us to understand the words of **Solomon**; “where there is no vision the people are destroyed.” He shows how, in the hour of trial, faith can triumph over reason – how God can lead a righteous man through a dungeon to a seat by the side of the throne – how the dreamer can turn scoffing into reverence when he has the corn.

**Samuel** is a standing rebuke to those who think “wild oats” a necessary crop in the lives of young men. He heard the call of God when he was a child; was reared for the Father’s work and lived a life so blameless that the people proclaimed him just when his official career came to an end.

In the **Proverbs of Solomon** we find a rare collection of truths, beautifully expressed; in **Job** we find an inexhaustible patience set to music and an integrity that even Satan himself could not corrupt.

**The Prophets** alone could immortalize the Bible – rugged characters who dared to rebuke wickedness in high places, to reproach a nation for its sins and to warn of the coming of the wrath of God. See **Elijah on Mount Carmel**, mocking the worshippers of Baal; hear him thunder the Almighty’s sentence against a king who, coveting **Naboth’s vineyard**, broke three commandments to get a little piece of land. And yet Elijah fled from wicked Jezebel and would have despaired but for the Voice that assured him of the thousands who were still true to Israel’s God – the obscure hosts who remained loyal even when the conspicuous became faint-hearted.

**Elisha** was a visible link in the chain of power. He was not ashamed to wear the mantle of his great predecessor; he was willing to take up an unfinished work. He bears unimpeachable testimony to the continuity of the Divine current when human conductors can be found to transmit it. It was Elisha who drew aside the veil that concealed from his affrighted servant the horses and chariots that, upon the mountain, await the hours when they are needed to supplement the strength of those who fight upon the Lord’s side; it was Elisha, too, who proved to the warriors of his day that magnanimity is more potent than violence. He conquered by self-restraint – and “the bands of Syria came no more into the lands of Israel.”

**Daniel** is another man in whom faith begat courage and for whom courage carved a large niche in the temple of imperishable fame. The Daniel who interpreted to the trembling Belshazzar the fateful hand-writing on the wall; who, unawed by enemies, prayed with his windows open toward **Jerusalem**, and who, in the lions’ den, waited in patience until Darius hastened from a sleepless couch to call him forth and join him in praising Israel’s God – this Daniel was the same intrepid **servant of the Most High**, who in his youth refused to drink wine from the king’s table, and,

demanding a test, proved that water was better – a verdict that twenty-five centuries have not disturbed.

Passing over many characters who would seem mountainlike but for the majestic peaks that overshadow them, let us turn to the immortal seer who, listening heavenward, caught the words of the song that startled the shepherds at **Bethlehem** and, peering through the darkness of seven centuries, saw the light that shone from Calvary. It was **Isaiah** who foretold more clearly and more fully than any one else **the coming of the Messiah**, suggested the titles which He would earn, described the sufferings which He would endure and enumerated the blessings He would bring to mankind. In chapter nine verse six we read: “For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.”

In chapter fifty-three, we learn of His vicarious atonement:

“He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.”

In chapter two, verse four, we are told of the glad day, which we are now trying to hasten, when swords shall be beaten into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks – when nations shall not lift up the sword against nations or learn war anymore.

If the Old Testament is so fascinating, what may we expect of the New? It is day as compared with dawn; it is the morning light, with which Moses and the Prophets beat back the darkness of the night, enlarged – until we have the sun in its meridian glory. “Old things have passed away; behold, all things are become new.”

The **Old Testament** gave us the law; the **New Testament** reveals the love upon which the law rests. **John** says: “The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ” (John 1:17). The Old Testament restrained by a multitude of “Thou shalt nots”; the New Testament awakens the monitor within and supplies a spiritual urge that makes the individual find satisfaction in service and delight in doing good. **David** soothes the dying with sweet assurance: “Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me, thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me;” **Jesus** inspires them with a living hope: “I go to prepare a place for you that where I am ye may be also.”

God is the center of gravity in the New Testament as in the Old, but the drawing power of **Jehovah** became visible in **Christ**; the attributes of the Father were revealed in the Son – the supreme intelligence, the limitless power, the boundless love. Divinity surrounded itself with human associates but spiritual enthusiasm crowded out the selfish element; His presence purged their souls of dross. The characters of the New Testament are about their Father’s business all the



time. If a Judas is base enough to betray the Saviour, even he is so overwhelmed with remorse that life becomes unbearable.

We are introduced to a new group of characters, beginning with a Virgin with a child and ending with her Son upon the cross – a galaxy of men and women whose words and deeds have travelled into every land. One poor widow with two mites, wisely invested, purchased more enduring fame than any rich man was ever able to buy with all his money. Another, Tabitha, by interpretation called Dorcas, drew forth as eloquent a tribute as was ever paid. In the goodness of her heart she made garments for the poor, and the recipients, exhibiting them at her death-bed, expressed their gratitude in tears. The narrative suggests an epitaph which every Christian can earn – and who could desire more? viz., the night is darker because a life has gone out; the world is not so warm because a heart is cold in death.

In **John the Baptist**, we have the forerunner – “the voice crying in the wilderness.” The **Apostles**, chosen from among the busy multitude, carried their habits of industry into their new calling; some turned from catching fish to become “fishers of men,” while Matthew employed the accuracy of a collector of customs in chronicling the life of the Master. Even the weaknesses of men were utilized: **Thomas** consecrated his doubts, and **John**, the disciple, baptized his ambition – each giving the Great Teacher an opportunity to use a fault for the enlightening of future generations. The latter became the most intimate companion of the Saviour – “the disciple whom Jesus loved” and the one who most frequently used the word love.

**Peter** and **Paul** stand out conspicuously among the exponents of early Christianity. In the case of Peter, Christ brought an impulsive nature into complete subjection and gave a steadying purpose to an emotional follower. In Paul, we see a giant intellect aflame with a holy zeal. Both were bold interpreters of Christ’s mission and both urged upon Christians the full gospel equipment.

In his second Epistle, chapter one, **Peter** exhorts:

“And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that you shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

In the sixth chapter of Ephesians, Paul pleads:

“Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints.

**Peter** was a stone, hewn into shape and polished by the Divine hand; **Paul** was a “chosen vessel” to bear the Redeemer’s Name before “the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel.” Paul was an orator with a purpose; he was a man with a message. He was eloquent because he knew that he was talking about and meant what he said. No wonder, for he was called to service by a summons so distinct and unmistakable that he turned at once from persecuting to preaching. Paul is

responsible for one of the most inspiring sentences in the Bible – “I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision.” It was the key to his whole life.

Love is not blind, declares **Tolstoy**; it sees what ought to be done and does it. So with Paul. His eyes were open to the truth and he saw it; he was sensitive to the needs of the Church and his epistles are filled with wise counsel. He encouraged the worthy, admonished the erring and strengthened the weak. Paul knew well the secret of liberality, as shown in II Corinthians 8: 5. The members of the Macedonian church “first gave their own selves”; giving was easy after that. Paul’s religion could not be shaken; read his vow as recorded in the eighth chapter of Romans:

“For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

His sufferings developed patience and deepened devotion. They prepared him to appreciate love and to define it as no other mortal has done.

His tribute to love, contained in the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians, is not approached by any other utterance on this subject. (I use the old version with the word charity changed to love.)

“Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing. Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things; Love never faileth: but whether there be prophecies they shall fail; whether there be tongues they shall cease; whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things; For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known. And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love.

I cannot leave the Book of Books without referring to one of the supreme moments that it describes. The Bible is full of pictures; the painter has found it an inexhaustible storehouse of suggestion. All the great climaxes of sacred history speak to us from the canvas. Moses and Pharaoh, Ruth and Naomi, Daniel at the Belshazzar Feast and in the Lions’ Den, Elijah at Mount Carmel and before Ahab, Joseph and his brethren, David and Goliath, Mary and the Child, Jesus, the Prodigal Son, the Sower, the Good Samaritan, the Rich Young Man, the Wise and the Foolish Virgins, Jesus in the Temple, Christ Entering Jerusalem, and in the Garden of Gethsemane, and The Saviour on the Cross – these are but a few of the word pictures that have inspired the artist’s brush.

But there is another picture, unsurpassed in thrilling power and permanent interest, namely, that presented by the trial of Christ – tragedy of tragedies, triumph of triumphs!

Here, face to face, stood Pilate and Christ, the representatives of the two opposing forces that have ever contended for dominion in the world. Pilate was the personification of force; behind him was the Roman government, undisputed ruler of the then known world, supported by its invincible

legions. Before Pilate stood Christ, the embodiment of love – unarmed, alone. And force triumphed; they nailed Him to the cross, and the mob that had assembled to witness His sufferings, mocked and jeered and said: “He is dead.” But from that day the power of Caesar waned and power of Christ increased. In a few centuries the Roman government was gone and its legions forgotten, while the Apostle of Love has become the greatest fact in history and the growing figure of all time.

**Who will estimate the Bible’s value to society? It is our only guide.** It contains milk for the young and nourishing food for every year of life’s journey; it is manna for those who travel in the wilderness; and it provides a staff for those who are weary with age. It satisfies the heart’s longings for a knowledge of God; It gives a meaning to existence and supplies a working plan to each human being.

It holds up before us ideals that are within sight of the weakest and the lowliest, and yet so high that the best and the noblest are kept with their faces turned ever upward. It carries the call of the Saviour to the remotest corners of the earth; on its pages are written the assurance of the present and our hopes for the future.

There are three verses in the first chapter of Genesis which mean more to man than all other books outside the Bible. **First:** the verse, “**In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,**” gives us the only account of the beginning of all things, including life. Many substitutes have been proposed for this verse but none that can be so easily understood, explained and defended.

**Second:** the 24<sup>th</sup> verse gives us the only law governing the continuity of life on earth. If life is to continue, reproduction must be according to law or lawless. ***Reproduction according to kind*** is the basic scientific fact in the world; all the books on science combined do not state as much that is of value to man as this one verse – it is the foundation of family life and of all human calculations. No living thing has ever violated this law; even man with all his power has never been able to persuade or compel that intangible, invisible thing that we call life to cross the line of species.

**Third:** the 26<sup>th</sup> verse – “**Let us make man in our image**” – gives us the only explanation of man’s presence on earth. Without revelation no one has been able to explain the riddle of life. Man comes into the world without his own volition; he has no choice as to the age, nation, race, or family environment into which he shall be born. So far as he is concerned, he comes by chance; he goes he knows not when, and cannot insure himself for a single hour against accident, disease or death; and yet, he is supreme above all other things.

**The 26<sup>th</sup> verse reveals a truth of inestimable value.** When man knows that he is “**the child of a King,**” with the earth for an inheritance – that the Creator, after bringing all other things into existence, made him, not as other things were made, but in the image of God, and placed him here as commander-in-chief of all that is – when he understands that he is part of God’s plan and here for a purpose, he finds himself. To do God’s will becomes his highest duty as well as his greatest pleasure and he learns that obedience links happiness to virtue, success to righteousness, and makes it possible for him to rise to the high plane that a loving Heavenly Father has put within the reach of man.

Where in all the books in all the libraries can one find as much that effects the welfare of man as is condensed into these three verses?

## The Origin of Man

When the mainspring is broken a watch ceases to be useful as a timekeeper. A handsome case may make it still an ornament and the parts may have a market value, but it cannot serve the purpose of a watch. There is that in each human life that corresponds to the mainspring of a watch – that which is absolutely necessary if the life is to be what it should be, a real life and not a mere existence. **That necessary thing is a belief in God.** Religion is defined as the relation between God and man, and Tolstoy has described morality as the outward expression of this inward relationship.

If it be true, as I believe it is, that morality is dependent upon religion, then religion is not only the most practical thing in the world, but the first essential. Without religion, viz., a sense of dependence upon God and reverence for Him, one can play a part in both the physical and the intellectual world, but he cannot live up to the possibilities which God has placed within the reach of each human being.

A belief in God is fundamental; upon it rest the influences that control life.

**First**, the consciousness of God's presence in the life gives one a sense of responsibility to the Creator for every thought and word and deed.

**Second**, prayer rests upon a belief in God; communion with the Creator in the expression of gratitude and in pleas for guidance powerfully influences man.

**Third**, belief in a personal immortality rests upon faith in God; the inward restraint that one finds in a faith that looks forward to a future life with its rewards and punishments, makes outward restraint less necessary. Man is weak enough in hours of temptation, even when he is fortified by the conviction that this life is but a small arc of an infinite circle; his power of resistance is greatly impaired if he accepts the doctrine that conscious existence terminates with death.

**Fourth**, the spirit of brotherhood rests on a belief in God. We trace our relationship to our fellowmen through the Creator, the Common Parent of us all.

**Fifth**, belief in the Bible depends upon a belief in God. Jehovah comes first; His word comes afterward. There can be no inspiration without a Heavenly Father to inspire.

**Sixth**, belief in God is also necessary to a belief in Christ; the Son could not have revealed the Father to man according to any atheistic theory. And so with all other Christian doctrines: they rest upon a belief in God.

If belief in God is necessary to the beliefs enumerated, then it follows logically that anything that weakens belief in God weakens man, and, to the extent that it impairs belief in God, reduces his power to measure up to his opportunities and responsibilities. If there is at work in the world today anything that tends to break this mainspring, it is the duty of the moral, as well as the Christian, world to combat this influence in every possible way.

I believe there is such a menace to fundamental morality. The hypothesis to which the name of **Darwin** has been given – the hypothesis that links man to the lower forms of life and makes him a lineal descendant of the brute – is obscuring God and weakening all the virtues that rest upon the religious tie between God and man. I venture to call attention to the demoralizing influence exerted by this doctrine.

If we accept the Bible as true we have no difficulty in determining the origin of man. In the first chapter of Genesis we read that God, after creating all other things, said, "Let us make man in our

image, after our likeness; and let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.”

The materialist has always rejected the Bible account of Creation and, during the last half century, the **Darwinian doctrine** has been the means of shaking the faith of millions. It is important that man should have a correct understanding of his line of descent. (NOTE: I use the word “**Darwinism**” rather than the word “Evolution”: because Darwin is the only evolutionist who, in applying the doctrine to man, has undertaken to outline a family tree linking man with the animals below him, which has received any considerable support among scientists.)

Huxley calls it the “question of questions” for mankind. He says: “The problem which underlies all others, and is more interesting than any other – is the ascertainment of the place which man occupies in nature and of his relation to the universe of things. Whence our race has come, what are the limits of our power over nature, and of nature’s power over us, to what goal are we tending, are the problems which present themselves anew with undiminished interest to every man born in the world.”

The materialists deny the existence of God and seek to explain man’s presence upon the earth without a creative act. They go back from man to animals, and from one form of life to another until they come to the first germ of life; there they divide into two schools, some believing that the first germ of life came from another planet, others holding that it was the result of spontaneous generation. One school answers the arguments advanced by the other and, as they cannot agree with each other, I am not compelled to agree with either.

If it were necessary to accept one of these theories I would prefer the first; for, if we can chase the germ of life off of this planet and out into space, we can guess the rest of the way and no one can contradict us. But, if we accept the doctrine of spontaneous generation we will have to spend our time explaining why spontaneous generation ceased to act after the first germ of life was created. It is not necessary to pay much attention to any theory that boldly eliminated God; it does not deceive many. The mind revolts at the idea of spontaneous generation; in all the researches of the ages no scientist has found a single instance of life that was not begotten by life. The materialist has nothing but imagination to build upon; he cannot hope for company or encouragement.

But the **Darwinian doctrine** is more dangerous because more deceptive. It *permits* one to believe in a God, but puts the creative act so far away that reverence for the Creator – even belief in Him – is likely to be lost.

Before commenting on the Darwinian hypothesis let me refer you to the language of its author as it applies to man. On page 80 of “**Descent of Man**” (Hurst & Company, Edition 1874), Darwin says: “Our most ancient progenitors in the kingdom of the Vertebrata, at which we are able to obtain an obscure glance, apparently consisted of a group of marine animals, resembling the larvae of the existing Ascidians.” Then he suggests a line of descent leading to the monkey. And he does not even permit us to indulge in a patriotic pride of ancestry; instead of letting us descend from American monkeys, he connects us with the European branch of the monkey family.

It will be noted, first, that he begins the summary with the word “apparently,” which the Standard Dictionary defines: “as judged by appearances, without passing upon its reality.” His second sentence (following the sentence quoted) turns upon the word “probably,” which is defined: “as far as the evidence shows, presumably, likely.” His works are full of words indicating

uncertainty. **The phrase “we may well suppose,” occurs over eight hundred times in his two principal works.** (See *Herald & Presbyter*, November 22, 1914.) The eminent scientist is guessing.

After locating our gorilla and chimpanzee ancestors in Africa, he concludes that **“It is useless to speculate on this subject.”** If the uselessness of speculation had occurred to him at the beginning of his investigation he might have escaped responsibility for shaking the faith of two generations by his guessing on the whole subject of biology.

If we could divide the human race into two distinct groups we might allow evolutionists to worship brutes as ancestors but they insist on connecting all mankind with the jungle. We have a right to protect our family tree.

Having given Darwin’s conclusions as to man’s ancestry, I shall quote him to prove that his hypothesis is not only groundless, but absurd and harmful to society. It is groundless because there is not a single fact in the universe that can be cited to prove that man is descended from the lower animals. Darwin does not use facts; he uses conclusions drawn from similarities. He builds upon presumptions, probabilities and inferences, and asks the acceptance of his hypothesis “notwithstanding the fact that connecting links have not hitherto been discovered” (page 162). He advances an hypothesis which, if true, would find support on every foot of the earth’s surface, but which, as a matter of fact, finds support nowhere. There are myriads of living creatures about us, from insects too small to be seen with the naked eye to the largest mammals, and, yet, not one is in transition from one species to another; every one is perfect. It is strange that slight similarities could make him ignore gigantic differences. The remains of nearly one hundred species of vertebrate life have been found in the rocks, of which more than one-half are found living today, and none of the survivors show material change. The word hypothesis is a synonym used by scientists for the word guess; it is more dignified in sound and more imposing to the sight, but it has the same meaning as the old-fashioned, every-day word, guess. If Darwin had described his doctrine as a guess instead of calling it an hypothesis, it would not have lived a year:

**Dr. Etheridge, Fossilogist of the British Museum,** says: “Nine-tenths of the talk of Evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation and wholly unsupported by facts. This museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of their views.”

**Professor Beale, of King’s College, London,** says: “In support of all naturalistic conjectures concerning man’s origin, there is not at this time a shadow of scientific evidence.”

**Professor Fleischmann, of Erlangen,** says: “The Darwinian theory has in the realms of Nature not a single fact to confirm it. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of the imagination.”

The January issue of **“Science,” 1922,** contains a speech delivered at Toronto last December by **Professor William Bateson of London** before the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He says that science has faith in evolution but doubts as to the origin of species.

Probably nothing impresses Darwin more than the fact that at an early stage the foetus of a child cannot be distinguished from the foetus of an ape, but why should such a similarity in the beginning impress him more than the difference at birth and the immeasurable gulf between the two at forty?

If science cannot detect a difference, *known to exist,* between the foetus of an ape and the foetus of a child, it should not ask us to substitute the inferences, the presumptions and the probabilities of science for the word of God.

Science has rendered invaluable service to society; her achievements are innumerable – and the hypotheses of scientists should be considered with an open mind. Their theories should be carefully examined and their arguments fairly weighed, but the scientist cannot compel acceptance of any argument he advances, except as, judged upon its merits, it is convincing. Man is infinitely more than science; science, as well as the Sabbath, was made for man. It must be remembered, also, that all sciences are not of equal importance. Tolstoy insists that the science of “How to Live” is more important than any other science, and is this not true? It is better to trust in the Rock of Ages, than to know the age of the rocks; it is better for one to know that he is close to the Heavenly Father, than to know how far the stars in the heavens are apart. And is it not just as important that the scientists who deal with matter should respect the scientists who deal with spiritual things, as that the latter should respect the former? If it be true, as Paul declares, that “the things that are seen are temporal” while “the things that are unseen are eternal,” why should those who deal with temporal things think themselves superior to those who deal with the things that are eternal? Why should the Bible, which the centuries have not been able to shake, be discarded for scientific works that have to be revised and corrected every few years? The preference should be given to the Bible.

The two lines of work are parallel. There should be no conflict between the discoverers of *real* truths, because real truths do not conflict. Every truth harmonizes with every other truth, but why should an hypothesis, suggested by a scientist, be accepted as true until its truth is established? Science should be the last to make such a demand because science to be truly science is classified knowledge; it is the explanation of facts. Tested by this definition, **Darwinism is not science at all**; it is guesses strung together. **There is more science in the twenty-fourth verse of the first chapter of Genesis** (And God said, let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping things, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it was so.) **than in all that Darwin wrote.**

It is no light matter to impeach the veracity of the Scriptures in order to accept, not a truth – not even a theory – but a mere hypothesis. **Professor Huxley** says, “There is no fault to be found with Darwin’s method, but it is another thing whether he has fulfilled all the conditions imposed by that method. Is it satisfactorily proved that species may be originated by selection? That none of the phenomena exhibited by the species are inconsistent with the origin of the species in this way? If these questions can be answered in the affirmative, Mr. Darwin’s view steps out of the ranks of hypothesis into that of theories; but so long as the evidence adduced falls short of enforcing that affirmative, so long, to our minds, the new doctrine must be content to remain among the former – an extremely valuable, and in the highest degree probable, doctrine; indeed the only extant hypothesis which is worth anything in a scientific point of view; but still a hypothesis, and not a theory of species.” “After much consideration,” he adds, “and assuredly with no bias against Darwin’s views, it is our clear conviction that, as the evidence now stands, it is not absolutely proven that a group of animals, having all the characters exhibited by species in nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural.”

But **Darwin** is absurd as well as groundless. He announces two laws, which, in his judgments, explain the development of man from the lowest form of animal life, viz., natural selection and sexual selection. The latter has been abandoned by the modern believers in evolution, but two illustrations, taken from **Darwin’s “Descent of Man,”** will show his unreliability as a guide to the young. On page 587 of the 1894 edition, he tries to explain man’s superior mental strength (a proposition more difficult to defend today than in Darwin’s time). His theory is that, “the struggle between the males for the possession of the females” helped to develop the male mind and that this superior strength was transmitted by males to their male offspring.

After having shown, to his own satisfaction, how sexual selection would account for the (supposed) greater strength of the male mind, he turns his attention to another question, namely, how did man become a hairless animal? This he accounts for also by sexual selection – the females preferred the males with the least hair (page 624). In a footnote on page 625 he says that this view has been harshly criticized. “Hardly any view advanced in this work,” he says, “has met with so much disfavor.” A comment and a question: First, Unless the brute females were very different from the females as we know them, they would not have agreed in taste. Some would “probably” have preferred males with less hair, others, “we may well suppose,” would have preferred males with more hair. Those with more hair would naturally be the stronger because better able to resist the weather. But, second, how could the males have strengthened their minds by fighting for the females if, at the same time, the females were breeding the hair off by selecting the males? Or, did the males select for three years and then allow the females to do the selecting during leap year?

But, worse yet, in a later edition published by L.A. Burt Company, a “supplemental note” is added to discuss two letters which he thought supported the idea that sexual selection transformed the hairy animal into the hairless man. Darwin’s correspondent (page 710) reports that a mandril seemed to be proud of a bare spot. Can anything be less scientific than trying to guess what an animal is thinking about? It would seem that this also was a subject about which it was “useless to speculate.”

While on this subject it may be worth while to call your attention to other fantastic imaginings of which those are guilty who reject the Bible and enter the field of speculation – fiction surpassing anything to be found in the Arabian Nights. If one accepts the Scriptural account of the creation, he can credit God with the working of miracles and with the doing of many things that man cannot understand. The evolutionist, however, having substituted what he imagines to be a universal law for separate acts of creation must explain everything. The evolutionist, not to go back farther than life just now, begins with one or a few invisible germs of life on the planet and imagines that these invisible germs have, by the operation of what they call “resident forces,” unaided from without, developed into all that we see today. They cannot in a lifetime explain the things that have to be explained, if their hypothesis is accepted – a useless waste of time even if explanation were possible.

Take the eye, for instance; believing in the Mosaic account, I believe that God made the eyes when He made man – not only made the eyes but carved out the caverns in the skull in which they hang. It is easy for the believer in the Bible to explain the eyes, because he believes in a God who can do all things and, according to the Bible, did create man as a part of a Divine plan.

But how does the evolutionist explain the eye when he leaves God out? Here is the only guess that I have seen – if you find any others I shall be glad to know of them, as I am collecting the guesses of the evolutionists. **The evolutionist guesses** that there was a time when eyes were unknown – that is a necessary part of the hypothesis. And since the eye is a universal possession among living things the evolutionist guesses that it came into being – not by design or by act of God – but just happened, and how did it happen? I will give you the guess – a piece of pigment, or, as some say, a freckle appeared upon the skin of an animal that had no eyes. This piece of pigment or freckle converged the rays of the sun upon that spot and when the little animal felt the heat on that spot it turned the spot to the sun to get more heat. The increased heat irritated the skin – so the evolutionists guess, and a nerve came there and out of the nerve came the eye! Can you beat it? But this only accounts for one eye; there must have been another piece of pigment or freckle soon afterward and just in the right place in order to give the animal two eyes.

And, according to the evolutionist, there was a time when animals had no legs, and so the leg came by accident. How? Well, the guess is that a little animal without legs was wiggling along on its belly one



day when it discovered a wart – it just happened so – and it was in the right place to be used to aid it in locomotion; so, it came to depend upon the wart, and use finally developed it into a leg. And then another wart and another leg, at the proper time – by accident – and accidentally in the proper place. Is it not astonishing that any person intelligent enough to teach school would talk such tommyrot to students and look serious while doing so?

And yet I read only a few weeks ago, on page 128 of a little book recently issued by a prominent New York minister, the following:

“Man has grown up in this universe gradually developing his powers and functions as responses to his environment. If he has *eyes*, so the *biologists* assure us, it is because *light waves played upon the skin* and eyes came out in answer; if he has *ears* it is because the *air waves* were there first and the ears came out to hear. Man never yet, *according to the evolutionist*, has developed any power save as a reality called it into being. There would be no fins if there were no water, no wings if there were no air, no legs if there were no land.”

You see I only called your attention to forty per cent of the absurdities; he speaks of eyes, ears, fins, wings and legs – five. I only called attention to eyes and legs – two. The evolutionist guesses himself away from God, but he only makes matters worse. How long did the “light waves” have to play on the skin before the eyes came out? The evolutionist is very deliberate; he is long on time. He would certainly give the eye thousands of years, if not millions, in which to develop; but how could he be sure that the light waves played all the time in one place or played in the same place generation after generation until the development was complete? And why did the light waves quit playing when two eyes were perfected? Why did they not keep on playing until there were eyes all over the body? Why do they not play today, so that we may see eyes in process of development? And if the light waves created the eyes, why did they not create them strong enough to bear the light? Why did the light waves make eyes and then make eyelids to keep the light out of the eyes?

And so with the ears. They must have gone *in* “to hear” instead of *out*, and wasn’t it lucky that they happened to go in on opposite sides of the head instead of cater-cornered or at random? Is it not easier to believe in a God who can make the eye, the ear, the fin, the wing, and the leg, as well as the light, the sound, the air, the water and the land?

There is such an abundance of ludicrous material that it is hard to resist the temptation to continue illustrations indefinitely, but a few more will be sufficient. In order that you may be prepared to ridicule these pseudo-scientists who come to you with guesses instead of facts, let me give you three recent bits of evolutionary lore.

Last November I was passing through Philadelphia and read in an afternoon paper a report of an address delivered in that city by a college professor employed in extension work. Here is an extract from the paper’s account of the speech: “Evidence that early men climbed trees with their feet lies in the way we wear the heels of our shoes – more at the outside. A baby can wiggle its big toe without wiggling its other toes – an indication that it once used its big toe in climbing trees.” What a consolation it must be to mothers to know that the baby is not to be blamed for wiggling the big toe without wiggling the other toes. It cannot help it, poor little thing; it is an inheritance from “the tree man,” so the evolutionists tell us.

And here is another extract: “We often dream of falling. Those who fell out of the trees some fifty thousand years ago and were killed, of course, had no descendants. So those who fell and were *not* hurt, of course, lived, and so we are never hurt in our dreams of falling.” Of course, if we were actually descended from the inhabitants of trees, it would seem quite likely that we descended from those that

were *not* killed in falling. But they must have been badly frightened if the impression made upon their feeble minds could have lasted for fifty thousand years and still be vivid enough to scare us.

If the Bible said anything so idiotic as these guessers put forth in the name of science, scientists would have a great time ridiculing the sacred pages, but men who scoff at the recorded interpretation of dreams by Joseph and Daniel seem to be able to swallow the amusing interpretations offered by the Pennsylvania professor.

A few months ago the *Sunday School Times* quoted a professor in an Illinois University as saying that the great day in history was the day when a water puppy crawled up on the land and, deciding to be a land animal, became man's progenitor. If these scientific speculators can agree upon the day they will probably insist on our abandoning **Washington's birthday, the Fourth of July, and even Christmas**, in order to join with the whole world in celebrating "Water Puppy Day."

Within the last few weeks the papers published a dispatch from Paris to the effect that an "eminent scientist" announced that he had communicated with the spirit of a dog and learned from the dog that it was happy. Must we believe this, too?

But is the law of "**natural selection**" a sufficient explanation, or a more satisfactory explanation, than sexual selection? It is based on the theory that where there is an advantage in any characteristic, animals that possess this characteristic survive and propagate their kind. This, according to Darwin's argument, leads to progress through the "survival of the fittest." This law or principle (natural selection), so carefully worked out by Darwin, is being given less and less weight by scientists. Darwin himself admits that he "perhaps attributed too much to the action of natural selection and the survival of the fittest" (page 76). **John Burroughs, the naturalist**, rejects it in a recent magazine article. The followers of Darwin are trying to retain evolution while rejecting the arguments that led Darwin to accept it as an explanation of the varied life on the planet. Some evolutionists reject Darwin's line of descent and believe that man, instead of coming from the ape, branched off from a common ancestor farther back, but "cousin" ape is as objectionable as "grandpa" ape.

While "**survival of the fittest**" may seem plausible when applied to individuals of the same species, it affords no explanation whatever, of the almost infinite number of creatures that have come under man's observation. To believe that natural selection, sexual selection or any other kind of selection can account for the countless differences we see about us requires more faith in **chance** than a Christian is required to have in God.

Is it conceivable that the hawk and the humming-bird, the spider and the honey bee, the turkey gobbler and the mocking-bird, the butterfly and the eagle, the ostrich and the wren, the tree toad and the elephant, the giraffe and the kangaroo, the wolf and the lamb should all be the descendants of a common ancestor? Yet these and all other creatures must be blood relatives if man is next of kin to the monkey.

If the evolutionists are correct; if it is true that all that we see is the result of development from one or a few invisible germs of life, then, in plants as well as in animals there must be a line of descent connecting all the trees and vegetables and flowers with a common ancestry. Does it not strain the imagination to the breaking point to believe that the oak, the cedar, the pine and the palm are all the progeny of one ancient seed and that this seed was also the ancestor of wheat and corn, potato and tomato, onion and sugar beet, rose and violet, orchid and daisy, mountain flower and magnolia? Is it not more rational to believe in *God* and explain the varieties of life in terms of Divine power than to waste our lives in ridiculous attempts to explain the unexplainable? There is no mortification in admitting that there are insoluble mysteries; but it is shameful to spend the time that God has given for

nobler use in vain attempts to exclude God from His own universe and to find in chance a substitute for God's power and wisdom and love.

While evolution in plant life and in animal life *up to the highest form of animal* might, if there were proof of it, be admitted without raising a presumption that would compel us to give a brute origin to man, why should we admit a thing of which there is no proof? Why should we encourage the guesses of these speculators and thus weaken our power to protest when they attempt the leap from the monkey to man? Let the evolutionist furnish his proof.

Although our chief concern is in protecting man from the demoralization involved in accepting a brute ancestry, it is better to put the advocates of evolution upon the defensive and challenge them to produce proof in support of their hypothesis in plant life and in the animal world. They will be kept so busy trying to find support for their hypothesis in the kingdoms below man that they will have little time left to combat the Word of God in respect to man's origin. **Evolution joins issue with the Mosaic account of creation. God's law, as stated in Genesis, is *reproduction according to kind***; evolution implies reproduction *not* according to kind. While the process of change implied in evolution is covered up in endless eons of time it is *change* nevertheless. The Bible does not say that reproduction shall be *nearly* according to kind or *seemingly* according to kind. The statement is positive that it is *according to kind*, and that does not leave any room for the *changes* however gradual or imperceptible that are necessary to support the evolutionary hypothesis.

We see about us everywhere and always proof of the Bible law, viz., reproduction according to kind; **we find nothing in the universe to support Darwin's doctrine of reproduction other than of kind.**

If you question the possibility of such changes as the Darwinian doctrine supposes you are reminded that the scientific speculators have raised the time limit. "If ten million years are not sufficient, take twenty," they say: "If fifty million years are not enough take one or two hundred millions." That accuracy is not essential in such guessing may be inferred from the fact that the estimates of time that has elapsed since life began on the earth, vary from less than twenty-five million years to more than three hundred million. Darwin estimated this period at two hundred million years while Darwin's son estimated it at fifty-seven million.

It requires more than millions of years to account for the varieties of life that inhabit the earth; it requires a Creator, unlimited in power, unlimited intelligence, and unlimited love.

But the doctrine of evolution is sometimes carried farther than that. A short while ago Canon Barnes, of Westminster Abbey, startled his congregation by an interpretation of evolution that ran like this: "It now seems highly probable (probability again) that from some fundamental stuff in the universe the electrons arose. From them came matter. From matter, life emerged. From life came mind. From mind, spiritual consciousness was developing. There was a time when matter, life and mind, and the soul of man were not, but now they are. Each has arisen as a part of the vast scheme planned by God." (An American professor in a Christian college has recently expressed himself along substantially the same lines.)

But what has God been doing since the "stuff" began to develop? The verbs used by Canon Barnes indicate an internal development unaided from above. "Arose, came, emerged, etc.," all exclude the idea that God is within reach or call in man's extremity.

When I was a boy in college the materialists began with matter separated into infinitely small particles and every particle separated from every other particle by distance infinitely great. But now they say that it takes 1,740 electrons to make an atom of infinite fineness. God, they insist, has not had

anything to do with this universe since 1,740 electrons formed a chorus and sang, “We’ll be an atom by and by.”

It requires measureless credulity to enable one to believe that all that we see about us came by chance, by a series of happy-go-lucky accidents. If only an infinite God could have formed hydrogen and oxygen and united them in just the right proportions to produce water – the daily need of every living thing – scattered among the flowers all the colours of the rainbow and every variety of perfume, adjusted the mocking-bird’s throat to its musical scale, and fashioned a soul for man, why should we want to imprison such a God in an impenetrable past. This is a living world; why not a *living* God upon the throne? Why not allow Him to work *now*?

Darwin is so sure that his theory is correct that he is ready to accuse the Creator of trying to deceive man if the theory is not sound. On page 41 he says: “To take any other view is to admit that our structure and that of all animals about us, is a mere snare to entrap our judgment;” as if the Almighty were in duty bound to make each species so separate from every other that *no one* could possibly be confused by resemblances. There would seem to be differences enough. To put man in a class with the chimpanzee because of any resemblances that may be found is so unreasonable that the masses have never accepted it.

If we see houses of different size, from one room to one hundred, we do not say that the large houses grew out of the small ones, but that the architect that could plan one could plan all.

But a groundless hypothesis – even an absurd one – would be unworthy of notice if it did no harm. This hypothesis, however, does incalculable harm. It teaches that Christianity impairs the race physically. That was the first implication at which I revolted. It led me to review the doctrine and reject it entirely. If hatred is the law of man’s development; that is, if man has reached his present perfection by a cruel law under which the strong kill off the weak – then, if there is any logic that can bind the human mind, we must turn backward toward the brute if we dare to substitute the law of love for the law of hate. That is the conclusion that I reached and it is the conclusion that Darwin himself reached. On pages 148-50 he says: “With savages the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilized men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the progress of elimination. We build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed and the sick; we institute poor laws; our medical experts exert their utmost skill to save the lives of every one to the last moment. There is reason to believe that vaccination has preserved thousands who from weak constitutions would have succumbed to smallpox. Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one who had attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man.”

This confession deserves analysis. First, he commends, by implication, the savage method of eliminating the weak, while, by implication, he condemns “civilized men” for prolonging the life of the weak. He even blames vaccination because it has preserved thousands who might otherwise have succumbed (for the benefit of the race?). Can you imagine anything more brutal? And then note the low level of the argument. “No one who has attended the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man.” All on a brute basis.

His hypothesis breaks down here. The minds which, according to Darwin, are developed by natural selection and sexual selection, use their power to suspend the law by which they have reached their high positions. Medicine is one of the greatest of the sciences and its chief object is to save life and strengthen the weak. That, Darwin complains, interferes with “**the survival of the fittest.**” If he complains of vaccination, what would he say of the more recent discovery of remedies for typhoid fever,

yellow fever and the black plague? And what would he think of saving weak babies by pasteurizing milk and of the efforts to find a specific for tuberculosis and cancer? Can such a barbarous doctrine be sound?

But **Darwin's doctrine is even more destructive**. His heart rebels against the "hard reason" upon which his heartless hypothesis is built. He says: "The aid which we feel impelled to give to the helpless is mainly the result of the instinct of sympathy, which was originally acquired as a part of the social instincts, but subsequently rendered in the manner indicated, more tender and more widely diffused. Nor could we check our sympathy even at the urging of hard reason, without deterioration in the noblest part of our nature. The surgeon may harden himself while performing an operation, for he knows he is acting for the good of his patient; but if we were to intentionally neglect the weak and the helpless, it could be only for a contingent benefit, with overwhelming present evil. We must therefore bear the undoubted bad effects of the weak surviving and propagating their kind."

The moral nature which, according to Darwin, is also developed by natural selection and sexual selection, repudiates the brutal law to which, if his reasoning is correct, it owes its origin. Can that doctrine be accepted as scientific when its author admits that we cannot apply it "without deterioration in the noblest part of our nature"? **On the contrary, civilization is measured by the moral revolt against the cruel doctrine developed by Darwin...**

**George John Romanes**, during his college days, came under the influence of those who worshipped the reason and this worship led him out into a starless night. Have we not a right to demand something more than *guesses, surmises, and hypotheses* before we exchanged the "hallowed glory" of the Christian creed for "the lonely mystery of existence" as Romanes found it? Shall we at the behest of those who put the intellect above the heart endorse an unproved doctrine of descent and share responsibility for the wreckage of all that is spiritual in the lives of our young people? I refuse to have any part in such responsibility. For nearly twenty years I have gone from college to college and talked to students. Wherever I could do so I have pointed out the demoralizing influence of Darwinism. I have received thanks from many students who were perplexed by the materialistic teachings of their instructors and I have been encouraged by the approval of parents who were distressed by the visible effects of these teachings on their children.

As many believers in Darwinism are led to reject the Bible let me, by way of recapitulation, contrast that doctrine with the Bible:

**Darwinism** deals with nothing but life; the Bible deals with the entire universe – with its masses of inanimate matter and with its myriads of living things, all obedient to the will of the great Law Giver.

**Darwin** concerns himself with only that part of man's existence which is spent on earth – while the Bible's teachings cover all of life, both here and hereafter.

**Darwin** begins by assuming life upon the earth; the Bible reveals the source of life and chronicles its creation.

**Darwinism** ends in self-destruction. As heretofore shown, its progress is suspended, and even defeated, by the very genius which it is supposed to develop; the Bible invites us to enter fields of inexhaustible opportunity wherein each achievement can be made a stepping-stone to greater achievements still.

**Darwin's doctrine** is so brutal that it shocks the moral sense – the heart recoils from it and refuses to apply the "hard reason" upon which it rests; the Bible points us to the path that grows brighter with the years.

**Darwin's doctrine** leads logically to war and to the worship of Nietzsche's "Superman"; the Bible tells us of the Prince of Peace and heralds the coming of the glad day when swords shall be beaten into plough-shares and when nations shall learn war no more.

**Darwin's teachings** drag industry down to the brute level and excite a savage struggle for selfish advantage; the Bible presents the claims of an universal brotherhood in which men will unite their efforts in the spirit of friendship.

As hope deferred maketh the heart sick, so the doctrine of Darwin benumbs altruistic effort by prolonging indefinitely the time needed for reforms; the Bible assures us of the triumph of every righteous cause, reveals to the eye of faith the invisible hosts that fight on the side of Jehovah and proclaims the swift fulfillment of God's decrees.

**Darwinism** puts God far away; the Bible brings God near and establishes the prayer-line of communication between the Heavenly Father and His children.

**Darwinism** enthrones selfishness; the Bible crowns love as the greatest force in the world.

**Darwinism** offers no reason for existence and presents no philosophy of life; the Bible explains why man is here and gives us a code of morals that fits into every human need.

The great need of the world today is to get back to God – back to a real belief in a living God – to a belief in God as Creator, Preserver and loving Heavenly Father. When one believes in a personal God and considers himself a part of God's plan he will be anxious to know God's will and to do it, seeking direction through prayer and made obedient through faith.

**Man was made in the Father's image**; he enters upon the stage, the climax of Jehovah's plan. He is superior to the beasts of the field, greater than any other created thing – but a little lower than the angels. God made him for a purpose, placed before him infinite possibilities and revealed to him responsibilities commensurate with the possibilities. God beckons man upward and the Bible points the way; man can obey and travel toward perfection by the path that Christ revealed, or man can disobey and fall to a level lower, in some respects, than that of the brutes about him. Looking heavenward man can find inspiration in his lineage; looking about him he is impelled to kindness by a sense of kinship which binds him to his brothers. Mighty problems demand his attention; a world's destiny is to be determined by him. What time has he to waste in hunting for "missing links" or in searching for resemblances between his forefathers and the ape? **In His Image – in this sign we conquer.**

We are not progeny of the brute; we have not been forced upward by a blind pushing-power; neither have we tumbled upward by chance. It is a drawing-power – not a pushing-power – that rules the world – a power which finds its **highest expression in Christ who promised:** "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."<sup>7</sup>

And let it be so...

---

Certain 21<sup>st</sup> century teachers and professors of science claim that "Science and Creationism are incompatible," and that, "the Bible is obsolete." Scientific principles today, however, are understood largely due to the discoveries of **Sir Isaac Newton** – the world's greatest scientist, who himself concluded that "*A Supernatural Being, "a Creator, "a Very First Cause,*" fashioned and maintains the System of the World, without whose "*Divine Arm to impress it,*" the Universe could not function."<sup>8</sup>

**Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727)** was a genius in the realm of Science. His discoveries of the *System of the Universe*; *the Law of Gravity*; *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*; *a New Calculus*; *the Parabolic Curve*; *Optics – A Treatise of Light*; and *the Reflecting Telescope*, among many others, revolutionized the world. His genius extended to an understanding of the force exercised by the sun and the moon, causing *Tides*. Elected to the *Royal Society of London* and *l’Academie des Sciences de Paris*, his brilliant analytical discoveries were made before the age of twenty-three.<sup>9</sup>

Newton’s response to the **Reverend Dr. Richard Bentley’s** request that he provide evidence of a Deity having created the universe, is that, “the growth of new Systems (of the world) out of old ones, without the mediation of *Divine Power*, seems to me apparently absurd.” The discoverer of the *Law of Gravity* continues his argument by asserting, “that gravity should be innate, inherent and essential to matter, so that one body may act upon another at a distance thro’ a vacuum without the mediation of anything else, by and through which their action and force may be conveyed from one to another, is to me so great an absurdity, that I believe no man who has in philosophical matters a competent faculty of thinking, can ever fall into it. Gravity must be caused by *an Agent* acting constantly, according to certain Laws.” And that, “I would now add, that the hypothesis of matter’s being at first evenly spread through the heavens, is, in my opinion, inconsistent with the hypothesis of innate gravity, without a *Supernatural Power* to reconcile them, and therefore it infers *a Deity*. For it there be innate gravity, it is impossible now for the matter of the Earth and all the planets and stars to fly up from them, and become evenly spread throughout the heavens, without *a Supernatural Power*, and certainly that which can never be hereafter without a Supernatural Power, could never be heretofore without the same Power.” (Cambridge, 1692-93).<sup>10</sup>

Newton’s amazing discoveries led him to conclude that there was “*a very First Cause*,” “*a Supernatural Power*,” “*a Creator*,” “*a Being Incorporeal, Living, Intelligent, Omnipresent*” who created the Universe, men and women; as well as animals in their species, maintaining his creation by “*Divine Power*.” “Whence is it,” he asks, “that nature does nothing in vain, and whence arises all that order and beauty, which we see in the world? Was the eye contrived without skill in Optics, and the ear without knowledge of sounds?...and whence is the instinct in animals?” “The diurnal rotations of the planets could not be derived from gravity, but required a Divine Arm to impress them,” he asserts. His *Observations on the Apocalypse of St. John* the Evangelist in relation to Daniel’s prophecies of the Messiah, and the End Times are insightful and profound. A scholar of the Bible, the last ten years of Newton’s life were spent studying the Scriptures. His *Theological Notebook* discloses an adherence to, and acknowledgment of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. A true Scientist, Isaac Newton proved that Science and the Bible are totally compatible.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Legislation signed on *April 23, 2018* by Governor Pete Ricketts of Nebraska.

<sup>2</sup> Official wording. Office of the Architect of the Capitol, Washington, D.C.

<sup>3</sup> Official Documentation. Office of the Architect of the Capitol. Washington, D.C.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.           <sup>5</sup> Ibid.           <sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Bryan, William Jennings. *In His Image*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1922.

<sup>8</sup> Millard, Catherine, D. Min. *Sir Isaac Newton’s Proof of Creationism*. Virginia: CHM, © 2015.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.           <sup>10</sup> Ibid.           <sup>11</sup> Ibid.

---