

The Bible
—*and*—
Its Enemies

By
WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

The Bible and Its Enemies

An Address delivered at the
Moody Bible Institute of Chicago

By

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

THIRD EDITION

Price 25 cents

COLLEGE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Chicago

THE BIBLE INSTITUTE COLPORTAGE ASS'N

826 North La Salle Street

5540
B91
1921
OMN

Copyright, 1921, by
THE BIBLE INSTITUTE COLPORTAGE
ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO

The Bible and Its Enemies

INTRODUCTORY

I ESTEEM it a privilege, as it is a pleasure, to appear before an audience assembled under the auspices of the Moody Bible Institute. Mr. Moody was one of the greatest preachers whom it has been my privilege to hear. I heard him when I was a young man in college and I heard him afterwards. I never lost an opportunity to hear him. I have often referred to him as an illustration of how God can infuse into man spiritual power. I have had him in mind as I have pointed out that it is only when you have the measure of a man's spiritual power that you have the measure of the man.

Measure a man in units of horsepower and he is not as strong as some of the animals; measure him in units of intellectual power and you will soon reach his limitations; but measure a man in units of spiritual power and there is no way of telling what a human being can do. Mr. Moody gave us one of

the greatest exemplifications of what a man can do when he loves God with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his mind and with all his strength, and loves his neighbor as himself.

The very fact that Mr. Moody's name is attached to this institution is in itself an inspiration, for it turns our thoughts to him. In him we find what one man can do, and we know that it was not a personal thing with him, but that God worked through him. He can work through any one who will yield himself up and be willing to be used.

I have taken the spring as the best illustration of the Christian life. The stagnant pool receives contributions from all the sloping ground around and gives forth nothing in return. The pool not only becomes the center of disease and death, but it is the most repulsive thing in the world, except a life that is built upon that plan.

A spring, on the other hand, is the most inspiring thing in the world, except a life that is like a spring. A spring just pours forth that which is refreshing and invigorating.

There is a very simple difference between a spring and a pool. A *spring is a spring because it is connected with a source that is higher than itself*, and the measure of the

power that forces the water out is the height of the reservoir above the spring. The quantity that may come from a spring is measured by the quantity in the reservoir above, and the size of the opening.

I have described Christ's mission—not its purpose, but one of its *results*—by saying that Christ takes human beings and brings them into such vital, living contact with the heavenly Father that the individual becomes the means through which the goodness of God pours out to the world. He can take the frailest of human beings and make them infinite in their usefulness, conduits through which He bestows blessings upon mankind. I regard Mr. Moody as a conduit through which the love of God poured out to a world in inexhaustible quantities. There was no selfishness in him to retard the flow of God's love through him.

This morning I shall talk to you on "The Bible and Its Enemies," first expressing my gratitude to Doctor Gray for giving me this opportunity. I am so much interested in this work that I do not need any thanks. On the contrary, I thank people if they are patient enough to listen to me while I call attention to what I regard as a real menace, not only to the church, but to civilization as well.

I make a great many speeches on many different subjects, but there is a sameness about them all. I try to use different illustrations, and possibly if one has not analyzed them he might think they were quite unlike. I have used this illustration: Every part of the rim of a wheel is supported by a spoke that leads down to the hub; the wheel would be nothing but for the hub. So with my speeches: though they have touched the circumference of the wheel at many points, there has always been a spoke leading down to the hub, and that hub is the creed of Christ. Whether I speak on politics, on social questions, or on religion I find the foundation of my speech in the philosophy of Him who spake as never man spake—a philosophy that fits into every human need and furnishes the solution for every problem that can vex a human heart or perplex the world.

OUR BIBLE

Of course, we get all we know of Christ out of this Bible, and therefore I take as my subject this morning "The Bible and Its Enemies." In this Institute I need not dwell long upon the Bible, and yet I venture to give you an argument in favor of this Bible that

occurred to me on the train one day. Opening my Bible I read a very familiar passage, and it suggested an argument that had not occurred to me before. It was the passage which describes Elijah's prayer test. You remember that he challenged the prophets of Baal to call down fire from their god, and he was willing to risk all on that—the God who answered with fire would be worshipped as the true God.

It suggested to me that we who believe in the Bible might well put to the test those who reject it. The Bible is either the Word of God or it is the work of man. Nobody can reject it except on the theory that it is the work of man. Let us ask those who believe that the Bible is the work of man to put their theory to the test. *If it is the work of man, then man can make today as good a book as the Bible, unless man has degenerated.* I will make it stronger than that. If this book is the work of man, man ought to be able to make a *better* book today than the Bible; for if this is so, it is the work of a few men and they were of a single race: they lived in a little district, not larger than a county, on the hills of Palestine. They had no great libraries to consult, no universities to attend, no swift ships to carry them to distant centers of civilization, no telegraph

wires to bring the news from every corner of the earth. Very limited means of information they had when they made this Bible (if it is a man-made book), and yet they dealt with every problem that confronts mankind, from the creation of a world to life beyond the grave. They gave us a diagram of life and set up warning signs at every dangerous point.

This Bible has come down to us throughout the centuries, and what do we find? We find that along every line except the one of which the Bible treats there has been marvelous progress. Take the mastery of the human mind over the forces of nature. Will you suggest a ratio that will describe the advance of the present day over the days when the Bible was written? It has been a long while since the flapping sail whispered its secret of strength to man; since that time man has been using this same idea—the value of the wind as a motive power. We use it to turn the wheel at the well, and now we have taken possession of the air—our ships vie with the birds.

Throughout the ages water came tumbling down the mountainside, useless in its fall to man, but we finally found that its fretting and foaming was just its way of trying to tell us how anxious it was to serve

mankind. Then we found a machine that would turn the weight of falling water into an energizing force. Now when we see a waterfall we measure it in units of horsepower.

The lightning flashed through the skies, an object of terror until some one was bold enough to reach up and bring it down: now we imprison it in a tiny wire and use it to light our homes and draw our traffic across the land. Man has taken possession of the hidden forces of nature and made them to do his will.

But the line of which the Bible treats is the one line along which we have made no progress. That is *the Science of How to Live*. We go back to the Old Testament for the foundation of our statute laws, and we find in the Sermon on the Mount the rules that govern our spiritual development.

We believe that this Bible was by inspiration given. Let those who say this Book is not of divine origin put their theory to the test. Let them gather their best, not from a single race or section, but from every race and clime. Let them take these selected few and give them the advantage of all the libraries and all the colleges, and then let them give the world a book to take the place of this Bible of ours. If they cannot do it,

they must admit either that our Book comes from a source higher than man, or that nineteen centuries of civilization have so dragged us down that man cannot be expected to do today what man could do then.

Will they accept this challenge? No; they will take the Bible and look through it to find some words or phrases or sentences that they can construe as contradicting some words or phrases or sentences somewhere else.

We give this Bible to all as a book good always and everywhere—a light to our feet when we are young—a guide to our path during mature years, and when we come to die, it is the only book one cares to have beside him. No matter what books have interested us in the full flush of life—fiction, poetry, history, science, no matter what—when the darkness comes and the clouds gather, then if our own eyes have grown too dim to read, we pray that there may be some loved one near to bring to us consolations from the Book of Books.

"The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake. Yea, 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." This comes to us from the Old Testament, and from the New Testament: "I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am, there ye may be also."

This is the Bible that the Christian world believes in. This is the Bible that for nineteen hundred years has been increasingly the basis of thought and of progress. I must now speak to you of the enemies of this Bible.

THE AGNOSTIC

In the first place, there is the Agnostic—the one who says that he *does not know whether there is a God or not*. It is hard to be patient with a full grown man who can not form an opinion on this subject. It is hard to believe that a man who can form opinions on such small evidence on everything else cannot reach a conclusion on this subject with evidence so overwhelming. And yet there are some who say that they do not know. If they find a broken bowl in an Indian mound they will estimate the civilization of the tribe that made it, but they are blind to the evidences of design written on all the handiwork of the Creator.

If it is hard for any one to believe in a God, it is still harder to explain the universe, nature and man with God left out.

When a young man, I wrote to Colonel Ingersoll and asked him for his views on God and immortality. He was the leading infidel of his time, and traveled over this country shaking the faith of Christians as far as he could. I received a letter from his secretary saying that Colonel Ingersoll was not at home, but enclosing an extract from a speech of Ingersoll's that gave his views. This is what I read: "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; I simply say, I do not know." And from that day to this I have asked myself the question—and have never been able to answer it to my own satisfaction—how could anyone find pleasure in taking from a human heart a living faith and putting in its place the cold and cheerless doctrine "I do not know"!

Such a man cannot tell you much. A man must have knowledge before he can impart it, and he must believe before he can advise you what to believe.

Some who call themselves agnostics are really atheists; it is easier to plead ignorance than to defend atheism.

THE ATHEIST

Next, the Atheist. I have met only two in all my life, and I have been meeting people for a long while: two atheists constitute the whole number that I have *met*. I had a letter from one. He said, "I am an atheist, but I think that to be happy one must believe in God." Do you call that a laughable thing? If you want to know how serious it is, read the words of George Romanes, who went to college a believer in the Bible and in God and in Christ and who was led so far away from his belief by Evolution that he wrote a book in which he combated the idea that there is a God. Let me read you what he wrote in that book: it is most pathetic.

When he had reasoned himself into an atheistic position he stated his disbelief in God, and then says: "I am not ashamed to confess that with this *virtual negation of God* the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness, and that from henceforth the warning to 'work while it is day' will gain an intensified force from the terribly intensified meaning of the words that the 'night comes when no man can work.' Yet when I think—as at times I must—of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of the creed that once was mine and the lonely

mystery of existence as I now find it, I feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible!"

He went out into a starless night. While he felt that he must, in obedience to his exaggerated confidence in his reason, deny the existence of God, he was not ashamed to confess the appalling contrast between the glory of the creed that once was his and the lonely mystery of existence as he found it.

I have met some who have been atheists and have been brought back to God. The bright spots of my life are the days in which I learned that I had been a help in bringing men back to God. I traveled from Washington to Kansas City some years ago to speak at a missionary conference. A few weeks afterwards I received a letter from a lawyer who said that he went to that conference an atheist, had been converted, and had since his conversion brought seventy into the church.

In Florida a man and his wife were in a meeting; the wife called soon afterward to tell my wife that her husband had been an atheist, that he became interested in what I said and in the night woke her up to say that he had been converted, declaring that he had been wrong all his life. There is more happiness in bringing souls back to God than in presidential nominations.

THE "HIGHER CRITIC"

I am not worried, however, about the man who declares that he is an atheist. He is like one who blows out the light. I know what he has done and I can light it again and express my opinion of the person who blew it out. But suppose he comes up and says, "I beg your pardon: I am afraid that light is so near you that it will hurt your eyes." He then moves it back, and back, until finally I do not see the light at all. That is the man I am afraid of.

The Higher Critic moves the light away, a little at a time, and finally takes it out of sight. There are some honest friends of the Bible who count themselves Higher Critics. These are trying to make the Bible suit the men who are criticizing it. But a head is worth little except to find reasons for doing what the heart wants to do. "Out of the heart are the issues of life." The mind can find an excuse for doing anything that a wicked heart wants to do. The Higher Critics who are trying to please such men are attempting the impossible task of suiting the Bible to a skeptical brain. The brain that is controlled by a heart that has love and faith in it does not need to be converted to the Bible—and no other kind can be converted to

it. If I understand the average Higher Critic, he is an egotist who thinks himself above the Bible and looks down upon it. He puts the Bible upon an operating table and cuts out what he regards as the diseased parts. When he gets through, the Bible is no longer the Book of Books; it is just a "scrap of paper."

The Higher Critic does not think of the survival of the Bible—it is a successful surgical operation if it takes out everything that he does not believe in. He does not act like a physician who is trying to understand anatomy in order to apply healing remedies; he is rather like the assassin who examines the body to find the place where a blow will be fatal.

You know of cases where this Higher Criticism has kept men out of the ministry, and it also leaves in the ministry men who ought to get out. The men who are tinctured with Higher Criticism ought to get into contact with nature and nature's God; they might come back after a while and do some good. Paul Kanamori, "the Japanese Billy Sunday," was so misled by Higher Criticism that he gave up preaching for twenty years. In the five years since he repudiated Higher Criticism he has brought 48,000 souls to Christ. In southern Ohio within three months one of these men told

his Sunday-school class that Christ was a bastard. He is not preaching in that church any more. He had to go to some other place where he can believe that, but he will probably be discreet enough there not to tell anybody.

But while few men are brazen enough to call Christ a bastard, that is exactly the belief of most of the Higher Critics, many of whom teach in our colleges. I read a book recently written by a professor in a Methodist college; when he came to miracles, his position was that our belief in a miracle should depend upon whether (in our judgment) there was reason sufficient to justify the performance of a miracle. As the resurrection was needed to establish Christ's authority, he thought it was worth while to perform that miracle, but he did not think there was a sufficient reason for the virgin birth, and so he rejected it. Think of such teaching in a Christian college! Most of them say they do not believe in the virgin birth, and yet the virgin birth is no more mysterious than our own—it is simply different. A God who could create by one method could create by the other also. They go through the Bible and reject everything they do not think reasonable. If we have to have a bible that seems reasonable to *every* man

who reads it, we must have a good many different kinds of bibles to fit the different reasonings of different people—and of the same people at different times. It must at last be brought down to the mind that can least comprehend the Infinite.

The Higher Critic usually feels little interest in revivals—he calls them “religious spasms.” He recognizes that a man can have a spasm of anger and become a murderer, a spasm of passion and ruin a life, a spasm of dishonesty and rob a bank, or a spasm of appetite and die of delirium tremens, but cannot understand how one overwhelmed by a conviction of sin and the need of a Saviour can be born again. The prodigal son went away deliberately, but a spasm of repentance brought him back to his father’s house.

One does not have to understand God to believe that there is a God. It is not necessary to understand the sun or the lightning in order to believe that there is a sun, and that there is such a thing as lightning. We must deal with the facts of nature. The fact that a man cannot understand the mysteries of nature is no proof that those things are not true. The miracles of the Bible are no more difficult to understand than the mysteries of nature—the fact that there is a God explains both.

THE EVOLUTIONIST

The Higher Critic is a close ally of another enemy of the Bible, which is the worst one of all. The greatest enemy of the Bible is the *numerous* enemy, and the numerous enemy today is the believer in the Darwinian hypothesis that man is a lineal descendant of the lower animals. Atheists, Agnostics and Higher Critics begin with Evolution: they build on that.

I must spend a little time on the Darwinian hypothesis. I believe this is the greatest menace to the church today: the doctrine that man was not created by God by a separate act and placed here for a special task assigned to him, but is blood kin to the brutes below him.

If the Bible deals with one thing only, “the Science of How to Live,” and declares that man is God’s supreme handiwork, would it not seem likely that the Bible would say something to support this hypothesis, if it is true? You cannot find a single sentence in the Bible—not a word or a phrase or a syllable—that in the most remote way suggests support of the Darwinian hypothesis.

First Corinthians 15:39 would seem to directly contradict Darwin’s hypothesis: “All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is

one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds."

That may not embarrass the believer in Darwinism. He says he proves Evolution by nature, and so I meet him on his own ground, and assert that there is not one fact in nature that supports the Darwinian hypothesis. All the facts of nature are against it.

Let me give you some of the facts that are against it (and may I suggest to you that you read the book called "The Other Side of Evolution," by Alexander Patterson. You can obtain it from the Bible Institute Colportage Association). You will find that those who accept Darwinism do not usually present an argument. They simply express surprise: "What! don't you believe in it? I am surprised!"

You say, "What do you know about it?"

They answer, "I don't know very much about it, but everybody believes in it."

That argument comes from a mother whose daughter had just returned from Wellesley.

Let me give you some facts; then you can question some of these people who tell you that Darwinism is an accepted fact. In the book referred to you will find a statement to the effect that we have now found

nearly one hundred species of vertebrate life in the early rocks, and more than half of them live today. In not a single case is there any material change from the time they were buried in the rocks until today. Now, if this is true, is it not an argument against the hypothesis that everything we see is the result of change?

Another fact: They have yet to find a single species that has changed from another species. If it is true that all these things have come through change, would you not think it possible to find at least one illustration on which to base the argument? But they cannot do it. There is not an illustration in all God's universe, so far, of one single species coming from another, and yet the whole hypothesis rests upon the assertion that in the beginning there were just a few invisible germs of life and that everything came from them. If that were true, we should find evidences of transition everywhere, but there is not a single example to be found—not a single one in process of transition—all perfect.

All nature confirms God's law, as recorded by Moses, that every living thing shall bring forth after its kind; Darwin's hypothesis of variation is confirmed nowhere.

Is it not strange that an hypothesis can last

104908

for fifty years without a fact to support it? If the followers of Darwin would call it "guess" instead of "hypothesis" it would not last a year. H. G. Wells has been writing some articles lately suggesting a *new bible*. This is quite a natural suggestion if one follows Darwinism to its logical conclusion. One evolutionist suggests that instead of teaching the Bible in the common schools, we should teach science in the Sunday-schools.

Wells' latest book begins with pictures of so-called missing links. If you see these in museums, you may be misled. But do they look like the "links" as they were when they were found? They find a piece of a skull, two teeth, and a bone of a leg: they don't know whether the teeth came out of the skull or whether the leg bone belongs to the teeth, but some man fixes the parts up according to his imagination and calls it a missing link. A man who can do this could take a keyhole and build a house around it. If anyone tells you that they have found the missing link, tell him that there is a group of scientists in Africa now. They went from New York just a few months ago; they are to stay five years, using money supplied by some rich men. They are hunting for the missing link—and the longer they stay

the better. It is far better to have them there than to have them poisoning the minds of students in this country. If they would spend half as much time trying to link themselves to God as they do trying to drag mankind down to a monkey ancestry, they would be making better use of their time. If we have found the missing link why hunt for it? If not, why not wait for it before believing in it?

But all the links are missing. I do not object to an absurd hypothesis when it does not hurt anyone. But these imaginings are not only groundless and absurd but harmful. You do not know what trouble you have taken on when you try to explain everything according to Evolution! You will not live long enough, even if you do nothing else. There is too much important work to be done to justify our wasting a whole lifetime in trying to explain changes that have not occurred.

If you ask me how man was made, I answer, Moses tells us. Can God really do that? The God who can make a whole world can do anything He wants to. How did the eye come? When God made man, He made the eyes and carved out caverns in the skull in which to hang them. It is easy for us to believe in a God who can do all things.

But if you try to find out how the eye came and *leave God out*, you have to guess. There was a time (according to Evolutionists) when animals had no eyes, and as they now have them there must have been a time when they came. Since God is not allowed to make an eye, it just happened! When you have nothing else to do just look it up—not taking valuable time, but just the time you have to throw away. But perhaps I had better tell you.

These people will not let God work; they shut Him out of His own universe; and they try to explain how things happened. This is one guess. (If you find any others, let me know, because any other will be better than this.) The guess is that there was a time when the little animal did not have any eyes and, as it was time for it to get an eye, there just happened—no design about it, it just happened—that a little piece of pigment (some call it a freckle) came on the skin. That converged the rays of the sun, and when the little animal felt the heat on that spot it turned it toward the sun to get more heat. The sun's heat irritated it, and a nerve came there, and out of the nerve came the eye! Can you beat it?

This only accounts for one eye, and there had to be another freckle pretty soon, and

that had to come in just the right place. Suppose it had come on the back of its neck. Not only might it have made us less handsome, but, what is worse, suppose the little animal had stopped trying to perfect the one eye before it started on the other. It might have lost the one without getting the other!

And then there was a time when the little animal had no legs, and the leg had to come. Since they will not let God work, what is the guess? Well, as this little animal was wiggling along a wart came on its belly—just happened. It found that it could use this wart to work itself along, and finally it developed into a leg. Only one leg, of course, and the other had to come in just the right place. Isn't it strange that they can teach this tommy-rot to students and look serious about it!

Lest the hearer may think the above explanations of the eye and leg too absurd to be seriously advanced by evolutionists, I quote the following confirmation from a book recently published by a very prominent Eastern clergyman.

"The force of this fact is more clearly seen when one considers that man has grown up in this universe, gradually developing his powers and functions as responses to his environment. *If he has eyes, so biologists as-*

sure us, it is because light waves played upon the skin and eyes came out in answer; if he has ears, it is because air waves were there first and 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.* Always the developing organism has been trying to 'catch up with its environment.'

How long did the "light waves" play upon the skin before the eyes "came out in answer"? How did each new generation retain the irritation caused by the "light waves" playing on the skin of preceding generations for millions of years—or was it all done in one generation? Why do not the "light waves" continue to "play" and call out eyes all over the body? And why do we not see eyes and ears and legs and fins and wings still in process of development? Evolution seems to open the mind to the most impossible guesses advanced in the name of science, while it closes the heart to the plainest spiritual truths.

But there is something more interesting to me than that. Of course I am interested in all this, but Darwin takes up a matter that touches me deeply. He tells us how we

men came to have brains superior to the women. Do you know how we came to have these superior brains? Darwin tells about it.

He says that when our ancestors were brutes, the males fought for the females, and they fought so hard that this struggle increased the brain power in the males, and this increased brain power descended to the males—just to the males. Even if we cannot prove that we have these superior brains, it is nice to know how we came to have them.

But don't think that Darwin devoted all his time to us men. He showed how the females did their part. (That was before they were women.) The getting of this superior brain power is not so important as getting rid of the hair. There was a time when all the animals had hair, and the question that bothered Darwin most was how a hairy animal was transformed into a hairless man. He could not explain it by natural selection, because the less hair a man had the less able he was to protect himself against the weather. He attributed it to the selection of the males by the females. He said the hair was bred off by the females preferring the males with the least hair. Of course it required ages, but that is one advantage the Evolutionist has. If you say

that a certain thing could not be done in a thousand years, he says, "Take a million years—a billion: take all the time you want." He hurls eons at you and dissolves opposition in the mist of ages.

But why did he not think that maybe all the females would not agree in such a preference? If no two women can agree as to a hat, how could the female brutes *all* agree in so impractical a thing as breeding the hair off? And if that was so universal a taste back there as to account for the breeding off of the hair, would you not suppose that that taste would "persist," as Evolutionists say, and that we would notice it in women today—so that bald-headed men would have a greater advantage than they have?

And has it not occurred to you that it might be difficult, if not impossible, for us men to get these brains we have by the males selecting the females, if at the same time the females were breeding the hair off selecting the males? Could they both select at once, or did they alternate and make brains for three years and then decrease hair during leap year?

I am telling you what Darwin says. He says that this argument about breeding off the hair was criticized more severely than anything else he said, which proves that

there were people in those days, as well as today, with common sense. Yet this is what we find in a doctrine that "everybody believes."

I want to show you the extremes to which Evolution will lead those who believe in it. I cut this out of a newspaper. I was passing through Philadelphia last November next day after a professor from a college in Pennsylvania spoke there. He was an extension professor and had extended to Philadelphia. He was enlightening an audience, and this is what the paper says he said. He covered two very important questions, one of which is of special interest to mothers. "A baby can wiggle its big toe," he said, "without wiggling its other toes; this is an indication that it once used its big toe in climbing trees." This must have been a puzzling question to mothers throughout the years. But their ancestors once did this (we are told) and the children can't get out of the habit.

Here is the other serious question. "We often dream of falling," he says. "Those who fell out of the trees some fifty thousand years ago and were killed, of course, had no descendants." (Now this is a fact which I will admit. It is highly probable that this was true.) "So those who fell and were not

hurt, of course, lived." (Which would be a natural presumption.) "So we are never hurt in our dreams of falling," because we are descended from those who fell and were not hurt. If I were a betting man, I would bet sixteen to one that that professor does not believe that Daniel or Joseph could interpret dreams, but he thinks *he* can. Are there not more important things for our professors to do than to spend their time in such speculation?

I recently read an article in the *Sunday School Times* about a professor in one of our Illinois institutions. He tells of the *great* day in the world's history. It looks as if we have made a mistake in the days we celebrate, such as Christmas, Fourth of July, Washington's Birthday, and the rest. The really great day, the professor says, was a day, not yet definitely fixed, when a water puppy crawled up onto the land and decided to live there, and became man's first progenitor!

An "eminent scientist," so a dispatch from Paris says, reports that he recently talked to the soul of a dog and learned that the dog was happy. Must we believe this, too?

This doctrine of Evolution leads you into the wildest of speculations. "The Arabian Nights" have nothing to compare with the

guesses of scientists. Science can do anything when it builds on facts. It gives us rules for the use of electricity and steam and gas. It tells us about the fertility of the soil and the rotation of crops, but it is dealing with facts. When a scientist goes to guessing he is no better than any other guesser. If we must have fiction it would be better to hire a crippled girl who cannot work to read "Grimm's Fairy Tales" to students than to have them taught the fiction of Evolution.

I have given you some illustrations of this fiction; what is the natural effect? It leads people away from God. They will say that it does not lessen their reverence for God to believe that millions of years ago He gave to a germ power to develop. It is true that He *could* do this, but that is not the question. Will you feel the same towards Darwin's far-away God as you feel toward the God of Moses? Darwin does not give God a chance after the first germ of life came upon the planet two hundred million years ago (according to his estimate). Some have put it farther away and some less. Exactness would seem immaterial when one scientist says twenty-four million and another three hundred and six million years. Suppose that for twenty-four millions of years God has never touched life on this planet; that means

that He has never inspired a man or laid His hand upon the destiny of a nation or a race. It recalls Elijah and the prophets of Baal. He told them to pray again, suggesting that their god was asleep. Darwin tells us that our God has been asleep for two hundred millions of years, and those who believe in his doctrine do not emphasize the fact that our God has ever been awake.

Some go back to the nebular hypothesis. This very year Canon Barnes, of Westminster Abbey, has given his interpretation of Evolution. He says the universe was filled with "stuff" out of which came electrons; out of them, matter; out of matter, life; out of life, mind; and out of mind, soul. There was a time, he declared, when there was no matter, no life, no mind, no soul. Now they are here, "a part of God's plan." But God has not been allowed to do anything for billions of years. How long do you think it has been if the nebular hypothesis is correct?

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 then united them in just the right proportions to produce water—the daily need of every living thing, scattered among the flowers all

the colors 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?

When I was a boy in college the materialists began with matter separated into particles infinitely small and each 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!"

I had a letter from one preacher who told me I was lessening my influence with the thoughtful. Another said I could not enter the freshman class of any theological seminary. I am not trying to enter the freshman class; I am lecturing to students. Some criticize me for dissenting from Canon Barnes, but I am trying to bring people back to believe that man was made in the image of God.

What is the result of Darwin's doctrine? What would you suppose would be the result? Here is a boy reared in a Christian

home, learning the first child's prayer and then the Lord's Prayer; he talks to God, asks for daily bread, pleads for forgiveness of sins, and desires to be delivered from evil. He reads the Bible and finds that his life is precious in the sight of God, and that the heavenly Father is more willing to give good gifts to His children than earthly parents are. Then he goes off to college and a professor takes a book six hundred pages thick and tries to convince him that his body is a brute's body. "See that point in the ear? That comes from the ape," etc. Darwin also tries to convince the child that there is nothing in his brain that is not found in miniature in the brain of the brute.

Then he says that the morals of man are a development from the brute. First, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth—and no mention of God or of religion. No mention of conscience. When the boy goes out from school, if he believes Darwin and believes his teacher, the Bible is to him a story book. Christ is reduced to the stature of a man with an ape for his ancestor, on his mother's side at least, and, as many teachers believe, on his father's side also. I have pointed out the natural, logical consequences of Darwinism—observation convinces me that they are the *actual* consequences.

Are you surprised when I tell you that within a month I met a young man twenty-two years of age who said he had been made an atheist by two teachers in a Christian college? A mother in northern Minnesota told me that her boy had become skeptical in college and had been brought back by a religious speech. He is now the leading Presbyterian preacher in his town. This year I received an invitation to speak at a high-school commencement in this state from a boy in the senior class who told me that he had been made skeptical on religion during his sophomore year, and that several of the others were agnostic.

In Miami, Florida, a mother told me that her boy would not pray; she found that he believed in the Darwinian doctrine. A father tells me of a daughter educated at Wellesley who calmly informs him that no one believes in the Bible now; a teacher in Columbia University begins his lessons in geology by asking students to lay aside all that they have learned in Sunday-school; a professor of the University of Wisconsin tells his class that the Bible is a collection of myths.

Last fall the president of one of the largest of the state universities (and a Doctor of Divinity, too), in an address on *religion*,

said to 3,100 students: "I go so far as to say that, if you can not reconcile religion with things taught in biology, in psychology, or in other fields of study in this university, then you should throw your religion away."

A professor of philosophy at Ann Arbor occupies a Sunday evening explaining to an audience that Christianity is a state of mind and that there are only two books in the Bible with any literary merit; another professor in the same institution informs students that he once taught a Sunday-school class and was active in the Y. M. C. A., but that no thinking man can believe in God or the Bible; a woman teacher in the public school in Indiana rebukes a boy for answering that Adam was the first man, explaining to him and the class that the "tree man" was the first man; a professor in Yale has the reputation of making atheists of all who come under his influence—this information was given by a boy whose brother has come under the influence of this teacher; a professor in Bryn Mawr combats Christianity for a session and then puts to his class the question whether or not there is a God, and is happy to find that a majority of the class vote that there is no God; one professor declares that life is merely a by-product and will ultimately be produced in the labora-

tory; another says that the ingredients necessary to create life have already been brought together and that life will be developed from these ingredients, adding however that it will require a million years to do it. They are robbing our boys and girls of spiritual life. A professor cannot cram enough intelligence into a boy's brain to offset the shrinkage of the heart when he takes God out. I have reached two conclusions: First, that all teachers in Christian colleges should be Christians with a spiritual view of life; and second, that where in public institutions we are not allowed to defend the Bible, they should not be allowed to attack it and rob our children of their faith and hope.

Nietzsche took this hypothesis, brought man down to a brute basis, taught that might makes right, and laid the foundation for the greatest war that man ever knew. He got it from Darwin. He says Darwin was one of the three great men of his century. He praises Napoleon as the greatest because he made war "respectable" again. I have here a quotation from an editor in Paris, written when there was a peace meeting there, some twenty-one years ago: "The spirit of peace has fled the earth because Evolution has taken possession of it. The plea for peace in past years has been based upon the divine

nature and divine origin of man. Men were looked upon as the children of one God and war was, therefore, fratricide. But now that men are considered children of apes, what matters it if they slaughter one another?" This was fifteen years before the war began.

A prominent English writer, in a book published by Putnam's Sons this year, says: "Darwinism not only justifies the Sensualist at the trough and Fashion at her glass; it justifies Prussianism at the cannon, and Bolshevism at the prison door. If Darwinism be true, if Mind is to be driven out of the universe and accident accepted as a sufficient cause for all the majesty and glory of physical nature, then there is no crime in violence, however abominable in its circumstances and however cruel in its execution which can not be justified by success, and no triviality, no absurdity of fashion which deserves a censure; more—there is no act of disinterested love and tenderness, no deed of self sacrifice and mercy, no aspiration after beauty and excellence, for which a single reason can be adduced in logic. On these grounds alone Darwinism is condemned; but it is condemned also on scientific grounds."

The reason this pernicious doctrine has not done more harm is that it has not reached

the mass of the people. Their "everybody" does not include all of society. Less than one in ten of our boys and girls ever go to a high-school, and only one in fifty—less than two per cent—attend college or university. Only about one boy and girl in one hundred, on the average, graduates from a college or university, but it is those who have the most education who have been injured most by this doctrine. It has not yet misled the masses; the people, as a rule, do not believe in the ape theory.

Darwin gives us a family tree which begins in the water with "larvae" and then traces the line of descent to European apes—he does not even allow us the patriotic pleasure of descending from *American apes*. Over eight hundred times he uses the phrase, "We may well suppose." Compare this phrase with the Bible's "Thus saith the Lord"! The Bible is built upon the rock and the other upon hypothesis. When they tell you that their sciences are the most important, you can answer that there is a science more important than any they teach in the schools. It is the Science of How to Live. It is more important that you trust the Rock of Ages than that you know the age of the rocks. When those who teach the physical sciences look down upon those who preach the Gos-

pel, tell them what Paul said, that the things which are seen are temporal; the things that are unseen, eternal.

I will now show you the actual effect of Darwinism. There is a book by James H. Leuba, published five years ago (in 1916), by Sherman, French & Co., Boston (now sold by the Open Court Pub. Co., Chicago). This man is a professor in Bryn Mawr College, in Pennsylvania. The book was written to prove that belief in God and immortality is passing away. Professor Leuba takes a list of scientists, biologists, sociologists and psychologists—the most prominent in the country—and asks them to answer certain questions. He then gives the figures to show that *more than half* of these prominent men do not believe in a *personal God and personal immortality*. He then takes nine representative colleges and questions the students, boys and girls, and states as the result of his investigation that the largest percentage of believers (85 per cent) are in the freshman class; the percentage decreases until they come to the senior class. He declares that at graduation, from forty to forty-five per cent of the boys do not believe in a personal God or in personal immortality. The percentage of believers is greater among the girls than among the boys. He explains this

by saying that the men are stronger and more independent: that the women are clinging, and rely more upon faith. Thank God for a faith that keeps one true!

This man argues that the more intelligent men are the less they believe in God and immortality. Are you willing to admit that intelligence is antagonistic to Christianity, that as men become more intelligent they will have less belief in God, the Bible, and in Christ? I will not admit it. The Christian church will not admit it: it is not true. There is an explanation; what is the reason?

I believe it is because of the acceptance of this false philosophy that takes away from man his belief in God and leads him to worship his own mind instead. What we need is to have our boys and girls come from our colleges and universities with a spiritual vision back of their trained minds, so that they will take up the work of the Sunday-school, the church and society. A canvass of the graduates of one state university showed that only twenty-five per cent of the boys and girls who went from Christian churches and Sunday-schools ever returned to take up their religious work again. Brains must be trained and then consecrated to the service of the Most High. We cannot afford to have the lives of our people robbed

of all spirituality and brought down to a brute basis.

Theodore Roosevelt, when President, talking to the Harvard law students, told them that there was scarcely a great conspiracy against the public welfare that did not have Harvard brains behind it. This might have been said at any other university as well. Many graduates go out with no sense of responsibility to God or society: they are the bulwark of every unrighteous cause, the defenders of every vicious system. This is not true of *all* college graduates; many do not accept Darwinism, and many evolutionists do not follow the doctrine to its logical conclusion. When reform starts in this country, it starts with the masses. Reforms do not come out of the brains of scholars. Some of these young men after graduating from our colleges go into business and become profiteers. They do not commit petit larceny; people are punished for that. Sometimes they commit grand larceny; sometimes they go into glorified larceny, and use lawyers who come out of our colleges to keep them out of the penitentiary. We have to enact child labor laws to keep college graduates from dwarfing the bodies and souls of little children. Anti-trust laws are necessary to keep them from ruining small competitors.

I believe the brute in man is brought out largely by the theory that makes man believe he is blood relative to the brute. Man must be brought back to God, to a belief in the Bible as the Word of God, and to a love of Christ as the Son of God. No mental processes can stop the mad race for money. Man must be born again. "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" must become a living force in his life.

I come to present to you the Bible as the Word of God, and to protest against the enemies, open and secret, who would lift man from his knees, take from him his faith in God and withdraw from his life the restraining influence of a belief in immortality. I believe that the Darwinian doctrine leads people into agnosticism and pantheism, plunged the world into the worst of wars, and is dividing society into classes that fight each other on a brute basis. It is time that the Christian church should understand what is going on and array itself against these enemies of the church, Christianity, and civilization.

THE EFFECT OF THE EVOLUTION THEORY ON DARWIN HIMSELF

I HAVE spoken of what would seem to be the natural and logical effect of the Darwin hypothesis on the minds of the young. This view is confirmed by its actual effect on Darwin himself. In his "Life and Letters" he says: "I am much engaged; an old man, and out of health, and I cannot spare time to answer your questions fully—nor indeed can they be answered. Science has nothing to do with Christ, except in so far as the habit of scientific research makes a man cautious in admitting evidence. For myself, I do not believe that there ever has been any revelation. As for a future life, every man must judge for himself between conflicting vague probabilities."

It will be seen that science, according to Darwin, has nothing to do with Christ, except to discredit revelation which makes Christ's mission known to men. Darwin himself does not believe that there has ever been *any revelation*, which, of course, excludes Christ. It will be seen, also, that he has no definite views on the *future life*—"every man," he says, "must judge for himself between *conflicting vague probabilities*."

It is fair to conclude that it was *his own doctrine* that led him astray, for in the same connection (in "Life and Letters") he says that when aboard the *Beagle* he was called "orthodox," and was heartily laughed at by

several of the officers for quoting the Bible as an unanswerable authority on some point of morality." In the same connection he thus describes his change and his final attitude: "When thus reflecting I feel compelled to look for a First Cause, having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called a Theist. This conclusion was strong in my mind about the time, as far as I can remember, when I wrote the 'Origin of Species'; and it is since that time that it has very gradually, with many fluctuations, become weaker. But then arises the doubt: Can the mind of man, which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animals, be trusted when it draws such grand conclusions?

"I cannot pretend to throw the least light on such abstruse problems. The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an Agnostic."

A careful reading of the above discloses the gradual transition wrought in Darwin himself by the unsupported hypothesis which he launched upon the world, or which he endorsed with such earnestness and industry as to impress his name upon it. He was regarded as "orthodox" when he was young; he was even laughed at for quoting the Bible "as an unanswerable authority on some point of morality." In the beginning he regarded himself as a Theist, and felt compelled "to look to a First Cause, having an intelligent mind in some de-

gree analogous to that of man." This conclusion, he says, was strong in his mind when he wrote "The Origin of Species," but he observes that since that time this conclusion has very gradually become weaker, and then he unconsciously brings a telling indictment against his own hypothesis. He says, "*Can the mind of man* (which, according to his belief, has been possessed by the lowest animals) be *trusted* in such mysteries?" He first links man with the animals, and then, because of this supposed connection, estimates man's mind by brute standards.

Who will say, after reading these words, that it is immaterial what man thinks about his origin? Who will deny that the acceptance of the Darwinian hypothesis shuts out the higher reasonings and the larger conceptions of man?

On the very brink of the grave, after he had extracted from his hypothesis all the good there was in it and all the benefit it could confer, he is helplessly in the dark, and "cannot pretend to throw the least light on such abstruse problems." When he believed in God, in the Bible, in Christ, and in a future life, there were no mysteries that disturbed him; but a *guess*, with nothing in the universe to support it, swept him away from his moorings and left him in his old age in the midst of mysteries that he thought insoluble. He must content himself with Agnosticism. What can Darwinism ever do to compensate any one for the destruction of faith in God, in His Word, in His Son, and of his hope of immortality?

OTHER BOOKS BY

William Jennings Bryan

In His Image.....	[Cloth]	\$1.75
Heart to Heart Appeals.....	[Cloth]	1.25
The Prince of Peace	[Boards]	.60
The First Commandment	[Boards]	.35
The Message From Bethlehem .	[Boards]	.35
The Royal Art	[Boards]	.35
The Making of a Man	[Boards]	.35

TWO NOTABLE BOOKS

On the Present Issue

The Other Side of Evolution, Its EFFECTS AND FALLACY, by Alexander Patterson, with an introduction by George Frederick Wright. Its penetrating examination of the evidence upon which Evolution rests marks this volume as one of the strongest published against this theory. Mr. Bryan has made much use of it in his great crusade [cloth] \$1.06, postpaid.

The Church, the Schools, and Evolution, THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY, ITS CAUSE AND CURE, by J. E. Conant, D. D. This book, just published, tells exactly what Evolution is, who are among its advocates, and how it flatly denies every fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith, which makes it imperative that it be resisted. Science falsely so-called is contrasted with true Christian science [not Eddyism], the spheres of both Church and Schools as respecting truth is clearly set forth, and a constructive cure for the present necessary antagonism is pointed out. LET EVERYBODY READ IT! [paper] 35 cents

The Bible Institute Colportage Association

Publishers of the Gospel

826 North La Salle Street, Chicago