

Should Evolution Be Taught
In Tax Supported Schools?



The Arguments Against

Delivered by

W. B. RILEY

in the

McCABE-RILEY DEBATES

BOOKS by DR. W. B. RILEY

Christ, The Incomparable (new), cloth.....	\$1.50
Evolution or Inspiration (new), cloth.....	1.25
God Hath Spoken.....	1.75
(Addresses of Christian Fundamentals Convention—1919.)	
Evolution of the Kingdom, Revised Edition, paper 75c; cloth	1.25
The Perennial Revival, cloth.....	1.25
The Crisis of the Church, cloth.....	1.25
The Menace of Modernism, paper, 50c; cloth.....	1.10
Ephesians, The Three-Fold Epistle, paper, 40c; cloth.....	1.00
Messages for the Metropolis.....	1.25
The Gospel in Jonah, paper.....	.25
Daniel vs. Darwinism, paper.....	.25
Spiritualism, or Can We Commune with the Dead?.....	.15
Jerusalem and the Jew.....	.10
The Challenge of Orthodoxy.....	.10
The Scientific Accuracy of the Scriptures.....	.10
Modernism in Baptist Schools.....	.10
The Great Question, Who Was Christ?.....	.10
The Eclipse of Faith.....	.10
The Interchurch, or The Kingdom by Violence.....	.10
The Liberty of Faith vs. the License of Infidelity.....	.10
Socialism in Our Schools.....	.10
Redemption of The Downtown.....	.10
Conflict of Christianity With Its Counterfeit.....	.10
Prof. Kent, or Cutting the Heart Out of the Bible.....	.10
The Bible, is It an Evolution or an Inspiration?.....	.10
Theory of Evolution, Does it Tend to Atheism?.....	.10
Theory of Evolution, Does It Tend to Anarchy?.....	.10
Riley vs. Fosdick.....	.10
Christ and His City.....	.10
Christ Will Come Again.....	.10

Order from L. W. CAMP

1020 Harmon Place

Minneapolis, Minn.

The Editor of this booklet edits two magazines, Christian Fundamentals in School and Church, a quarterly magazine, \$1.00 per year; the Baptist Beacon, a denominational organ, a sixteen page monthly, \$1.00 per year. Send subscriptions to 20 South Eleventh Street, Minneapolis.

RESOLVED, That Evolution is a Proven Fact and Should Be So Taught in the Public Schools.

The reply to J. B. McCabe of London, England by Dr. W. B. Riley of Minneapolis, U. S. A.

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Permit me to introduce what I have to say by expressing my appreciation of this occasion. The subject to be debated tonight is one in which the entire public is profoundly interested, and concerning which I shall voice to you my deepest convictions. The setting of this debate is satisfactory at many points. My honored opponent, Prof. McCabe, is easily a leader among Rationalists, if not their world's most outstanding man, as his scholarship, eloquence and authorship unite to testify. The issue created by the statement of our subject is clear, and the parties to this controversy are so diametrically opposed, one representing the extreme wing of rationalism, and the other an uncompromising fundamentalism, that the debate should serve the purpose of setting this whole subject in bold relief. I have never until now faced an opponent who measured up to my ideal, or even desire.

Prof. Metcalf, the biologist, with whom I debated in the State College of North Carolina, was an ardent evolutionist, but a professed Christian.

Prof. Burts of the philosophy department of the University of Chicago, with whom I crossed swords last summer in the University Mandel Hall, was a modernist Christian, whatever that may mean. Dr. Edward Adams Cantrell, whom I have overwhelmingly defeated in seven successive debates, is a rationalist and socialist, but also a Unitarian preacher, and consequently is supposed to retain some respect for small portions of the Bible. Dr. Maynard Shipley, president of "the Science League of America," is a rationalist, and socialist, whose views are practically identical with those of my present opponent, but whose abilities as a speaker were not sufficient to make debate interesting; while Prof. Linsley, the biologist of California, a Baptist modernist; Dean Noe of Memphis, a modernist Episcopalian; and Clarence Darrow of Chicago, an agnostic and rationalist, have each of them agreed to meet me and then backed down before the hour of debate came, and thereby cheated me out of additional opportunities. But, if I may judge my present opponent by his books, he is both capable and unafraid. I am frank to say that I have found his writings clear, logical, and if one could consent to his basis or starting point, somewhat convincing. That basis, in every one of them, is "evolution, an established fact"—the very claim that I am here to flatly deny and fully disprove.

Prof. Henry B. Smith of the University of Chicago some time since wrote, "One thing is certain, that infidel science will rout everything except thoroughgoing Christian orthodoxy. All the false theories will go overboard. The fight will be between a stiff thoro-

402150

MAR 20 '28

W. O. Beal gift

R+56

going orthodoxy and a stiff thoroughgoing infidelity." Even so; and for once, at least, these are the very forces that face each other in the representatives this evening. I am not here to trim; I am not here to explain; I am not here to compromise. I am confident that my opponent entertains an identical attitude. We are here to "fight it out" and that to a finish, and find, if possible, where truth lies.

I will do, then, exactly what the liberal, Lord Russell of England, requested in the London McCabe-Price debate, namely, "come closely and instantly to grips with my opponent on this subject." I shall contend that evolution is false to nature's facts; that evolution is the philosophy of skepticism, and that evolution fruits in anarchy and crime.

First

EVOLUTION IS FALSE TO NATURE'S FACTS.

If there is one phrase of which my opponent is fond and upon which he has played, like persistent chimes, it is the statement that "all nature proves evolution to be true," and that "evolution is now accepted by all scientists;" that "all controversy concerning that subject is over, etc., etc." It may be necessary to tell him, I trust it will not be necessary to repeat the statement before an intelligent audience, that an assertion is not a proof; and even tho, like Mrs. Eddy, one repeat it upon every page, it carries no demonstrating power.

"Science is knowledge gained and verified." Science is not a string of 800 suppositions, such as characterizes Darwin's greater works; and science is not a string of eight hundred assertions, such as mark and even blot the pages of Joseph B. McCabe's books. I grant you that, because Mrs. Eddy has asserted over and over again that "matter is no part of the reality of existence," some people are found who suppose these repetitions amount to proof; but, for the most part, they are sentimental women, individuals a thousand miles removed from the attitude or method of original and independent research, intelligent investigation and justifiable conclusion.

Before I finish tonight, I shall show you that all scientists are not agreed upon this subject; that the utmost confusion and contradiction reigns among them concerning every step that has been taken in the world's progress, and that some men who are scientists (their company now rapidly increasing), repudiate the whole philosophy.

But, suppose for an instant, that the claim of my opponent was true, and every living scientist agreed that evolution was to be accepted, does that make a science? By no means. Every layman has a perfect right to ask that concensus of scholarship "on what grounds?" and the man who does not ask that, is neither an independent thinker, nor even an intelligent reader. Let Mr. McCabe express his own conviction of a man who is convinced merely by a concensus of opinion. When he came to discuss the existence of God, he said,

"We are, of course, investigating the question in which authority has no value; no man or woman can be deeply convinced of the existence of God, because abler men are convinced of it."

All right, brother McCabe, take a dose of your own medicine now! Some scientists are not agreed on this subject, and if they were, I, like you, insist that "authority here has no value, and that no man or woman can be deeply convinced of evolution simply because some abler men are convinced of it." I don't reach my conclusions by consulting other men's minds. I long since decided that God had given me my own mind with which to work my way through the great problems of life, and that He would hold me responsible for personal conclusions,—not for corporate ones. To use Mr. McCabe's words again, adapted to my own uses, "I do not even 'rely on the testimony of millions,' if they have nothing better for their assertion than the negative evidence."

The New Testament records that above five hundred brethren beheld the risen Christ in the hour of his ascension. Many of those men went to the stake for their testimony. Not one of them ever discarded it or discredited his fellows who united with him in it, and yet Prof. McCabe flouts their witness as insufficient. He comes back to me, and after admitting that England has not to exceed "one hundred men" that it can truthfully call scientists, and he could justly add that only a few of the eleven thousand or more members, (of whom I am one), of "the American Association for the Advancement of Science," are truly worthy to be called scientists; and yet, expects that I shall bow the knee and worship where and as a majority of these may indicate; but I answer in the language of the Christianity that I profess, "Call no man Master."

To quote once more from my opponent Prof. McCabe.

"Men, even scientific men and philosophers, have been convinced for ages that certain ideas were true, yet were compelled at last to recognize their falseness."

But I must give you a better reason for rejecting this philosophy than my inalienable right so to do; and here again, I choose to come to close and instant grips with my opponent.

The record of the rocks know nothing of it! The Werner uniformitarian theory, at one time quite widely accepted by men of science, is now like evolution,—fighting a battle for its very existence. So-called "thrusts" of former days, that sought to explain the utter lack of uniformity in the down-laying of the earth's crust, from the archeozoic to the quaternary, have been found to be altogether too extensive and too multitudinous and too naturally placed to be accounted for by thrusts. Convulsions in nature might displace rocks for a few miles, but do not account for pulling hundreds of miles of rock out of nature's place and pushing them over younger rocks. In fact, there is a good reason for the statement of Prof. Price, the geologist.

"No man on earth knows enough about the rocks or the fossils to be able to prove, in any fashion fit to be called scientific, that

any particular kind of fossil is actually and intrinsically older or younger than any other kind."

The scheme, as Dr. Price said in the London debate, has been to name the rocks by the fossils found in them, and then prove progression by an appeal to the rocks thus named,—reasoning in a circle. This method reminds one of Mr. Moody's man, who said to the great evangelist. "I don't believe as you do!" "But," answered Mr. Moody, "what do you believe?" "I believe what my church believes." "But, what does your church believe?" "It believes what I believe."

In religion, Prof. McCabe holds to scorn such a basis; but in science, he would have us all accept it. The age of the rocks is proved by the fossil forms, and then, in turn, the age of the fossil forms is proved by the rocks. It is a merry-go-round! When I was a lad of five, at a county fair, my parents put me on one. Its dizzy swing made me sick at my stomach; and now, when men want me to adopt that motion in science, it disturbs my mental bile.

But Prof. McCabe says, "We have to do it, for all the scientists are agreed upon it." I beg his pardon! Huxley didn't consent to it; LaConte didn't consent to it; Fairhurst doesn't consent to it; Willis doesn't consent to it; Price doesn't consent to it; Bateson doesn't consent to it; Guppy doesn't consent to it; O'Toole doesn't consent to it; More doesn't consent to it!

Gregory called some features of it into question; Nicholson does; so does Seward, and so does Scott, Tansley, Bower and others.

The answer of my opponent is that some of these are dead! My reply is, that the most of the men who gave expression to the whole philosophy of evolution, are dead. The fact that a man dies has nothing to do with the truthfulness or falsehood of his science. Euclid is dead, but his theorems live; Bacon is dead, but much of his philosophy survives; Newton is dead, but most of us still hold to gravitation; Christ is dead, but the church marches on,—McCabe to the contrary, notwithstanding!

I assert now, and stand ready to prove it when it is disputed, that the rocks of the earth hold not one single species that ever clearly evolved into another. Another Joseph, a true scientist,—one of the greatest America has ever known—Joseph LaConte,—voiced what the best geologists admit, namely:

"The evidence of geology today is that species seem to come into existence suddenly and in full perfection; remain substantially unchanged during the term of their existence, and pass away in full perfection; other species take their places apparently by substitution, not by transmutation."

Or, if you prefer the language of J. C. Willis of Cambridge, "Evolution did not proceed from individual to variety, from variety

to species, from species to genus, and from genus to family; but inversely, the great families and genera appearing at a very early period, and subsequently breaking up into other genera and species." (Is Evolution True. p. 38.) It is my own profound conviction,—a conviction that was borne by Huxley, Dana, Dawson, Wallace, and shared by scores of living scientists, that Genesis and geology are wondrously together in their enumeration of life-orders.

But, I said, the face of the earth is set like flint against it. Unlike my opponent, I shall not rest in assertions, however oft repeated, but proceed immediately to proofs. For six thousand years, at least, and in the judgment of my opponent, somewhere from one hundred thousand to two million years, man has been a keen observer upon the facts of nature, and in that whole time he has never seen one species evolved into another. Goaded by the most desperate desire to prove this atheistic hypothesis, the entire school of evolutionists have yet lacked the hardihood to claim that such an observation has been made by man. They know concerning the vegetable world what Hunter in his Civic Biology states, namely, that the vegetable hybrids can be produced between species of close kin, even these do not reproduce themselves sexually, but by grafting, budding, etc. They know that, while the ass and the horse have a kinship close enough to be crossed, the product, a mule, balks the whole evolution theory by his stubborn sterility—a sterility born, not by the will of the flesh, nor of the will of the mule, but of God. My son, who is a Veterinary Surgeon, tells me that the ovarian tubes are not developed in a mule, revealing God's insurmountable barrier, defending His Holy Word, "to each seed it is given to bring forth after its kind."

The illustrations they would have us accept of this false philosophy are found only in dead forms—forms that have slept, according to my opponent, for millions and even billions of years. These they resurrect, and by a new ventriloquism, make to talk again and tell strange weird stories; namely, a little five-toed-rat-like animal stands in the museum and is taught by the modern evolutionists to say to all passers-by, "I was a horse!" In appearance, he has not anything like the kinship to a horse that a jack-rabbit has to a jackass; but, of course, the jackass is alive and refuses to claim the jackrabbit as his ancestor; and the jackrabbit is alive and he resents the insinuation of any kinship. You can put what you like into the mouth of the dead; it can't help itself; but with the living it is different. And mark you, his kinship between that ehippus and the modern percheron is maintained in spite of all the scientific data to the contrary; and they are many. For instance, the little rat-like animal that is made to say he was a horse, lies underneath the soil of America and was buried, in the judgment of my opponent, something like "ten millions of years ago." Yet he admits that when the Spaniards reached America a few centuries ago, "there was not a horse on the entire continent." What had happened? All the horses of America discovered there was a passable bridge that does not now exist, from America to Europe, and the most of them took it into their heads to see what

foraging they could find on the other side of the world, and so Joseph McCabe said **"The horse crossed the bridge"** But fearing lest some colt or two should be as stubborn in transmigration as McCabe himself is in religion, and stay behind, he dispatches those on the authority of his friend, Prof. Sambon, who told him that **"one of those deadly parasites of the horse arose in America and destroyed the horse in America."** (Price-McCabe debate. p.14.)

Whether Sambon was a veterinarian ten million years ago and treated the parasitic eohippus, Prof. McCabe does not say; but he does ask us **"How do you explain that answer as a part of the story of evolution?"** My reply is, "I don't!" It doesn't require explanation. It is a part of the story of evolution and like all the other parts of it, the biggest and wildest piece of imagination that ever possessed a mortal mind or found expression on mortal tongue. To make animals that have practically no kinship in appearance and constitution, and that never even occupied the same continent, to be sires and sons, is going some; and it is all done in the name of "science." Oh science, great and good word; but what discredit thou art suffering at the lips of thy professed friends!

But I must give you some further evidences of the absurdity of the supposed proofs from the face of nature!

My opponent, in his debate with Prof. Price in London, said, **"Why is it that when the first man went to Australia there was not one single animal in Australia of a higher type than the kangaroo; no cat, no dog, no lion, tiger, wolf, hyena; not a single one of our higher mammals? The kangaroo was the highest type of life on the earth two hundred million years ago. Why was the clock stopped in New Zealand 250 or 200 million years ago? New Zealand is fifty million years more primitive than Australia. In New Zealand when man came, the highest animal in the whole Dominion was the Tuatara, an ancient lizard, a more primitive and ancient reptile than any in the whole world."** That raises a question in my mind. What stopped the evolution clock? Who stopped it, since there was no God in the universe? If evolution be true, it ought to work as well on one continent as on another. What possible explanation of the fact that evolution is still working on the other continents but stopped in Australia and in New Zealand?

If I held a philosophy of life that had its first stroke of paralysis 250 millions of years ago in New Zealand, and its second stroke 200 millions of years ago in Australia, I would be afraid lest "the old thing" would have a third, and die on my hands, as it is now doing. The simple fact of the business is, that that is the meaning of this debate.

This philosophy of evolution has been in the world for over three thousand years. From the days of Grecian philosophy until the time of Erasmus Darwin, grandfather of Charles, the philosophy was paralyzed. It had no tongue, and in Charles Darwin it found a voice, and for more than fifty years it has been feebly muttering. Just now, it is screaming aloud, but its unwonted activity is only a physiological sign of its last and terrible death-struggle. Moved by the most humane emotions, I am going to do my best to put "the poor thing" out of its suffering.

The study of man is, today, sounding its death-knell. Already, its most ardent advocates are one by one conceding that man cannot be traced to a brute ancestry. Maynard Shipley, in his debate with me on the coast, admitted, **"We do not now claim that man came from a monkey, or any lower form of life. Man alone can produce man."** Henry Fairfield Osborne, is in many respects the foremost evolutionist on the American continent. In a letter to Dr. John Roach Straton, Dr. Osborne wrote.

"If you will examine carefully an exhibit in the Hall of the Age of Man, you will see that it demonstrates very clearly, not that man has descended from monkeys or from the apes, but that he has a long and independent line of ascent of his own." (The Earth Speaks to Bryan, p. 51.)

Even my opponent unwittingly concedes the very point for which I am contending! His famous bridge, spanning the gulf from monkey to man, mentally conceived and artistically drawn for the London debate, is short one pier; and that's the pier that would take him over from ape to man. In explanation of this impassable gulf, he says, **"Any day we may discover the fifth pier, and the gap will be bridged between the man and the ape."** (Is Evolution True. p. 24.) But, will my Beloved Opponent blame me, if I wait until the discovery is made before I plunge into the bottomless abyss of skepticism that swirls through this impassable gap. Furthermore, he admits that another one of his four pillars is uncertain. Concerning the Taungs skull, he says, **"The position as to that is not finally decided."** But your amazement will increase when I tell you that when he comes to discuss the three remaining piers, he builds them out of **"the Piltdown man and one or two others going as far again in the direction of the ape."** (Price-McCabe, P.23.) Already he had admitted that **"the theory doesn't depend upon certain stones and bones that we find in the rocks."** He knew they were too flimsy and the claims of their antiquity and evolution too far-fetched, to rest his case upon them.

But, we are here to assert that it is no more steadily placed upon Pithecanthropus erectus, the ape-man of Java, and piltdown, than it is **"upon the one or two others that look in the ape direction."** What are the facts about the ape-man of Java,—Prof. Dubois' purported discovery, and Piltdown, the pet of Chas. Dawson? One almost hesitates to rehearse it, just as one always hesitates to throw into scornful relief mistakes to which men have seriously pinned their faith. But, since my opponent has insisted from the first on "the facts," I reply by giving "the facts" to him! Was ever a scintilla of "the Java ape man" seen by mortal? For one, I honestly doubt it. Prof. Dubois, two years before he found it, affirmed his expectation concerning the discovery and suggested Java as the place. After he announced his discovery, he refused to let the public look on it—a violation of what Prof. Lull affirms to be the first essential for scientific evidence. (See evolution of Man. p. 8.), and it is less than four years since pressure was brought upon him concerning Pithecanthropus erectus, the ape-man of Java, to compel investigation of the very thing that had long been published in textbooks and paraded, as though the last bone of it had been discovered, with each section in place.

If there was any exception to this secrecy, John Lubbock (Lord Avebury) was the man, and he said of what he saw, "It is greatly to be regretted that they are not more complete; but they certainly belonged either to a very large gibbon or a very small man."

Now, who is willing to accept as a scientific demonstration a creation that had as its basis a small section of a brain pan, two molar teeth and a piece of thigh bone, and these not found all together, if you please, nor at the same time, but forty-eight feet apart, and months between discoveries. Virchow is dead, as my opponent is sure to remind you, but he was living then and passed upon the professed portions entering this creation as belonging—the thigh bone to a man, and the brain-pan to a chimpanzee. In other words, the actual discovery of anything has been doubted by me, and the secrecy maintained gave perfect occasion. The strata from which they were brought has been in dispute. Whether these pieces ever met before they came together in plaster cast, there is absolutely no agreement.

Whether the teeth were upper or lower, simian or human, has also been in dispute, and finally, the cubic contents of the skull was the subject of bitter discussion. See (Evolution of Man, p. 23.) And yet, with every essential feature of the poor thing's existence in doubt, Prof. McCabe presents it as the most solid and prominent pillar, in his bridge scheme. I wonder if even that poor little five-toed horse, that fled from America before the face of a parasite, would trust his twenty pounds avoirdupois to a bridge resting on a pillar like that?

But while we are about it, we will show you the sickly strength of another pillar in that same bridge, namely, "Pitldown."

✱ A few facts about this supposed simian-human hybrid. First of all, it was brought from the gravel near Pitldown, England, "less than four feet in thickness at the point of discovery." (Evolution of Man, p. 19)—hardly a decent depth for present-day burials. This gravel bed rested on a bed-rock of Mesozoic age, so they tell us. According to the Werner uniformitarian theory, that Mesozoic age should have been about ten miles deep, but in this instance, it was only a few feet instead—hardly deep enough to bury one decently. A little piece of a skull was found first and a long search followed—ultimately resulting in the finding of other characteristic portions of the cranium, a ramus of the jaw with several molars and two nasal bones. The men who worked upon it, attempting reconstruction of the several pieces, isolated both at time of discovery and in location, were Smith, Woodward, Keith and McGregor, and they were never united on the subject; they debated constantly the skull capacity. The jaw proved a veritable bone of contention. Prof. G. S. Miller, Jr., of America, declared that it didn't belong with the skull at all, but was a chimpanzee fossil. In this conclusion, "Mr. Miller had quite a large following," we are told, (See Antiquity of Man, p. 21.) The tooth was canine, neither human nor simian; and yet, in spite of these discussions as to the strata in which it was found, the possible antiquity or modernism of the tidbits, whether the jaw was that of one animal and the skull-cap that of another; whether the tooth was upper or

lower, human, simian or canine and finally, as to the cubic contents of the cranium, questions enough surely to put the thing out of commission from a scientific standpoint, Prof. McCabe accepts it and makes another pillar on which to rest his bridge over the almost infinite canyon between the ape on the one side and man on the other.

✱ He has but a single pier left, the Neandertal. The bones, out of which he builds that, were brought from the mouth of a cave in the Neandertal gorge, tributary to the Rhine; and to this good hour it has never been settled whether this represents a man or, as one famous American scientist puts it, "merely the relic of some poor waif of humanity diseased or otherwise." (Evolution of Man, p. 23.) However, when you know that the skull had a cranial capacity of 1,600 c.c. you would cease giving consideration to it as having anything to do with monkey-kinship, for the average cubic content of the present-day man is only 1,400, and if Neandertal proves anything, as he does not, it would only demonstrate, not that we are descended from the lower forms of life, but degenerated from one of higher brain capacity,—a conclusion to which I am tempted when I think on the present popularity of the evolution philosophy.

Some day in the not distant future, some professor will stumble on to a grave that contains the bones of the Siamese twins. In my lifetime, I have known three pairs of these, physically bound together; and not having their personal history in hand, that Professor will conclude that this is a proof that, at one time, every man and woman was twin-tied, and if some other scientist in some other part of the world suddenly digs up another one of the three pairs, of which I have had knowledge in my lifetime, and some man in another section, the third, they will at once declare a twin-tied race—ala Neandertal; and the successors of Prof. McCabe, with these three instances back of them will be saying to my far-off descendants, "Any opposition to this view of science is simply foolish!" They may even add, in the language of their far-off predecessor,—Prof. McCabe, "there is not a dissentient voice among the professors and experts of three or four different branches of science which deal with the matter." Physiologists thus far off, will declare, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that man's body was once dual. The geologists of that future day, examining the bones of these duplicates, will affirm, "there is not a faintest doubt that man once existed in dual form," and the rationalist successors to Prof. McCabe—scientists every one—will say, "We are all agreed upon this subject and that is the end of discussion!" But I would not be a bit surprised if some Irish descendant of mine, would still insist on thinking for himself and asking further evidence.

But enough on the subject of man! "The London bridge is falling down!" The facts of nature have risen to demolish the philosophy of evolution.

But, I have said in the second place

EVOLUTION IS THE PHILOSOPHY OF SKEPTICISM

At this point, history is replete with illustrations. In its entire life history, it has either been advocated by those who were naturally skeptical, or, if adopted by believers, they became skeptical in consequence. The skeptical attitude of Huxley—the agnostic; Spencer—the philosopher, and Haeckel—my opponent's teacher, are more widely known than were their scientific attainments.

Charles Darwin, we are told, was a student for the ministry, and in his life and letters by his son, Francis, speaking of the period between 1828 to 1831, he says, "I did not then in the least doubt the strict and literal truth of every word in the Bible," but in a letter written to a German youth in 1879, and printed on page 277 of the same volume, he says, "For myself, I do not believe that there ever has been any revelation," and a few sentences later, he speaks of "deserving to be called an atheist."

When has it had other effect upon men's lives? Witness the transmutation of my opponent from a prophet of Catholicism to an apostle of agnosticism. I have carefully read every single word of his discussion of the subject of "God's existence," and I find his uniform conclusion is against it. This conclusion he reaches, in spite of the testimony of language, which, according to as high an authority as Max Muller, points unmistakably to Monotheism and to an original worship of the one and true God.

This agnostic conclusion Prof. McCabe reaches in spite of the Paley arguments for the existence of God on the testimony of nature itself, whose order and beauty are alike eloquent as to His greatness and glory! And in reaching this conclusion, Prof. McCabe confessedly parts company from the overwhelming majority of the very men whose testimony he demands that I accept in favor of evolution. To be more specific, he opposes William James. He sets himself against Father Boedder; he repudiates the ontological argument of St. Anselm; he will have none of the reasonings of Dr. Warschauer as they proceed from "cause to effect." He bitterly denounces Sir Oliver Lodge, concerning whom he once asserted "He is a man of science and does not eke out his arguments with quotations from ancient authorities or foreigners whose names and authority the reader is not likely to know," but later he seeks in every possible way to discredit his scientific attainments, in order that Lodge's religious faith may fall into discard.

The great Dr. Wallace, the matchless Lord Kelvin, the notable Sir. J. J. Thompson, Principal Lloyd Morgan, Dr. Ballard, the immortal Bergson, Eucken, Martineau, LaConte, John Fiske; those several American professors, who in 1897 published a book, "The Conception of God;" the eight Oxford men, who, in 1902, put forth another; Dr. Rashdall, Prof. Jas. Ward, the seven Oxford men who, in 1912 gave to the world their "Foundations," intended as a reconstruction of the Christian belief—these all have written sufficiently well to disturb my opponent and lead him to attempt an answer to each and every one of them, because they are united on the fact that there must be an infinite Creator back of nature; and

yet, their united testimony makes no profound impression upon him, so deeply immersed is he in the atheistic doctrine of evolution.

Aye, more, when Henry Fairfield Osborne, one of our first American scientists, claims, as he does in his recent book, that the great outstanding minds of the world today believe in God, and that many of them are advocates of the Christian religion; and even when no less a name than that of Robert Millikan joins him at once in the exercise of that faith and its far-reaching influence, the united testimony of these is all swept aside. For what reason? To save the face of the false and atheistic philosophy of Evolution.

It was when commenting on an infidelity growing out of that very devotion to an unproved doctrine, that Osborne said concerning the well-known adage, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." "Lest we become too serious, let us refer to the immortal Pickwick, wherein Sam Weller speaks of the fascination of widows and says, "A little widow is a dangerous thing." "I am reminded of this when I see the first effects of science and of the principle of evolution,—not only on the student mind, but on the mind of the man on the street and on the mind of the man of letters."

Again and again, in the course of his discussion, my opponent has referred, in scant praise, to the forty thousand preachers of his own country. He would hold no more compliment for the hundred thousand of my own blessed land. These are specialists in religion, every one a religious scientist, if you please. We have given to it a life-study; and yet, what does our concurrent testimony to the existence of God mean, when this advocate of evolution can set against us a few dozen of the world's physical scientists who deny God? Suppose, however, that Prof. Leuba's statement is true, that a majority of these physical scientists now doubt His existence and deny immortality, since there are only one hundred true ones in England, and possibly even less in America, why should they disturb the 140,000 specialists in the science of religion?

But let me hasten to say, at this point,—

There is no debate between the contestants of this evening. I believe as firmly that the tendency of evolution is to atheism as does my honored opponent, and I say with all frankness that, while this long list of names to which he elaborately refers in his book, and a few of which I have called in your presence this night, have their gods every one. "The spirit of cosmos," "the God of the modernist," "the limited God of Sir Oliver Lodge," of Kant, and "the force that is working for righteousness," etc., etc., etc.; I claim little in common with their mental creations and am well nigh disposed to join with Prof McCabe in saying that, "I would not give a two pence" for their entire pantheon of partial gods!

I am not here to defend these gods of evolution, or evolutionary gods at all; but the God of the Bible instead,—the God that "created the heavens and the earth and all that in them is;" the God whose wisdom is infinite, whose power knows no limitations, whose love transcends all human comprehension, and whose creative acts alone can account for a universe such as that of which we are a part.

Let me say, however, that Henry Fairfield Osborne does approach the very conception that I am now advocating and to which

evolution, in its true interpretation, is the eternal enemy, when he says:

"We naturalists accept as transcendent the teaching that the universe is by no means the result of accident or chance, but of an omnipresent beauty and order, attributed in the Old Testament to Jehovah, in our language to God."

Would God they were all of one mind on that subject, and then this war of words would be at an end. But just so long as teachers, subsisting on the public monies of the state, attempted to trace the history of man along what Howard Kelley calls "the gamut of the animal creation through multiplied millions of years, to an archaean ooze—a natural product of hitherto eternally dead matter,"—just that long, every clear thinker, as well as every advocate of the Christian faith must lift his voice against a doctrine that seeks to dethrone God, thereby orphaning the universe and leaving us with only an accidental chaos rather than an orderly and divinely created cosmos.

If one ask for the explanation of this skeptical modernism, the answer is at hand. It is not the language of the scientist, but it is the language of Scripture, and on that very account vastly more dependable. Dr. A. E. Winship, editor of the Journal of Education, writes.

"Any book on physics, electricity or astrology written eight years ago is now out of date; any geography or history written eight years ago is spineless; any philosophy or pedagogy of eight years ago is nerveless; any book on physiology or psychology that is eight years old is a joke; any book on chemistry, biology or sociology written eight years ago is comedy; any book on economics, industry or commerce, written eight years ago, is tragedy."

But there is a Book written from two thousand to three thousand five hundred years ago, that is truth, and "truth changeth not," and that Book says:

"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."

Long ago, this same Word of God enjoined upon the ministry concerning the truth, "guard the trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so-called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith." I Tim. 6:20-21.

But I turn to the most important feature of it all, and the one that profoundly affects the last clause in our resolution of debate, namely, the question of having this philosophy taught in public schools, and I affirm that

EVOLUTION FRUITS IN ANARCHY AND IN CRIME

Its imaginary history is chaos and carnage. Once more I will let my opponent speak. It requires the eloquence of his own language to do justice to his own conception. "The price of evolu-

tion has been an ocean of blood, a hell of pain and bestiality. I do not want to insert too much science here, but let me recall one page. Everybody knows something about the great Coal Forests (now compressed into our coal seams.) The warm age in which they lived ended in an Ice Age which slew thirty-nine out of every forty species of living things on the earth. It was a monumental carnage. Sad, terrible ages, and sharks with six-inch teeth, and reptiles with two or three hundred monstrous fangs. . . . But I need not go over it all. The machinery of evolution has been ghastly. And the issue of hundreds of millions of years (as geologists now count) of this was a 'man' so stupid and bestial that it took him two million years to reach a civilization in which seven out of ten still live in poverty and meanness, and wars are possible which will blast ten million out of existence in four years. The religious reader will at least recognize that here I could use lurid rhetoric, for which I have some faculty if I merely wished to 'attack Christianity.'"

For the moment, we will leave apart the thought of attacking Christianity and face the philosophy itself in its carnage aspect. What wonder that a philosophy that can only exist on condition of having such a past, should now express itself in brutality and bloody wars! Prof. Williams of Oxford said:

"Nietzsche was the only man who ever had the hardihood to push this philosophy of evolution to its legitimate consequences, and when he had done so, it proved a transvaluation of all values and a demoralization of all morality."

Is there any marvel when Nietzsche, who looked to it to produce the world's superman, declared that in the struggle for existence the German was the fittest to survive, and then he turned it about and called him a "blonde beast."

John Burroughs, the great naturalist and scientist with whom my opponent is proud to claim sympathy, admits that the Germans, by the adoption of this philosophy of the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, became a menace to the world and wrote a few years ago:

"They are the fittest to survive by reason of sheer power; they are the least fit by reason of sheer brutality—their reliance upon the predatory methods and the lower aims of earlier times. They have gone forth to battle in the spirit of their ancestral Huns, and in many ways in a worse spirit. . . . Wreckers of cathedrals, destroyers of libraries, despoilers of cemeteries, slayers of old men and women and children and priests and nuns, barbarians by instinct, pirates and incendiaries by practice, terrorists by training, slaves by habit and bullies by profession, void of humility, void of spirituality, resourceful but not inventive, thoro but not original, docile as individuals but brazen and defiant as a nation—ravishing, maiming, poisoning, burning, suffocating, deporting, enslaving, murderers of the very soul of a people, so far as it is in their power—the rest of the world can live on terms of peace and goodwill with them only after they have drained to the dregs the bitter cup of military defeat." (Inspiration or Evolution. p. 63.)

Prof. More of the University of Cincinnati, a far more careful speaker, on page 258 of his book "The Limitations of Science" says,

"Nietzsche regarded the self-assertive superman as a true reaction against the prevalent man of sympathy, and as a cure for the disease of the age."

But More concludes,

"If the predominant object of science is to acquire power, how can we escape the conclusion that if it should become the arbiter of ethics, society would tend to a condition closer to the ideals of Nietzsche than of sentimental eugenics? Can we look with complaisance on the unrestricted development of either of these ideals? Nietzsche teaches a gospel of scientific evolution when the restraints are removed from the free exercise of self-interest. The gospel of the Superman who transferred to the ambitions of a nation, as was done by Treitsche, shows its results in that doctrine of necessity of the Germans which has plunged Europe into war. No individual and no nation can believe for long that in him or in it rest the culture and the power of the world without resorting ultimately to the arbitrament of force to overcome opposition. And, on the other hand, the ideal of a world governed by human evolution and depending on brotherly love—a world under a banner floating from a Peace Palace of The Hague—is a dream of sentimentality."

Can any man who is interested in the education of America forget the Chicago experience in this whole matter? I was in that city on the day when it was shocked, as it had never been shocked before, by the brutal, beastly and damnable murder of the little Frank's lad; and Clarence Darrow, America's most noted agnostic and evolutionist attorney, came to the defence of the student-murders. This is what he said, "Babe Leopold took to philosophy. He became enamored of the philosophy of the Nietzsches," and then he quoted from Nietzsche, "Why so soft, oh, my brethren, so unresisting and yielding? Why is there so much disavowal and allegation in your heart. Why is there so little faith in your looks? For all creators are hard. . . . This new table, oh, my brethren, I put over you; Become hard. . . . To be obsessed by moral consideration, purposes a very low grade of intellect. . . . A great man, a man whom nature has built up, is greater, however, less cautious and more free from the fear of public opinion. He does not possess the virtues which are compatible with respectability, with being respected, nor any of those things which are counted among the virtues of the herd."

And then, Clarence Darrow said,

"If this boy is to blame for this, where did he get it? The University that taught it would be more to blame than he is; the scholars of the world would be more to blame than he is."

And I agree with Darrow in that conclusion.

That's the bloody issue of this bestial instruction. The fruits of its philosophy, at present, is no better than its purported past. And now I turn back for a moment to my opponent's hint that if he wanted to attack Christianity in view of the bloody past, he

would have some arguments with which to do it, and I ask in all candor, how could he attack Christianity for a history with which he himself thinks it has so little to do?

Within the week, I have read six books from his pen and in every one of them he declares that Christianity has never been a vital force in the world, (a declaration contrary to fact, I grant you)—but one that cuts the foundations from beneath his threatened charge. He says that when Rome had thirty millions, the Christians did not exceed one million, and he says at the present time in England and on the continent and in America, not one man in ten attends church, and only one in three makes any profession of Christian faith. And yet, he intimates that Christianity was responsible for the late war. But he must admit the German leaders in the war were evolutionists, practically every one, and he has already asserted in print that in France, the Catholic church, pretty nearly the only one that functions largely in that land, is without political office or influence. How strange, in view of such charges, to try to make it appear that the Church of Jesus Christ, so pitifully in the minority according to his estimates, should determine the destiny of nations, control the action of armies and settle the international disputes of the world.

I should like, also, to remind my Opponent that if he will consult my volume of Daniel vs. Darwinism, he will find that I even took the risk of governmental disapproval to oppose the last war, and I invited the wrath of intimate personal friends, my own church officials—millionaires in the steel industry—by opposing our war with the Philipinos twenty years ago. Here is a passage that I uttered when the war-cloud of 1917 was on our horizon,

"And even our own nation, so long boasting itself Christian, draws daily nearer the swirling, sucking circle of deadly shot, asphyxiating fumes and consuming flame of war. Our neutrality, entered upon by our President and his Cabinet, as they were animated by motives worthy of men set to administer the affairs of a great nation, is more and more being at once commercialized and criminalized. Never since the days, when as a babe, leaving my mother's arms, to walk alone, and, while walking, awake to the fact that a civil war was swirling about me, have I seen any movement sweeping over my own country with such rapidity, and backed by such corporate wealth, and quickened by such prospect of multiplied fortunes for the few whose 'god is gold,' as that movement which now names itself 'Preparedness!' It has already impelled certain of our citizens, whose accumulated riches are their curse, to start munition factories that are daily adding millions upon millions to their plethoric purses, and at the same time giving in exchange for these millions on millions, such missiles of death as the devil's world never could devise until now.

If this spirit of war continues to grow at the pace of the past two months; if men, who are more anxious to be political leaders than they are to be patriots, are to remain our spokesmen and to come into places of administrative power; if the factories, hitherto employed in the creation of the implements of peace, are to be turned now to the manufacture of the missiles of torture and

death; if, worse than all, the peace-loving people are to be hoodwinked by daily newspapers, captured already by men more concerned in commercial advantage than with patriotic sentiments; if designing politicians, in order to defeat their opponents, are to have free access to the ears of the unthinking; if Mr. Edison's latest device, the moving picture, is to be made the medium of alarm, impossible without its imaginary lies—then, I declare before God and men that the time has come for the Christian Church to voice herself against this whole bestial business, and that, in terms that no man need misunderstand.

It is a very easy matter for men who represent vested interests, known to be enhanced a hundred fold if only national conflicts can be engendered and kept up, or politicians, out of office, and determined to return to the same at any cost, to call their more conservative—not to say Christian brethren—"traitors to the commonwealth." But it might also be replied that our first and most binding citizenship is, after all, with another King; and our first ruler is over and above all, "The Prince of Peace."

The man who can look at the blood-soaked fields of Europe and chuckle with the thought that they are daily increasing his exchequer, is unfit for citizenship! The man who can think upon the diabolical explosives, made, as Herbert Booth says, "in devilish haste" that they may be instantly hurled against certain of our brothers who happen to be born under other flags, and of fiendish contrivances that fly through the air in the dark, that drop bombs on sleeping children, or turn loose ten thousand piercing lances upon the defenseless heads and shoulders of innocent women; the man who can think on the deadly fumes of liquid fire, exploded in the midst of as fine a regiment of men as ever trod the face of the earth, to send the last one of them either to death or insanity in one short hour, and not revolt at it all, is far removed from the spirit of the Nazarene who never lifted His hand against another, nor assumed an attitude toward any man but that of kindness, sweetness and assistance." (Daniel vs. Darwinism, pp. 69-72).

I should like, also, to remind him that my great friend and beloved brother, easily America's first citizen, William Jennings Bryan, who fell but yesterday in his battle against agnosticism and infidelity, resigned his portfolio in the President's cabinet rather than become a party to the crime of continually killing men, and by that act proved his Christian spirit and illustrated his constitutional opposition to the bloody, bestial doctrine of "the struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest."

Teach this to your children at the expense of the state and what will be the result? Aye, what is the result already? Let me prove it to you by the latest deliverance. Lawrence Veiller writes in the December "World's Work" after this manner:

"An official report of the New York State Commission of Prisons, made a few months ago, reveals an appalling increase during the last three years in the number of young men between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one committed to the Tombs Prison,

charged with serious crimes—an increase from 1,559 in 1922 to 2,328 in 1924. These are not young men charged with petty offences but men charged with serious crimes and held for action by the higher courts. The commission adds that in the last five years nearly 10,000 boys under twenty-one years of age have been confined in this prison for serious crimes." (World's Work, Dec., 1925, p. 134.)

Mark you these boys are the products of present education!

Now, let another scientist speak and tell you why Henry Newell Martin, a pupil of Huxley, standing before the American Society of Naturalists in Boston, said,

"We science teachers have been making a great mistake; we have been developing the minds of our students and neglecting their souls."

And, commenting upon that, Henry Fairfield Osborne adds,

"On the headstone of Huxley's grave is the inscription: 'He giveth His beloved sleep, and if forever, 'tis for the best.'"

This inscription is consistent with the agnostic attitude of mind. Many of us are familiar with Huxley's tribute to the Bible, not only as one of the most exquisite in diction, but as one of the most profound in conviction that our age needs the lofty moral teachings of the Bible. Huxley himself was brought up with very strict religious training by a gifted mother who was a devout Sabatarian. In the life of this revered teacher and in the lives of many friends and colleagues in various branches of science of similar religious training, I have observed qualities of truthfulness, of straightforwardness, of righteousness, of self-effacement that are ingrained in human character by the right kind of religious training."

How significant his later words, **"Our youthful confidence in the powers of reason has been shattered; like Icarus, we have taken our flight, and the wings of reason have ceased to sustain us."**

Before I sit down, let me speak one other word! Social evolution, which is now the beau-ideal of agnosticism, is as signally failing of desirable results as is the doctrine itself of sustaining data. Society is not improving, nor are the conditions, being created by present-day education, prophetic of a better future. On the contrary, every observant man knows that we are moving into the latter times concerning which the prophet said, **"Some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, etc." (I Tim. 1-2).** The time has come **"when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts heap to themselves teachers having itching ears; and they turn away their ears from the truth, and are turned unto fables," (II Tim. 3-4),** chief of which is the lie of evolution.

Was there ever a time in human history when the literal word was more fulfilled than now, and men were **"lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce break-**

ers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." (II Tim. 3:2-5).

Is the Church of God to blame for this? My opponent thinks the church would die if it were not for the enormous amount of money that is being expended upon it. We wonder if he has reckoned up that amount. If he has not, it has been done for him; twice done, and since one of these performances is by a scientist, he would certainly accept it.

Henry Fairfield Osborne provides us a table based upon the advertising pages of the press to see what effect it would probably have upon public thought. We find that it gives largest space to fashion; second to athletics; third to political misconduct; fourth to domestic difficulties; fifth to stage and movies; sixth to private misconduct; seventh to politics; eighth to education; ninth to food and health and tenth and last to religion.

In the Year Book of the Y. M. C. A. of 1925, there was a catalogue of expenses showing that out of every dollar, 24½ cents would go to living costs; 22 cents to luxuries; 14 cents to waste; 13½ cents to miscellaneous; 11 cents to investment; 8½ cents to crime; 4½ cents to government; 1½ cents to schools and three-fourths of a cent to the church. The same report shows that the cost of crime in the United States in 1924 was three billions of dollars—an amount sufficient to carry the expenses of all the Y. M. C. A.'s in the United States and Canada for sixty years, at the rate now being expended, fifty millions a year. And yet, our friend and brother feels that rationalism is rapidly coming to the ascendant and that it holds the future in its molding hands. Our fear is that he is right about it, and so I join my voice with that of that great scientist, Henry Fairfield Osborne, when he says,

"The genesis of the intellectual and spiritual powers of man through the Lamarck-Spencer hypothesis of use and disuse fails as entirely as does the survival of the fittest or any other useful theory of genesis of the mind and of the soul. All the Lamarickian and purely materialistic hypotheses which were current when I was studying philosophy and biology in 1876 have fallen one by one by the wayside, and the origin of the soul of man is more of a mystery than ever.

"What has become of the fate of the rationalists of 1876?
* * * No overconfident rationalist of 1876 dreamt of radiant energy as we know it now; no one can dream of biology as it will be fifty years hence when it is studied by physical methods. Rationalists are more humble now, because in the hunting-field of human thought the scientists have taken as many falls as the theologians; the honors are even in this regard." (Earth Speaks to Bryan, p. 57.)

Following this statement, he quotes from his great teacher, Huxley, "When the great mass of the English people declare that

they want to have the children in the elementary schools taught the Bible, and when it was plain from the terms of the Act that it was intended that such Bible-reading should be permitted, unless good cause for prohibiting it could be shown, I do not see what reason there is for opposing that wish. Certainly, I, individually, could with no shadow of consistency oppose the teaching of the children of other people that which my own children are taught to do.
* * * I have always been strongly in favor of secular education, in the sense of education without theology; but I must confess I have been no less seriously perplexed to know by what practical measures the religious feeling, which is the essential basis of conduct, was to be kept up, in the present utterly chaotic state of opinion, without the use of the Bible."

My opponent, in one of his books, holds that religion was born of man's fear of his own shadow, and later of the recognized forces of nature. He thinks it evolved from fetichism to polytheism, then to monotheism and finally in highest civilization, to rationalism. He claims it came to this last stage in Rome, Greece and China two to three thousand years ago. While admitting that progress became paralyzed in China with the rise of rationalism, and both Greece and Rome perished at that point of intellectual attainment—rotting—he assures us that such fate will never again overtake the religion of rationalism. What a pity to have no better assurance of it than his unsupported opinion.

Walter Rathenau recently said: "Woe to the race and to its future should it remain deaf to the voice of conscience; should it still be petrified in materialistic apathy; should it rest content with tinsel; should it submit to the bondage of selfishness and hate. We are not here for the sake of possessions, nor for the sake of power, nor for the sake of happiness; we are here that we may elucidate the divine elements in the human spirit."

When God is dethroned in the interest of a false philosophy, the pillars of civilization will shortly show that they have no stable base!

As a tax-payer and parent, and a patron of higher learning, I refuse to rest in supine silence, while our schools are atheised in the name of a "science falsely so-called."

THE BIBLE OF THE EXPOSITOR AND THE EVANGELIST

BY

W. B. RILEY

The Union Gospel Press, Cleveland, Ohio, is beginning the publication of **The Bible of the Expositor and the Evangelist**—

40 VOLUMES

This series will undertake the dual task of giving an exposition of the entire Bible in forenoon sermons, together with evangelistic appeal, based upon particular texts selected from the body of the morning study and treated in a soul-winning way at night!

The young preacher and the Sunday school teacher will find in these volumes a long-felt need. Young ministers are constantly asking themselves, "What next?" They will see in this series a method whereby they need never make that inquiry. Through a series of five years, the pastor of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, has preached to his people in the morning these expositions, and instead of wearying with it, his audiences have increased and packed the great auditorium. At night, he has taken from the body of the morning text some particular passage and made it the basis of an evangelical appeal, which has resulted in the conversion of thousands of souls. The night text comes as incidental to the morning study. It need not be searched for. It will suggest itself and clamor for treatment.

The Sunday school teacher has in this series of volumes exactly what every Sunday school teacher needs—an exposition of the Word and the language and spirit of soul-winning appeal. When these two combine in a teacher, he is commonly successful.

The low cost of this publication will be an amazement to interested people. To get out such volumes at \$1.00 in cloth and 50c in paper is something new with present-day publishers, and yet, W. B. Musselman of the Union Gospel Press, Cleveland, has contracted so to do.

THE WHOLE BIBLE COURSE

Sunday school studies begins January 1st, with Matthew. Inasmuch as Matthew is treated in connection with the other synoptic gospels, Mark and Luke, it will take at least four volumes to cover this portion of the book, but when seven months of such aids can be secured by the young minister or the Sunday school teacher for \$2.00 in paper, or \$4.00 in cloth, in four beautiful volumes, no one need go without this help.

These volumes represent maturity of study, simplicity in expression and special adaptation to pulpit and Sunday school uses. They are being ordered in large numbers even in advance of the first volume from the press. The International Sunday school lessons will also be covered beginning with the publication of Genesis before April, and from that time, it is hoped to so bring the series from the press as to meet the demands of both these great Sunday school organizations. Order of the Union Gospel Press, Box 680, Cleveland, Ohio, single volume or whole set.



WANTED!

100,000 NEW MEMBERS

for

THE CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS ASSOCIATION

By June 1st, 1926

Will You Be One?

During comparatively recent years, Higher Criticism of the Bible, known as Rationalism or Modernism, has secured a strangle hold on the throat of practically every evangelical denomination, and seeks entire control not only of pulpits and schools, but foreign mission fields as well. Already this infidelity concerning inspiration, deity and atonement has wrought untold harm. How to throw off this deadly grip is the problem of all orthodox men and women who love the Lord and His Word, and hold to the Fundamentals of Christianity.

THE CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS

movement has arisen with no other purpose than to destroy this enemy and strengthen the faith of Christian people in the simple, fundamental truths of the Gospel.

OUR CONFESSION OF FAITH

I. We believe in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as verbally inspired of God, and inerrant in the original writings, and that they are of supreme and final authority in faith and life.

II. We believe in one God, eternally existing in three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

III. We believe that Jesus Christ was begotten by the Holy Spirit, and born of the Virgin Mary, and is true God and true man.

IV. We believe that man was created in the image of God, that he sinned and thereby incurred not only physical death but also that spiritual death which is separation from God; and that all human beings are born with a sinful nature, and, in the case of those who reach moral responsibility, become sinners in thought, word and deed.

V. We believe that the Lord Jesus

Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures as a representative and substitutionary sacrifice; and that all that believe in Him are justified on the ground of His shed blood.

VI. We believe in the resurrection of the crucified body of our Lord, in His ascension into heaven, and in His present life there for us, as High Priest and Advocate.

VII. We believe in "that blessed hope," the personal, premillennial and imminent return of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

VIII. We believe that all who receive by faith the Lord Jesus Christ are born again of the Holy Spirit and thereby become children of God.

IX. We believe in the bodily resurrection of the just and the unjust, the everlasting felicity of the saved and the everlasting conscious suffering of the lost.

DO YOU BELIEVE WITH US?

Do you care enough for your religious convictions to help us fight this, the greatest battle in the religious world today? If so, will you join hands with 99,999 others and say it with signature and check, mailing to RUTH WAHLQUIST, Sec'y, 1020 Harmon Place, Minneapolis, Minn.

If you desire to become an active member of the Christian Fundamentals Association, (receiving notices of conferences and some free literature, including the magazine), a right to vote and hold office, send \$5.00 per annum; an associate member with magazine \$2.00 per annum.