

The Bible

VS.

FALSE THEORIES

Radio Talks By

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

CHER-
E
py 1

THE BIBLE
vs.
FALSE THEORIES

A series of short sermons delivered over
RADIO STATION WTMV (1490)
on Sunday afternoons, August 5, 1945 to October 28, 1945
by W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

Sponsored by
CHURCHES OF CHRIST

7121 Manchester Avenue,
St. Louis, Mo.

412 Queen Street,
Webster Groves, Mo.

5344 Lillian Avenue,
St. Louis, Mo.

137 East Maple Street,
Hartford, Ill.

29th and Washington Streets,
Granite City, Ill.



Dedicated to
LIONEL BURTON
of the Manchester Singers,
Now with the United States Navy.

GOD IS

This is an age of doubt and skepticism. It is an era of scoffing and ridicule of that which is sacred. Nothing that is worthwhile seems to be safe from the blasphemous tongues of those who think it is smart to flaunt their paganism and atheism in the face of those who love the Lord. It is amazing, but true, that men will laugh at God. Even in the churches of this present day, the pulpits are occupied with religious teachers who do not believe the Bible, and deny the great truths of the ages.

Just a few years ago, Sinclair Lewis, the novelist, was invited to speak at the Linwood Boulevard Christian Church, in Kansas City, by the pastor, Burriss A. Jenkins. It was shortly after the death of the great naturalist Luther Burbank, who, you remember, did not believe in the existence of God. In the course of his remarks from the pulpit, Lewis arraigned certain religionists who ascribed the death of Burbank to the just vengeance of God. He then told the audience that he was going to conduct an experiment. He said, "If there is a God in heaven who strikes down men like Luther Burbank for their utterances, then I forthwith call upon Him to strike me within the next ten minutes. If He kills men who say there is nothing to Him, let Him kill me and prove it." He drew forth his watch and placed it on the pulpit stand, and said, "Here's a lovely chance for God to show what He can do. I give Him ten minutes, which ought to be long enough if He is as powerful as His believers pretend, but if I'm killed in an automobile accident on the way home, it doesn't count."

At the end of ten minutes, this blatant skeptic picked up his watch and smilingly returned it to his pocket. With a smirking grin, he said, "That ought to prove it!" Now, I presume a lot of ignorant fools would think that such a performance did show there was no God. It did not weaken my faith at all. I do not worship a God who is under orders from Sinclair Lewis, or who has to take time now and then to smack down a worm of the dust so that I'll know He still lives. Suppose an ant crawling across the desert a thousand miles from our city should some day crawl

upon the Santa Fe railroad track, and wave his feelers around in the air, and summon all of his fellow-ants who have been crawling across the sand. Suppose he should address them in this fashion, "Ants, there are some of you who believe that there is a president of the Santa Fe railway sitting in an office far off from here. I deny it! If there is such a person, let him prove it by sending a train in the next ten minutes to run over and crush me!" And just suppose that no train was scheduled in that time, and the ant gaily cried out, "There you are, friends, that proves there's no president to the Santa Fe!" But would it? Of course not. The president of the Santa Fe has too much to do to pay attention to an ant. And certainly he could not be expected to send a special train out of Chicago just to bump off such a little, insignificant agnostic.

The mere fact that God does not kill every blabber-mouth atheist in no way argues that there is no God. What I would like to know is what Sinclair Lewis has to say about God ten minutes after he dies. Atheism is only for this world. There are no atheists in the next. Men may go right to the door of death shouting that there is no God and no hell, but as soon as that door closes on them, they change their minds and change them quickly. A man once preached a sermon from hell. As long as he lived he wasn't interested in others, and couldn't even see a beggar lying at his gate. But when he died, in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment, and he could see that same beggar afar off. Funny how death improves some people's eyesight, isn't it?

And do you know that same man who was rich on earth, but wasn't concerned about anyone's welfare, all of a sudden became interested in mission work when he got to hell? He pleaded that Lazarus be permitted to go back to earth and preach the truth to his brethren, so they wouldn't come to the same place he landed in! It has been said, "There are no atheists in the foxholes!" There are none in hell either! Everybody in hell knows that there is a God, and if some of the infidels who died protesting that there was no God could talk to you now, they would say that surely there is one scripture that is true, and that the one which says, "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God!" It's a little hard to make some of these know-it-alls think they are fools while

they live, but you won't have to convince them of it after they die. They'll know it by themselves without being told.

I believe in God! Man himself proves that there is a God. For man is on earth! He is here! You are here! And you had to come from somewhere! And if you trace your origin back far enough you must come to a beginning, unless you conclude that man has existed from eternity. To do that would be to prove that man himself is God. How did man arrive here? He must have come from one of three sources, either by mere chance, by creation of another man, or by the power of a higher being.

He couldn't originate by chance, because no system can come by chance! And man's body is the most wonderful system on earth. It is a perfect machine! When you see the cogs working in a combine as it cuts and threshes the wheat, do you think that such a machine originated by chance? Do you really feel that all of this iron ore came from the earth, passed through the furnace, was amalgamated in just the proper proportion with hardening steel, fell into the proper gears, and meshed without some guiding power? That would be silly. But it isn't a bit sillier than to think that man is the result of blind selection, that started him in as a little one-celled creature and then took him through the tadpole, frog, monkey, chimpanzee stages and finally just by chance developed him into what he now is! That's ridiculous! How in the world can those who claim to be educated fall for such tommyrot?

But, on the other hand, if you take the position that man did not come by mere chance, you must assume that he was made by another power his equal or superior. If the other power was his exact equal, then it was another man. But that would be silly, for then we would have a man existing before the first man. And if that was true then the first man wasn't the first man at all, but the second, and if he wasn't the first, but the man who made him was the first, then who made the first? That puts us back where we started!

The Bible answers all of this. It starts out thus, "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth" (Genesis 1:1). **IN THE BEGINNING—GOD!** What majesty, what power, what might there is in those four words. And now we read, "And God

said, Come now, let us make man in our own image, and in the image of God created He him!" Another sublime statement! Man came into existence by the power of God. Let us read once more, "And God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul" (Genesis 2:7). Certainly when I look at the wonderful mechanism of the human body, I must know that it speaks eloquently of the One who designed and created it. I cannot help but believe in God.

When I look at my watch, I am made to marvel. I see the intricate design of the wheels. I note the amazing perfection of the balance staff. I see the consummate functioning of the mainspring. And I know that all of these are not the result of mere chance. For every result there must be a cause. Back of every design is a designer. Back of every plan is a planner! Back of every thought is a thinker. Man is a design, transcending all other designs. His body bears the stamp of a divine workmanship. Man proves that there is a God. Behold yourself and believe! Look at yourself and learn!

Let no one tell you that there is no God! To lose faith in God is to lose faith in your responsibility. To lose that is to bring yourself into a position where you will lose all the reward that is worth working for. Remember always that, "Without faith it is impossible to please Him, for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him!" (Hebrews 11:6). For every positive there is a negative. If, therefore, God rewards all who diligently seek Him, He will punish all who do not. It is not enough, therefore, to have a passive belief that God exists, but you must make that an activated faith, by diligently seeking Him. Start this day to know the will of God, and then knowing it, do the things He has commanded. You will be happier in this world, and also in the world to come!

ATHEISM AND AMERICA

A very few years ago, one of the most damnable institutions ever permitted to exist in this nation was chartered by the State of New York. It was organized by Charles Smith and Freeman Hopwood, the last named being the prodigal son of a sectarian minister. That organization to which I refer is the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism. Among other objectives, they announce to all and sundry that they propose to stop the reading of the Bible in the schoolroom, since it is to them a Jewish scrapbook, full of vain mouthings about a God who is called an "unholy terror!" They propose to do away with the Presidential proclamation of Thanksgiving Day, since they declare that there is no God and we have no right to be thankful to any non-existent being. They also denounce the idea of the President taking oath of office with his hand upon the Bible and suggest the substitution of an almanac or some other secular product if one is needed.

Too, they would abolish all Christian morality, and substitute what is called "natural morality," and they would abolish the thought of sanctity connected with marriage, and forbid ministers performing wedding ceremonies. Last of all, they would remove the slogan "In God We Trust" from all of our coins! Now, a lot of you who listen in this day and who are shocked by such unhallowed blasphemy and damnable ideas will sit back with smug complacency and declare that, "It can't happen here!" Is that right? Well, let's see!

On April 3, 1926, a member of this association, James I. Elliott, filed a petition for injunction to prevent the payment of salaries to the chaplains of the Senate and House of Representatives, and all those connected with the War and Navy Departments. The suit was brought against the Treasurer of the United States, and was filed in the District of Columbia Supreme Court. In the petition it was alleged that chaplains were "ecclesiastics engaged in performance of a religious and sectarian duty not authorized and expressly prohibited by the Constitution," and that the plaintiff "as a taxpayer, and all other citizens of the United States, will

suffer irreparable damage if the salaries are paid out of the moneys in the Treasury of the United States, contrary to the Constitution." Now, this shows how bold atheism has become, when it will in open court attack the idea of the nation supplying religious comfort to its soldiers and sailors in time of war.

But that isn't the half of it. Many of you will recall having read at the time about the organization of an atheist body in the University of Rochester, New York. The Associated Press reported it thus, "The Rochester Journal says that the '*Damned Souls Society*' has been formed at the University of Rochester, a Baptist institution, 'to prove the necessity of atheism, and to abolish belief in God and all religions based on that belief.' The new society with a membership of thirteen students, including men and women of both upper and lower classes, aims, the paper quotes its leader as saying, 'to convince those who are on the fence of the necessity of rejecting a theological God and all forms of religion based on the powers attributed to this God.' Students who are members of the club will not be prosecuted or expelled, although the university in no way gives encouragement, Dr. Charles Hoering, dean of the college for men, said last night when informed of the existence of such a group." Shortly after this appeared, other articles told of the formation of such societies among other young people—societies known by such titles as "Hell-Bound Heathen," "Satan's Angels," etc.

Perhaps you will say that all of this occurred about 1930 and that is a long time back. But if you think for one minute that the American Association for Advancement of Atheism is no longer working, all you need to do is simply send a request for their free literature, and you'll get through the United States mail the most scurrilous, disreputable and despicable reading matter that has ever been published. Full of lies, alive with treachery, it attacks the Bible and all that we as Americans have held dear.

Now, there might not be so much in this to concern us, were it not for the fact that the churches of today are aiding atheism in its spread. I make the charge that there are those today in our pulpits in this land who are nothing more or less than agnostics. They are Judas Iscariots who have betrayed our Lord for thirty

pieces of silver; they have crucified the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam in his book entitled, "Preaching in a Revolutionary Age," which contains the Lyman Beecher lecture series delivered in 1944 to the students of Yale Divinity School, illustrates exactly what I am talking about. He is a bishop in the Methodist Church, and now president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. He takes issue with the Bible, and denies the idea of the atonement of Jesus Christ, or the fact that God gave His Son to die for our sins. Listen to this statement from his book, "We have long since rejected a conception of reconciliation associated historically with an ideal of a deity that is loathsome. God, for us, cannot be thought of as an angry, awful, avenging Being, who because of Adam's sin must have His Shylockian pound of flesh. No wonder an honest boy could say in justifiable repugnance, 'Dirty bully'."

There you have it! God is called a Shylock because He sent His Son to die for the sins of the world. He is called a dirty bully because of His righteous anger against sin. I tell you people, when those who stand before classes of young ministers deny the principles of sin, atonement and the resurrection, and call God a dirty bully because He punishes this world for its unrighteousness, we are pretty far down the road. That's about the way Russia started in her communistic beliefs. She, too, ridiculed the idea of the sacred death of Jesus. She put up posters in public places and pictured individuals standing about eating the body of Jesus and drinking His blood in a wild orgy. Thus she scoffed at the Lord's Supper and called those who partook of this memorial, cannibals! America is on the road to communism, atheism and spiritual decay, and I charge the churches today with aiding and abetting that move. That's what happens when you get away from God's teaching that there is One Body, and Jesus Christ is head of that body, the church.

It's time for thinking people to call a halt. It's time to come out from among those who no longer love the Lord. There is not one ounce of scriptural right for the existence of a sectarian body. Protestantism has engaged in a bitter, relentless fight against itself.

It is made up of bodies galore, all of them opposing the others, while the great "isms" of the world have taken advantage of this bickering and strife, and are filling the earth with their soul-destroying propaganda.

Let's get back to the Bible. If we all re-examine our hearts and our faith and come back to the truth, then we can stand together and fight the devil to a finish. This is our only solution. Some of my brethren, when they read about these things taught in the schools, immediately begin to say, "We must build our own schools and colleges, where we can teach the truth and these things will not be heard!" That's not the solution. You cannot build a fence to keep the devil out. God has two institutions already that are intended to prepare the young people for the great fight against sin. They are the home and the church. Let's work through them and give God the glory. Our young people will have to meet these things some time anyway. They cannot always be where they are not taught. If you raise a flower in a hothouse, when it gets out where the wind blows it will die. Train up your children to meet these things, and let them fight them. The mere fact that some of our boys and girls will some day get a job on the railroad, and there they will hear profanity and dirty talk, is no sign that we should build a Church of Christ railroad from here to Nashville, so that we can always keep them in the proper atmosphere. Neither is it a sign we should build a Church of Christ school in Nashville because they run up against infidelity in other places.

The secret is for "Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." It is for the preachers to fight sin, worldliness and every tendency to depart. It is for the Bible Class teachers to live so they can gain the respect of the young people, and then teach them the way of life. If God's institutions cannot save us, it's a dead cinch that one built by man won't do it! Let's join hands in the home and church to battle atheism and infidelity.

INFIDELITY IN THE PULPIT

I have charged before, and I unhesitatingly affirm again today that America is being betrayed by modern religionists. Jesus Christ is being dethroned, the Bible emasculated, and the faith that saves derided, by a group of mercenary-minded hirelings who are selling religion "down the river" for personal gain and popularity. Robert Ingersoll, the silver-tongued orator of infidelity, never did as much harm as these undermining, treacherous betrayers who hide behind their clerical garb to send forth their poison into the hearts of those who hear and support them. Tom Paine, the arch agnostic of his day, did not do as much damage to the Cause of Christ as a bunch of these modern hypocritical, Bible-chopping preachers are doing.

Let me tell you what I mean! Take for example the teaching of the Word of God on the subject of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. That is the center of God's plan. All of the Old Testament points forward to it, all of the New Testament points backward to it. Our hope of eternal life depends upon the fact that Jesus came forth from the grave. Without that belief we are lost in a world of sin, no chart or compass to guide us toward our eternal destiny.

Back in the days of the apostle Paul, there had already grown up some crackpot, hobbyistic ideas about the resurrection. One class destroyed the faith of some, saying that the resurrection was already past. The apostle said of them, "Their word will eat as doth a cancer: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus, who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already" (2 Timothy 2:17, 18). Another group admitted that Jesus was raised from the dead, but denied that there would be another resurrection in the future in which all of the dead would rise. Of them, Paul asks, "Now if Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there be no resurrection of the dead?" (1 Corinthians 15:12).

I want you to notice that neither of these groups denied the resurrection of Christ. They might have peculiar ideas relative to the general resurrection, but they lived too near the time when

Jesus was raised to ever attempt a denial of that great salient truth. But there are men who deny it now. I have before me a clipping from the Kansas City Star. It contains a special column called "From the Pulpits." The special writer in this article is Joseph Myers, minister of the Community Church, originally the Linwood Christian Church, in Kansas City. Listen while I read his exact words: "Some passionately believe that Jesus arose physically from the grave and moved among men as before His death. Others just as passionately believe that the appearance of Jesus after death was a psychological phenomenon, a profound conviction of His nearness which came into the minds of His discouraged disciples. The details of the story in the three gospels that were written earliest are too meager to enable us to say precisely what happened. My own conviction is that there was nothing physical about the resurrection of Jesus."

Now, friend, if that isn't denying the Lord that bought us, I don't know how you would do it! Jesus didn't come out of the grave physically, says this modern minister. It was a "psychological phenomenon" or "a profound conviction of His nearness. His disciples were discouraged and as they brooded over their loss, it just seemed like He was near them. Now, you might make people in this day believe that infidel tommyrot, but you wouldn't have dared to utter it in the days of the apostles. You couldn't have told that to the impetuous Peter, who saw Jesus standing on shore after His resurrection, and took off from his companions in the boat, and swam to His Lord. I suppose that when the other disciples arrived on shore and saw the fire of coals, with fish laid thereon, as well as bread prepared, that was a phenomenon. Those hungry fishermen who had toiled all night must have been wonderfully relieved when they thought they were eating fish, to suddenly realize that it was just a "profound conviction of nearness" which they were chewing and which an imaginary person had cooked in an imaginary way on an imaginary fire.

There was one of them who doubted all right. After the rest of them told him that Jesus had appeared to them, he refused to believe them. He thought they had seen a will-o'-the-wisp, or a psychological phenomenon. And Thomas told them, "You'll never get me to believe that until I see the nail prints in His hands and

the spear wound in His side." Jesus walked in and said, "Thomas, thrust your finger in these nail holes, and push your hand in the wound in My side!" The doubter fell down gasping, "My Lord and my God!"

Now this modern divine comes along and tells his congregation, "My own conviction is that there was nothing physical about the resurrection of Jesus!" Was he back there at the time? Was he qualified to judge? Listen to the testimony of some who were there, and see if Jesus came forth in a body. "And as they thus spoke, Jesus Himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit." Yes, they didn't think there was anything physical about it. They thought they merely had a "profound sense of His nearness." But let's go on. "And He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself: handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have. And when He had thus spoken, He showed them His hands and His feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, He said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb. And He took it and did eat before them" (Luke 24:36-43). That proved it to those who were present. And it was good proof!

I knew a man once who moved his family into a haunted house, as he was informed by his superstitious neighbors. And sure enough the first night, they heard a ghost in the kitchen. When the man arrived downstairs, after having taken his time, his wife yelled and asked him if he saw the ghost. He informed her that their imaginary visitor had a ghastly appetite, if not a ghostly one, for he had eaten a half of a mincemeat pie. They knew that a spirit did not eat literal food. Jesus appeared along with His disciples in the open air, in closed rooms; He walked with them along the road, talked to them by the sea shore. He prepared food for them, ate with them, invited them to inspect His body and to touch Him. He appeared to them singly, and in small groups. Once He appeared to more than five hundred of them at once! He was with them forty days, taught them, commanded them and

gave them instructions. I'll say one thing for those disciples, that if this was a psychological phenomenon, you could get more people to agree on the same thing then than you can now. But it is foolish and absurd to deny the testimonies of scores who saw Jesus and talked with Him, and take the opinion of a man who never did see Him, and will only see Him at the Judgment for a brief spell before he is denied entrance to heaven. For Jesus says, "Whosoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My Father and His holy angels."

But you ask why I say that these modern preachers acting under the guise of religion do more harm than a real, hard-boiled, dyed-in-the-wool, openly-admitted atheist. I answer that it is because not many are fooled by the mouthings of an agnostic. They will not be led astray by such. But when a man claims to love the Bible, and builds a church, and speaks in the name of religion, a lot of people believe him, solely on account of his influence.

I still take the word of the apostle Paul. He declared that he saw Christ. He reasoned, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified that He raised up Christ; whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ raised from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept."

I believe in the resurrection of Christ. I believe that He came forth bodily from the grave. I challenge any man in the world to take the Bible and prove otherwise, and will meet them any time, any place on this matter!

DINOSAURS AND THE BIBLE

Recently I had a letter from a school boy who asked me these questions: "Since you claim to believe the Bible, I would like to ask you if you also believe that at one time such huge animals as mammoths and dinosaurs lived? Also, how do you account for their destruction, seeing that they no longer inhabit the earth?" I might have told this lad, who is a student of what he thinks is science to ask his science teacher to account for this great change, but instead I wrote him the answer. There doesn't live on earth a scientist who denies the Bible and can answer this young fellow's queries. But the Bible gives a clear-cut reply to it.

Certainly I believe that such creatures as the mammoth, dinosaur and giant camel once roamed the earth. A man would be a fool indeed to deny the plain evidence of such. A few years ago in Calhoun County, Illinois, I went to view a place where they were making a road cut, and saw there the excavation of the bones of a mammoth. I have seen in the museums at Chicago, Denver and Buffalo reproductions skillfully put together of the skeletal framework of these huge creatures. These animals are found in perfectly natural condition frozen in the mudbanks of Siberia and Alaska. They have been excavated from their icy tombs and found with undigested grass in their stomachs, and unchewed hay in their mouths. Their flesh, preserved in nature's refrigerator of the great north, is undecayed and untainted. Men have eaten steaks of these animals which died thousands of years ago and pronounced it palatable and of good flavor.

The condition in which these bodies are found indicates that they died in some sudden catastrophe. No scientist can explain it. Prof. Elmer S. Riggs, of the Field Museum, reporting on his South American expedition, on April 28, 1925, says: "All these early animals apparently died off about the same period, as all were found together with their bones intermingled. This demise is incidentally one of the mysteries of science that have been explained only by conjecture." This is a candid admission that science is powerless to tell us how the earth became at once a sepulcher for these vast and bulky beasts. We believe the Bible gives the solution to the problem.

Dr. R. S. Lull, in referring to the mighty dynasty of giant dinosaurs, says, "One of the most inexplicable of events is the dramatic profound extinction of this mighty race." Whatever the change that took place on earth and caused the result we are talking about, it must be admitted that it came with suddenness and unexpectedly. It cannot be accounted for by the "millions of years" that scientists falsely so-called, like to guess about. And they admit this too, for Henry Fairfield Osborn, world-renowned president of the American Scientific Society, says, "The cutting off of this giant dinosaur dynasty was nearly, if not quite, simultaneous the world over."

In his volume, "Geological Distribution of Animals," pages 149-151, Alfred Russell Wallace says, "We live in a zoologically impoverished world from which all of the hugest, the fiercest and strangest forms have recently disappeared; and it is, no doubt, a much better world for us now that they are gone. Yet it is surely a marvelous fact and one that has hardly been sufficiently dwelt upon—this *sudden* dying out of so many large mammalia not in one place only but over half the land surface of the globe. We cannot but believe that there must have been some physical cause for this great change; and it must have been a cause acting simultaneously over large portions of the earth's surface." Notice the use of the words, "sudden dying," "physical cause," "great change," "simultaneously over large portions of the earth." Was there ever such a cataclysmic force as this mentioned in the Bible?

Even Charles Darwin lifts up his doubting hands, and says, "What then has exterminated so many species and whole genera? The mind at first is irresistibly hurried into the belief of some great catastrophe; but thus to destroy animals, both large and small, in southern Patagonia, in Brazil, on the Cordillera of Peru, in North America and up to Bering Straits, we must shake the entire framework of the globe." This quotation is from Darwin's book, "The Voyage of the Beagle," pages 172, 176.

Now we turn to the Bible and ask ourselves when and where there took place such a great upheaval which changed the face of the globe, deposited fish and aquatic life on the peaks of the highest mountains, buried huge animals in the sediment and mire,

altered the temperature of the earth, and purged it of its former life and inhabitants. For more than 1600 years after creation God permitted man to follow his inclinations and saw the earth becoming more and more wicked. Finally conditions became so terrible that it repented God He had made man. He saw that "the earth was filled with violence" and "the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Then God pronounced His divine judgment upon the guilty world, "And, behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; and everything that is in the earth shall die."

Those who were faithful entered the ark which Noah had prepared. Then the hand of God closed the door of mercy. Dark clouds filled the heavens. The very elements unleashed all of their fury to demonstrate to a puny earth that God reigns on high. Rain began to fall in torrents, but still this was not enough. "The same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up and the floodgates of heaven were opened" (Genesis 7:11). You know the force of a tidal wave. You know that whole cities have been washed away and hundreds killed by such calamities. You have seen the surging Mississippi, as it overflowed its banks, lick hungrily at the homes of those who dwell near. You have seen the forest giants fall with a sickening swish into the muddy waters which undermined them; homes have torn loose from their foundations and disintegrated into the depths. The whole face of the land has been changed time after time. But nothing like we have seen could compare with the flood.

Higher and higher the waters arose. Strong tidal currents from the fountains of the great deep lashed out. Hills disappeared as grains of sand, jets of power would burst forth with indescribable force, rocks be tossed as matchsticks, only to fall and bury themselves deep in the earth from whose bosom they had been rudely shaken. Le Conte in his book, "Elements of Geology," proves that a current running two miles per hour will move stones the size of a hen's egg, or about three ounces weight. But a current of ten miles per hour will move rocks weighing one and a half tons, while one moving at the rate of twenty miles an hour will

move rocks weighing one hundred tons. From this it can be seen that the man doesn't live who can estimate the force of the water as it swept over the earth in one vast, tossing, milling, swirling wave when all the restraints were loosed at once from the fountains of the great deep.

I will freely affirm that most of the events which science says required millions of years to bring about could have been accomplished by the flood. As the waters receded from the earth, the sediment would begin to deposit. The heavier rocks and debris would settle, first imprisoning a mass of the dead animals, fish and other marine life. Then the lighter bits would settle and thus rock strata would be formed containing the bodies of animals, trees and flowers which would later fossilize, and leave their marks upon coal, rocks and other minerals, as the stamp of God's power. Who knows but what the huge mammoths which pushed their swaying bulk through the age of the antediluvium served their purpose by their appearance, and were then destroyed by the One who created them, entombed intact, as a sign to all mankind to come after that the greatness of God's might still reigns over even the giants of His creation? Who knows but what the sepulchers of these gigantic dinosaurs are intended to speak to us eloquently of the wrath of God, even as the open sepulcher of His Son speaks to us of the love of God?

The believer in the Bible accepts the Genesis story of the flood. And the entire scientific world acknowledges that the earth was once covered with water. For sheer stubbornness they deny that it was at the time of the flood of Noah. But every nation reaching into antiquity has its tradition of a world deluge. Tradition admits it, science acknowledges it, and I choose to believe that the Bible explains it and puts the finger of history upon the time and the place. Let this mighty spectacle of world destruction be a lesson to us!

MONKEYS IN THE FAMILY TREE

I am sure you will all agree with me this day that action is produced by thought, and thought is the result of our teaching. We do the things that we do because of the way we think, and we think the way we do because of what we are taught. At this present time the world is concerned about the moral conduct of all, but especially the young people. Volumes have been written on the subject of juvenile delinquency. Warnings have been issued from supreme court judges and those who are at the head of the criminal investigation committees. America is filled with young people who have cast off all restraint; made up of cigarette-smoking, liquor-swigging, gambling boys and girls still of teen age. And the future is black unless something is done.

But have you ever considered the cause of all this? Someone volunteers the idea that the war has caused it. If I recall, however, this problem started before the war began, and while the world chaos may have intensified it, it did not cause it. Another says that the so-called "jazz age" is responsible for it. I think you have it backwards. I think that it was delinquency which resulted in the jazz age, rather than the other way around. Has it ever occurred to you that we are just reaping what we have been sowing? The teaching our boys and girls have been receiving is finding expression in this heyday of immorality and trampling down of sacred conventions and decencies.

Let me explain what I mean. In our schools, from grade school on through high school, our children are taught that the thought of creation by God is an outmoded theory belonging to the Dark Ages. They have the idea instilled in them that man is nothing more or less than the highest product of an evolutionary process which has been going on through the years; that he is a sort of exalted ape, whose forefathers swung from limb to limb through forest trees, and that since he cannot help his inheritance of various tendencies that there is nothing wrong with his finding expression for them. I charge this day that American youth has been betrayed in the schoolrooms of this nation, by a God-dishonoring, Christ-denying, Bible-defaming supposition which is now reaching

its fullness in the debauchery and immorality prevalent upon every side.

When you teach children that they are nothing more or less than animals, you may expect that they will act like animals. And now we find them going through life giving vent to their animal desires, with no sense of accountability unto God and no idea of punishment after death. Do you deny this thing is being taught? Listen, I'll meet you any time, any place and show you that it is being taught in every public grade school and high school in this entire area. If you doubt it, all you need do is to accept the challenge.

Creation by God is positively denied by modern scientists, so-called. I quote instead their theory as set forth in "Popular Science." "Life appeared a billion years ago in mud and puddles in the shape of tiny bits of jelly, probably the products of ancient chemical forces, which developed into cell groups, into small worm-like creatures, and then into air-breathing fishes which became our ancestors." This damnable little bit of guess work is unadulterated fiction, and the one who wrote it knew that it was, if he had any sense at all. Chemical forces, either "ancient" or modern, have utterly failed to produce life. It is an indisputable axiom of science that life comes only from life; and when you get that back as far as you can, you will find that it is God and not a bubbling, jelly-like mud puddle! Science starts with a mud puddle and they just about have civilization back in one. "The sow that was washed has returned to wallowing in the mire."

Once in a while I find those who argue that scientists do not teach that man really sprung from monkeys. I have heard that one, too. I know that it is alleged that Darwin did not say we came from monkeys but from a common stem which branched off two ways, one branch producing apes and the other, man. Well, what's the difference? Does it make any difference whether my great-grandfather a thousand times removed was an ape, or whether his grandfather produced two sons, one of them an ape and the other a man? Personally, those who think so much of the monkey as a grandpa can trace their family tree back if they prefer and boast about their relatives hanging by their tails and

throwing coconuts at each other, but I've got a different idea of my progenitors.

But I'm going to prove to you that these "monkey-lovers" do claim that man came directly from an ape-ancestry. More than that, they claim that he is still an ape, and after listening to some who taught that idea in school, I did have more faith in the idea than before. It seemed as if they sort of proved it, not by what they said, but by the way they acted and conducted themselves in the presence of the class. I quote here, word-for-word, a statement from Dr. William K. Gregory, of the American Museum of Natural History of New York City. He was asked by an interviewer, "You subscribe, then, to the theory that we are descendants of monkeys?" Dr. Gregory replied, "That is no longer a theory but an established fact. We are not only descendants of monkeys but we are still monkeys. To complete the collection in the monkey house at any zoo, there should be a man behind the bars. As it is, the only monkeys not in the cages are the spectators and the keepers." The interviewer then commented, "I suppose you are joking." "Indeed I am not," is Dr. Gregory's reply, "I am stating a scientific fact. When a man is watching an inmate of the monkey house, you have representatives of two species of monkeys looking each other over." So, now you know why you like to go to Forest Park Zoo. It's like a trip down to see grandpa and grandma. Everyone likes to visit their relatives!

But who would think that legitimate scientists, men who are smart in every field of research, could fall for that kind of thing? Yet the sad part about it all is the effect it has on the minds of the immature. Some members of the Church of Christ have a foolish idea that you ought to build church colleges to keep this kind of thing from being taught. That's ridiculous, because by the time children get ready for college these days, the seeds of the doctrine have already been instilled in their hearts. If you wanted to curtail it in that fashion, you'd have to build parochial schools from the first grade to high school senior classes. Church colleges are only parochial schools anyway, so if you are going to build one, you might as well go "whole hog or none," as the saying is. The way to combat these soul-destroying ideas is for the parents to teach their children to reverence God and respect His Word,

and for the church to preach against the sinful evils prevalent in the age in which we live. It is absurd to let your children sit under the influence of skeptics until they are twenty years old and then try to build a fence to keep out these damnable ideas, which they have already absorbed.

The Bible tells us that man was made in the image of God. Modern guessers say he was made in the image of a monkey. These two ideas are as far apart as the poles. They are at the two extremes of human concept, and never the twain shall meet. If we are to believe God, we must reject the monkey ancestry idea, and vice versa. There can be no compromise. My Bible tells me that, "God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul!" It also tells me, "Now let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter, Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." It further declares, "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent, because He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He raised Him from the dead."

I protest the teaching of the evolutionary theory that all the higher forms of animal life have risen by natural development from the lower, and that man is merely the end product of this development. I oppose it because it is a mere theory of speculation which denies the facts of the Bible; it makes man a mere animal, and cannot account for the instincts, or for the attributes of mercy, love and gratitude. I oppose it because it creates the thought that man is wholly irresponsible, and thus will lead civilization back to the law of the jungle, the law "of claw and fang," which is the direct result of the theory that "only the fittest shall survive!" With David of old, I exclaim, "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear though the earth be removed and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea" (Psalm 46:1, 2).

EVOLUTION OR DEVIL-LUTION

In the series of talks now in progress, I am pointing out the fallacies and dangers of the teaching of infidelity in our schools in this country. It may appear to you that I am undertaking a huge task when I buck up against the might, wealth, power and prestige of those who have resolved to lead this nation down the road to ruin. That is true, but although I am but one man, and my voice is aired over a small station, and the books which contain these speeches will have but little circulation, yet I believe it is my duty and my solemn obligation to God to fight with all of my strength those damning influences which work against the truth and against our Creator and nation.

I issued the charge last Sunday that the theory of evolution which teaches that all higher forms of animal life are but derivatives from the lower, and that man is just the last of these developing processes, is responsible for much of the profligacy and irreverence of our modern youth. Today, I charge just as plainly and unequivocally that the same idiotic, foolish and asinine theory has produced much of the serious criminality which is so manifest.

Have you ever heard of Friedrich Nietzsche? He was the man who began at the place where Darwin left off. Darwin and others brought man to the place where he now is in their blundering philosophies, then spent their time looking for the "missing link" between apes and man. But the German philosopher, Nietzsche, preached that development was still in progress and that man could develop into the "Superman." In his theories he taught the doctrine that love was outdated, and hate should take its place. He enthroned might and ruthless power, and declared that pity was a doctrine only preached by weaklings. He laughed at Christianity, called Jesus "the founder of a little Jewish sect," and said that the apostle Paul was a forger and briber, who preached something he did not believe, that was "accepted by the idiots among whom he spread his doctrine." He also taught that man could become superior in crime, and that all the good that was ever achieved had been achieved by crime. The criminal hanged today would be looked to as the hero of tomorrow.

A few years ago our papers were filled with the story of a brutal crime. A little boy, Bobbie Franks, had been murdered and his body partially dismembered, and portions of it disposed of. Police relentlessly stayed on the crime until they tracked down the killers, two mere boys, Loeb and Leopold. The great criminal lawyer and agnostic, Clarence Darrow, was hired to defend them. He learned that the boys had been students of Nietzsche, and that they had but followed his teachings, intending to commit the "perfect crime." They almost got by with it. Then Darrow, believer in evolution that he was, stood before the jury and made an impassioned plea, that these boys could not help what they did, that man is merely the result of those passions and inherent traits received from his brute ancestors, and cannot be expected to do anything else than just what he does. The murderers were given life imprisonment. Who killed the little Franks boy? You say, Loeb and Leopold! True, they were the assassins, but I assert that the damnable theory of evolution was the red-handed murderer behind it all. The wild-eyed, maniacal supposition of the man who taught the development of the Superman was the criminal at the bar.

But I'm not through yet. That same theory is being taught your boy and girl and my boy and girl in the schools of today. We pay our tax money, those of us who love the Lord, only to have it dealt out to some crackpot theorist who laughs at the Bible and scoffs at the thought of man's future responsibility to God. I know that all teachers are not guilty, but will you dare me to put my fingers on some that are, in this territory? In history classes, in zoology, in biology, in psychology, in physiology classes, mere theories are advocated without a shred of proof which today will make this nation one in which God is ridiculed as "an old-fogey" and religion laughed at as being the "feeble aberration of a diseased mind."

Again I charge that much of our brutal criminality lies at the feet of those who teach such soul-destroying trash. Let me quote to you a little bit from Clarence Darrow's own book. He is the man, you recall, who defended Scopes, at Dayton, Tennessee, when William Jennings Bryan defended the Word of God in the trial of the law forbidding teaching of evolution within the

schools of the state. I'm quoting from Clarence Darrow's book, "Crime, Its Cause and Treatment." On page 7, he says, "I am fully aware that this book will be regarded as a plea or an apology for the criminal. To hold him morally blameless could be nothing else." This shows that Darrow does not believe that man is morally responsible for anything he does. Let us read now, from page 199, "A criminal could know neither the dangers that lurked along other roads, nor the fact that *he had no choice about the way he went*. All he knows is that he stumbled along a certain path which led to disaster. All paths of life lead to tragedy; it is only a question of how and when."

Then the self-confessed terrorist who stabbed two women, killing one and almost killing the other, in St. Louis, couldn't help it. When he followed the street cars on which a dozen other innocent victims were riding and waited for them to get off so he could attack them in the dark, he had no choice. God says, "Choose ye this day whom ye shall serve!" He says, "I have set before you good and evil; only choose the good that you may live!" Darrow says it is all a lie. Man has come up from the brute with brute instincts still in him, and he can't help what he does. Listen again, as I quote, "*The disasters cannot in reason or justice be called criminal or non-criminal. They are all natural; they are each and all inevitable. Man is in no sense the maker of himself, and has no more power than any other machine to escape the law of cause and effect. He does as he must. Therefore there is no such thing as moral responsibility.*"

The woman who drank ten highballs and staggered over to her neighbor's house and shot the sailor lad a few weeks back was not a criminal, for she only did the natural thing. It was inevitable. She did as she must. There is no moral responsibility, so she must not be held accountable, according to this criminal lawyer, and I do mean CRIMINAL lawyer! No wonder this country is full of crime, when you realize that such books are on the required reading list of a lot of classes. But what can we do to reform criminals? Are we doomed to go on, or is there any salvation for our society? Let us ask Mr. Darrow, and I quote him, "We must abandon the idea of working his moral reformation. Man works according to his structure. *He never does reform and cannot*

reform.”—page 274. Therefore, according to this agnostic, Jesus and John the Baptist, the apostles and all gospel preachers who have tried to uplift humanity have been a group of nincompoops working at a hopeless task. More than that, all have been deceivers, because they have called upon man to repent, when, according to this modernist, “man never does and cannot reform.”

What will Darrow, the agnostic, do with them? Listen to him, “ALL indignities should be taken away from prison life. Instead, the prisoner should be taught that his act was the necessary result of cause and effect and that, given heredity and environment, he could have done no other way.” There you have it. Hitler couldn’t help what he did! Mussolini had no choice. He had to leave his wife and live with his mistress, he had to kill the helpless and powerless, he had to bring suffering and torment to the world. The German prisoners were helpless and, according to these theories, we ought to teach them that they only did what was expected of them, and make life easy for them in prison. I resent this trash being taught. I lift up my voice against these ideas that are leading America to certain destruction. People, rise up against these things before it is too late.

Our children are being taught that there is no such thing as sin. Prof. Eliot, of the Sociology Department of the Northwestern University, Chicago, has announced that the word “sin” has no place in the dictionary and neither have the words “praise or blame.” I picked up a book while visiting a school for an assembly talk recently, and had not read but two pages until I found that “Man is merely a conscious automaton.” That means he is a helpless machine. If his passion inspires him to be guilty of lust, he must obey the impulse. He is an animal, and moved by the same urges and fears that animals obey. That is the modern thinking! That is the modern teaching! Let’s put God back in our teaching, our lives and our pulpits! Let’s fight this modernism which is taking America on the road that Germany trod!

EVOLUTION AND THE WAR

In this fight we are making against modernism and infidelity, I have recently offered some very serious charges. I have affirmed that the theory of evolution taught in our schools is greatly responsible for juvenile delinquency; and last Sunday, I further announced my conviction that the crackpot theorists who teach our children are directly responsible for much of the crime in our world today. Now, I am going even farther. Today I just as seriously and boldly charge that the theory of evolution which was taught in the German schools was responsible for the World War with its millions of killed and wounded, its terrible destruction of property, and all of the curse that war can bring upon a present-day people.

I shall prove that charge absolutely and positively, in the few short minutes allotted me today, although I could wish for an extension of speaking time that I might become more detailed in this analysis. I have already told you that where Charles Darwin left off in his book, "Origin of the Species," that Friedrich Nietzsche took up. It was this latter hater of God who became such a hero, as a German philosopher. His books became texts in Germany. The fuehrer of the Third Reich, Adolf Hitler, drank in the words of this corrupt, illogical reasoner, and from those words became imbued with the idea that he was the "Superman" to lead his people to honor and glory and to rule over the world of mankind. Almost all of the ideas that Hitler advanced can be found long before in the writings of Nietzsche. The German people took up with Hitler, because they were ready for him. They had long been fed upon the doctrine of evolution, and were already convinced that they were to be the superior race of the world, which must bow to them. This was the fruition of the theory of evolution which our children are taught in a hundred subtle ways in our state-supported schools this day.

Why did Hitler kill off the old, sick and infirm? Let me read to you the exact words of the philosopher who inspired him to do it. "Pity is a waste of feeling, a moral parasite which is injurious to health. Pity is opposed to the tonic passions, which enhance

the energy of the feeling of life, its action is depressing. A man loses power when he pities. . . . Pity preserves that which is ripe for death, it fights against the destruction of the disinherited and condemned of life." Now you know why in those concentration camps, mere lads kicked the aged and weakened sufferers, why the German people could see them die without a quaver. They were taught that pity was a disgrace, and that when one was old and disinherited, he should be killed without a quiver of mercy. Remember, this book from which I am reading was a textbook in the German schools.

But I'm not through. The statement I have just given is opposed to all the principles of Christianity. Do you recall how Hitler opposed the Bible as a Jewish scrapbook? Do you recall how he tried to abolish Christianity? Now listen, "The weak and the botched must perish, that is the first law of humanity. And they must be helped to perish. Christianity is gradually receding because it protects the weak. Christianity is practical sympathy with those who are helpless, and it must go!" You'll remember that those who were aged were confined in homes where later it was proved that they were killed with poison. I'm speaking now of the German aged and helpless long before the war. Hitler did not want those who were sick to live. He was breeding his people like cattle, trying to develop a strain of supermen. Well, that gang ran up against some lads from the cities and farms of the United States, boys who knew and respected God, and they knocked those supermen into a cocked hat along with their wild-eyed theories.

Let me prove that this propaganda brought about the war. Let me show you why this was a fight to the death, not between Nazism and the United States, but between the theory of the superman and the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. I quote again from the German philosopher, "If you cannot be saints of knowledge, then, I pray you, be at least its warriors. War and courage have done more great things than charity. What is good, ye ask? To be brave is good. Live a life of obedience and war. For nations that are growing weak and contemptible, war may be prescribed as a remedy, if indeed they really want to go on living. . . . The more fully and thoroughly we live, the more ready we are to sacrifice life for a single pleasurable emotion."

But now we present even stronger proof. A student of Nietzsche, General Bernhardt wrote his book, "Germany and the Next War." Listen to what he has to say, as I quote, "War is a biological necessity, and an indispensable regulator in the life of mankind, failing which would result a course of evolution deleterious to the species and, too, utterly antagonistic to all culture. War is the father of all things. Without war, inferior or demoralized races would only too easily swamp the healthy and vital ones and a general decadence would be the result. War is one of the essential factors of morality. If circumstances require, it is not only the right, but the moral and political duty of a statesman to bring about a war." And Hitler grew up under that kind of propaganda.

Like all other Germans, he read the words, "I teach you the superman. Man is something that is to be surpassed. What have ye done to surpass man? All beings hitherto have created something beyond themselves, and ye want to be the ebb of that great tide, and would rather go back to the beast than to surpass man. What is the ape to man? A laughing-stock, a thing of shame. And just the same shall man be to the Superman: a laughing-stock, a thing of shame. The Superman is the meaning of the earth. Let your will say: the Superman shall be the meaning of the earth! I conjure you, my brethren, remain true to the earth, and believe not those who speak of super-earthly hopes!"

Now, friends, that's evolution gone to seed. All lower forms developed into something higher. Now, the question is, will man stop there, or will he go on and develop a master race, a race of supermen? Again I charge that the same doctrine which is taught your children and mine in the schools today, when carried to its fullest, and executed by its fanatical believer, Hitler, was responsible for the suffering and woes of the world. How tragic that we are traveling the same trail. How sad that fathers and mothers sit with hands folded and calmly let their loved ones imbibe th's poison without ever giving them the antidote of God's Word to counteract it? The churches are emptied of their youth, the theaters are filled. The Bible is neglected, forgotten and dust-covered upon the shelf, and the trashy magazines add their burden of filth to the ungodly teachings that are sown in the hearts of our loved

ones! God will not always stand for this. He proved to the whole world that Germany was not filled with a master race. He may yet prove to us in sorrow and tragedy that we cannot hold the serpent of Communistic atheism and warm it in our bosoms without being bitten.

Your sons died upon foreign battlefields to show that democracy was not dead or decadent. They spilled their crimson blood to show that the principles of Jesus Christ still survive in spite of all the tendencies of paganism. At the very time some of our misguided pacifistic churchmen were crying that we should disarm in keeping with what they thought was the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount, the propaganda I have mentioned was being fed to Germany, as they prepared to cut the Sermon on the Mount from the Bible and destroy the memory of Christianity from the earth by force. And to think that there are some so-called Churches of Christ which have the nerve and audacity to teach that our sons who took up arms to preserve our ideals are murderers. Just recently a congregation within sound of this station paid a man \$250 to stand in their pulpit ten nights and condemn sectarianism, when that very man thought that the boys who had gone from that congregation were cold-blooded murderers because they took up arms against the most dastardly attempt ever made to subject the world to darkness, despair and misery. How can people give the Lord's money to support one who would thus sit silently by, murmuring prayers while fiends were filling concentration camps with the pitiable starved corpses of one-time strong men and women?

Let us not glorify war. That is the tactic of the enemy. But, on the other hand, let us guard against the very weakness and decadence of which we have been accused, and let us banish the seeds of the doctrine from our schools which brought about the tragic downfall of the German nation. God help us to do that!

A HOAX ON THE FOLKS

Teachers of science (falsely so-called) speak glibly of a "chain of development" purporting to reach back through the years, and connect man with lower forms of creation. The unsuspecting and ignorant student may be led to believe that this chain is unbroken, that is, perfected and completed and must be accepted as absolutely factual. Nothing is farther from the truth, as we shall prove.

In order to cover up their speculations, pseudo-scientists like to use big words and lengthy terms. They talk about the "nebular-hypothesis" and the "Darwinian theory of human development." Those words should not deceive you. The word hypothesis simply means "a guess." Theory is but speculation until it is proven to be valid. Then it is not a theory at all, but a fact. Just as long as men are forced to talk about the "evolutionary theory" of man's rise, it is evident that they are admitting, although in technical terms, that they cannot prove what they postulate.

Even Charles Darwin himself admitted that he could not account for the beginning of life. All of his writings on the subject of "natural and sexual selection" could not demonstrate that there was no God. Here are his exact words concluding his chapter on religion, "The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an Agnostic."

He admitted that he probably exaggerated, and did not deny that he might have made an error in his theory. I quote him again, "Hence, if I have erred in giving to natural selection great power, which I am very far from admitting, or in having exaggerated its power, which is in itself probable, I have at least, as I hope, done good service in aiding to overthrow the dogma of separate creations." Have you ever heard of a more prejudiced statement? It is apparent to even a casual thinker that the father of the "natural selection theory" had as his chief motive not the establishment of truth at all. His main aim was to overthrow the teaching of the Bible on separate creations. And he admitted that he probably exaggerated, and also affirmed that he may have erred; but even with error and exaggeration, he was satisfied if

he had cast some doubt upon the doctrine of the creative record as set forth in Genesis. Can you afford to set aside that which claims to be truth, and is proven to be, for some wild speculative theory which its author admits might be an error and is probably based upon exaggeration? Will you let some long-haired professor cram such a thing down your intellectual throat?

All crackpot theorists run up against a stone wall when they try to explain how man developed his superior mental ability and intelligence from the lower animals. Never did an ape live that could erect a modern skyscraper, construct an automobile, or even make a kiddie car. In the St. Louis Zoo there is a chimpanzee which has been trained to ride a bicycle, but the zoo doesn't exist which has a chimpanzee that can take the raw materials and build a bicycle. Then, if man came from such a lower order, how did he get his intelligence and mental faculties which these orders do not and never did possess? Can they pass on something which they never had? Can they give man that as an heritage which they never possessed?

Darwin cites the fact that monkeys use stones to pound with when enraged, as well as sticks and twigs to make for themselves beds. He mentions the cunning of the dogs which he observed. How silly to say that man derived his ability for cracking atoms from the squirrels cracking nuts! Even the philosopher himself knew it was silly, and he said, "In what manner the mental powers were first developed in the lowest organisms, is as hopeless an enquiry as how life itself first originated. These are problems for the distant future, if they are ever to be solved by man."

So evolution cannot even account for the mental powers of the lowest organisms. It is said to be a hopeless enquiry. Certainly, then, it cannot account for the superior intelligence of man, which it is admitted places him as the highest organism in the ascendant scale. But it is a positive lie that this is a problem for the distant future. The mere fact that evolution could not account for it does not make it either a problem, or a future study. The truth of the matter is that the Bible settles for us, even before man's creation, the question as to this creature's intelligence. Evolution cannot answer the question after man has been here thousands of

years. They are forced to say it is future even with all of the modern techniques for investigation. But God put His finger on the solution before man ever arrived on earth.

Listen! "And God said, Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness, and let them rule over fish of the sea, and over fowl of the heavens, and over cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that is creeping on the earth (Genesis 1:26). Simple, isn't it? And that is not an unsolvable problem of the future, at all!

Now I want to explode a bombshell on this theory that man arrived at his present position as a result of sexual selection, and natural breeding. Charles Darwin himself lost faith in his theory before he died. He printed two issues of his renowned work, "The Origin of the Species," and upheld his theory in both of them. But *if he had lived to print the third edition, he would have repudiated his basic theory.* Here's the proof.

In 1876, which was two years after the appearance of his second edition, he wrote, "In my opinion the greatest error which I have committed has been not allowing sufficient weight to the direct action of environment, i.e., food, climate, etc., independently of a natural selection." Now I want to quote from the words of C. Schwalbe, Professor of Anatomy in the University of Strassburg, in his book, "From Monkey to Man," published by Haldeman-Julius, page 21. He says of this statement of Darwin, "It is certain from this change of opinion that, if he had been able to make up his mind to issue a third edition of 'The Descent of Man,' he would have ascribed a much greater influence to the effect of external conditions in explaining the different characters of the races of man than he did in the second edition. He would also undoubtedly have attributed less influence to sexual selection as a factor in the origin of the different bodily characteristics, if indeed *he would not have excluded it altogether.*"

Darwin's own statement assures us that he committed errors, and admits that his "greatest error" was the very foundation stone for the structure of his theory. If, therefore, the foundation is faulty, since all of his ideas are tied in therewith, how can we accept any of the theory? That this supposition is not "science"

at all is evidenced by a statement quoted from Darwin himself, and appearing in the book above referred to by the eminent Dr. Schwalbe, who was an evolutionist of note. Here is Darwin's statement in his own words, "The views here advanced, on the part which sexual selection has played in the history of man, want scientific precision." Then we know that these are only the "views of a man, they lack scientific precision, and the man who advanced these views later repudiated the same and candidly admitted they constituted his "greatest error."

In spite of this, his book, "The Origin of the Species," is maintained on the shelves of many of our high schools, and is quoted as being authoritative. We sincerely hope that those of you who are Christians will have the courage of your convictions, as well as the intellectual stamina to resent the encroachments upon your good sense by such unscientific trash as the Darwinian theory. But if it be stated that science has advanced since the days of Darwin, and that new theories have been discovered, jut tell the teachers that you will "lay low" and wait. Remember that when Darwin's book was first presented, "science" grabbed it up, and said that it was the answer to the riddle of the universe. If they were mistaken about his theory, who knows but what they may be mistaken about others? Don't be stampeded. It is as much your right to question false theories as it is the right of those who hold such to question your belief. Don't be a sucker! Don't fall for something just because it has a few high-sounding terms. Make those who produce such theories produce the proof of them! Make them put up or shut up!

"HORSE PLAY" AND "HORSE SENSE"

Not long since I attended a science class during one of my rather frequent visits to high schools, for the purpose of presenting a program. On the wall was a very curious chart. I had seen it a good many times before but never quite so enlarged. Because of my interest in it, I remained when the class was dismissed that I might examine it all the more thoroughly. It was intended to be a graphic representation of the rise of the modern horse from a small three-toed creature to the noble specimen which now pulls the plow or draws the racing cart.

I knew immediately what members of that class were being taught. It was being impressed upon their minds that three million years ago, the ancestor of the horse was just about the size of a common backyard tomcat, and had four complete toes on each forefoot, and three complete toes on each hindfoot. The students were being told that these original "horses" had skulls and necks not at all horse-like but more like those of civet cats; and their teeth were short-crowned and covered with rounded knobs of enamel, suggesting the teeth of pigs or monkeys.

The chart showed some twelve stages of development, and the skulls of the animals were pictured over against regular strata of rocks and soil just as though someone had found a skull of a modern horse lying on top of the earth, then dug down about three feet and found the skull of the extinct *Protohippus*, then three more feet to find one called *Mesohippus*, three more feet down to *Protorohippus*, and so on down to the little "tomcat" who was given the title of *Hyracotherium*, and called *Eohippus* for short. I asked the science teacher if he believed that chart. He replied that he guessed he did. That's about all so-called science teachers do—is guess. He didn't know whether he believed it or not—he just guessed. I asked him if there was any definite proof that the horse came through all of these stages and he pointed to the words at the foot of the diagram, "Hypothetical Ancestors with five toes on each foot." He asked me if I knew what "hypothetical" meant. I didn't guess. I told him it meant "assumed, supposed." He admitted that the chart was just that and nothing else. I then

asked him if he could make anybody in class swallow that assumption. He said that he could get some of the youngsters from the city to believe it, but the ones from the country who had worked with horses laughed at it—and him, too. I suggested that in all probability their association with horses had enabled them to pick up a lot of “horse sense” which those in the city had not the opportunity of getting. The teacher didn’t like me much! I didn’t like him much, either!

I resent the idea of the evolutionists presenting their false doctrines with so much arrogance and assumption to conceal the fallacies lying under their dogmas. In some instances they have found a mere tooth, or portion of a jawbone, and with that as a guide they have constructed a full-sized animal. Then they have arbitrarily located this fragmentary specimen somewhere along the line and boldly declared it to be a “missing link.” The first of the so-called “series of horses” was not found upon the western plains of the United States at all, although the chart shows it in Wyoming. No one knows that there ever was such a specimen, and even if there was, no one can locate it as the ancestor of any New World horse, or any other kind of a horse, for that matter. The only fragment of one of these “early ancestors” is a small portion of a jawbone dug up in England. And since that is all they have, and they admit that it has more the appearance of a civet cat than a horse, how do we know that it isn’t a portion from the head of some defunct striped “stink-pussy?”

In 1922, a well-worn molar was found by a geologist while excavating in Nebraska. The tooth was sent to the American Museum of Natural History in New York. Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn, head of the museum, and his associates, pronounced it the tooth of a “man-ape.” The news created a sensation in the whole scientific world, and scientists abroad joined with our own local variety in calling it the “find of the century.” Dr. W. K. Gregory dubbed it “the million dollar tooth.”

The museum bulletin for 1925 declared, “In the whole history of anthropology no tooth has ever been subjected to such severe cross-examination as this now world famous tooth. . . . This tooth resembles the human tooth more closely than it does that of any

known anthropoid ape." Then the bulletin added that some had questioned the conclusion but that "every suggestion made by scientific skeptics was weighed and found wanting."

When the Scopes trial was underway in Dayton, Tennessee, Dr. Osborn came out with his book, "The Earth Speaks to Bryan." On page 40, he said, "This little tooth speaks volumes of truth—truth consistent with all we have known before, with all that we have found elsewhere." On page 43 he asks Mr. Bryan, who you will recall was a native of Nebraska, "What shall we do with the Nebraska tooth? . . . Certainly we shall not banish this bit of truth because it does not fit in with preconceived notions." That was as much as to say that other ideas might fail, but the tooth presented incontrovertible evidence. It was proof positive of the fact that once an "ape-man" walked across the Nebraska prairies.

Then came the grand climax. Scientists went back to this exact spot for excavation at a later date. Digging a little deeper, they discovered several more of these "million dollar" teeth. But the bottom went out of the market and the price dropped suddenly. For this time they were found in connection with the remains of an extinct wild pig. Yes sir, they were pig molars! Now that brings up a question. Since the museum bulletin declared that never in the history of anthropology had a tooth been subjected to such severe cross-examination, and it turned out that this one belonged to a long dead swine, what about all of those teeth that have not even been examined as closely? Is it not barely possible that they might belong to Belted Berkshires or Chester Whites of another day, rather than to some stooped, gnome-like, barrel-chested ape-man?

How did the scientists get out of the difficulty which this pig's tooth brought about? As Dr. Osborn asked, "What shall we do with the Nebraska tooth?" They left it up to Gerrit S. Miller, Jr., Curator, Division of Mammals, United States National Museum. In the Smithsonian Report under the title, "The Controversy Over Human Missing Links," on page 422, Dr. Miller merely says, "It seems that the crowns of the teeth in this species of wild pig are deceptively like the crowns of human molars."

Well, that takes care of that! A million dollar tooth sold for thirty cents with the three rubbed off! And that is "science"!

There's something funny about all this. When a bone looks like a civet cat's skull, they say it came from a horse. When it came from a pig, they say it looks like a man! Now, let's put the cap sheaf on all of this. Remember that it was Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn who pronounced this tooth that of an "ape-man." That was in 1922. He still contended that in 1925. That's before he found out that it was from a pig. It must have taken the wind out of "Doc" Osborn when he got the truth, because on December 27, 1929, he stood before the Association for the Advancement of Science, in Des Moines, Iowa, and made an epochal address. Therein he said, "I believe in the evolution of man. But I do not believe he came from the apes. He came along a path of his own, and never passed through the ape stage." Back into the long ago he went and drew a picture from studies of bone structure indicating traits too strongly to have been derived from apes. So said a reporter of the memorable speech.

In 1925, Dr. Osborn declared that a tooth belonged to a missing link, or an "ape-man." In 1929, he threw all this aside and declared that man had no relation to the ape at all. So you see that all of the "bone hurling" scientists have been doing amounts to just so much "poppycock." There is no indication that the horse is much different than it ever was. It could not have developed from another species anyway, for cross-breeds are sterile. The mule is a good indication of that, and if sterility cannot be bred away by man's manipulation of species, certainly it has not been done by blind chance. Believe in God—not a bone pile!

THE CREATION

It is a fearful thing for a nation to lose faith in God. It is a fearful thing when religion becomes a mere pawn in the hands of slavish men who pamper the rich and intellectual, because they fear to resist the criticism of philosophy upon one hand, and hesitate to reject the lure of gold upon the other. Yet, that is the condition in which our nation finds itself today. The men who stand in the pulpits have compromised with sin, through fear. The worst infidel on earth is the one who wraps his clerical robes about him in mock dignity and denies the truth of God's revelation and laughs at the divinity of the Son of God and Savior of men.

It is considered smart in these days to ridicule the Bible. It is thought to be a sign of superior intelligence to deny the miracles related therein. Men in their haughty arrogance have tried to strip the sacred truth of the ages of the glowing robes of eternal light which surround it, and expose its nakedness to a mad populace exactly as the Roman soldiers stripped the Son of God of His robe and brutally taunted Him as He hung bare upon the Cross. And the world is paying for its doubt, paying in baths of blood and sweat and tears; in wan faces, frightened eyes and wildly beating hearts; paying in oppression, depression and everything but confession of its dastardly guilt.

Preachers, standing in the pulpits, start at the beginning of the Bible and try to laugh into oblivion the God of the beginning. They call the story of creation a myth, and the book which records it a Jewish tradition. And even the Jews themselves, protectors through fire, sword and famine of the great heritage of the Old Testament, now say through the lips of their learned rabbis that these stories represent only the imagination of the minds of oppressed people subject to barbaric torture. "Professing themselves to be wise, they have become fools." In the schools of our own city, teachers scoff at the story of man's origin as recorded in the first chapter of the Book of Books. And so widespread has become this vain philosophy that there are some who flatter themselves that they have stamped out of the hearts of all men belief in the truthfulness of God's sacred teaching.

To all such vain and reckless thinkers I come this day avowing my firm and confident belief in the teachings of the Bible. I believe it because it is the Word of God. I believe it because it is the revelation from heaven. I believe it because it is true—true in every particular—not in part, but as a composite whole. Yes, I believe it, and am ready to defend it. Not because it needs the defense of any puny man, but because one cannot help but defend the things that he loves, and I love the Bible, with all my heart, with all my soul, with all my strength.

I do not propose to defend it by making it fight the vain and transitory ideas of frail mankind. I do not believe it is right to change my ideas without proof, but the Bible presents me ample proof, and will present the same to you if you will study it fairly and honestly.

I am many times asked if I believe in the story of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis. I unhesitatingly answer in the affirmative. I am asked if I believe that God did all of these things in six days. Again I answer yes. And why do I believe these facts? Let me tell you. But first I know that there are those who squirm about and attempt to reconcile God's Word with their own human conceptions. They reason that the word "day" as used in this connection might mean an interminably long period of time, perhaps a million years or so. How silly! If God could make a germ of life which through millions of years could develop into man, could He not just as well make man, and be done with it?

Science admits that there was a great First Cause. They are forced to admit that life came from a great lifegiver. They know that there is no such thing as spontaneous generation. But, they want this creative force to mess around and experiment over a few million years in order to arrive at the creation which He intended from the beginning. Is it any more ridiculous to believe in a God who could speak all things into existence at His will than to believe in one who made a minute germ which developed into everything from pelicans to pandas, blackbirds to buffalo, toad frogs to tomcats, or monkeys to man? If God could make a cell which eventually would become all of these varied forms, could He not with the same power bring all of these into existence forthwith?

It is urged, however, that the Bible does not really say that God did His creative work in six days. Yes, it does! I call your attention to this scripture as found in Exodus 20:11, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day." Are these regular days as we know them? Listen again! The reason why the above statement was made to Israel at the foot of Sinai was because God was preparing there to give them a law to keep the Sabbath. Thus He says, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Whatever time is embraced by the six days we labor each week is the same as that embraced by the God of Heaven in His labors.

When God said, "Let there be light," and there was light, the record immediately informs us that the evening and the morning were the first day. Whatever this day was, it was composed of a morning and evening, it embraced that much time and no more. But you question how God could accomplish all of this in such a short period of time. If you deny the existence of God, you cannot believe this could be done, but if you admit that God is, you have no doubts at all, for "with God nothing is impossible." It isn't necessary that you understand how it was done. It is only necessary that you believe that there is a God, and faith will supply the necessary testimony. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen are not made from things which do appear" (Hebrews 11:3).

But there are too many people in these days who fear what men will say and think about them. They feel that religion is inconsistent with philosophy. Well, it is inconsistent with every false idea. It would have to be in order to be true within itself. All truth is in agreement. But Sir Isaac Newton declares, "They are only minute philosophers, who are skeptics and unbelievers. Smatterers in science, they are but smatterers in religion. Whereas, the most eminent philosophers, those who have done honor to the nation, done honor to human nature itself, have also been believers and defenders of revelation, have studied scripture as well as nature, have searched after God in His Word as well as in His works, and have even made comments on several parts of Holy Writ."

There is nothing degrading in a belief in God. There is nothing debasing in acceptance of His testimony concerning the foundation of the earth. There is nothing to apologize for in a firm conviction as to the truth of the revelation contained in the Bible. The greatest minds of the ages have acknowledged their indebtedness to the sacred scriptures. The less one knows about logic, the more ignorant he is of true philosophy, the more apt he is to be an agnostic. The more one knows about truth and reason, the stronger will be his faith in the Bible. Lord Bacon in one of his essays says, "A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion."

There is, and can be, no harmony between the wild guesses and absurd speculations of the modernists upon one hand, and the Word of God upon the other. The absurd, asinine attempts of preachers to reconcile the theories concerning the establishment of the earth with what the Bible teaches only make more unbelievers. Let the axe be laid at the root of every tree. Let the Bible be tested and tried. Let the false theories of men also be questioned and forced to submit proof. By their works ye shall know them. If the Bible is a conglomeration of myths and falsehoods, let it be forced out of existence; if the theories and suppositions of science (falsely so-called) cannot show logical proof for their existence, then let them be laughed out of court.

I care not what course others may take. I shall continue to stand with the Bible as the Word of God until it is proven that its author does not exist, or existing, is a God of lies rather than truth. But who has the power to supplant God? There is none who can. God is true!

THE BIBLE AHEAD OF DATE

Modern crackpot theorists continually scoff at the Bible as being behind the times. They contend that it belongs to the horse and buggy age; that it is as moss-covered as the iron-bound bucket which hung in the well, and as outmoded as bustles or hobble-skirts. The truth of it is that the Bible is so far ahead of them that they have not yet arrived in sight of it, and in their childish jealousy think it's still behind them. The Bible has always been in advance of science, and all of the experiments made have but proven the authenticity of Holy Writ. I shall convince you of that today.

Take medical science for instance. In no other field have such rapid strides been made. The introduction of penicillin, sulfanilamide, sulfathiazole and kindred drugs has been made possible by research of the highest type. But these are recent—very recent—discoveries. Did you know that only a few hundred years ago physicians were called “leeches”? That is true, and the reason is very apparent. Doctors in those days had one standard remedy for everything, and that consisted of bleeding the patient. If he suffered headache, snake bite, or had boils, skin rash or ingrown toenails, a lancet was inserted into his veins and blood was drained out. The barbers were the principal doctors in those days. And that is where our modern barber pole originated. The red represents the blood, the white stripes running spirally represent the bandages that the doctors applied. In those days, medical science thought that the blood was the cause of, as well as the carrier of, disease, and they killed thousands of patients by taking their blood when they were already too weakened to hardly exist. But doctors are more fortunate than preachers—they can bury their mistakes.

Finally medical practitioners awakened to the truth. They found that in most cases blood should be infused into the body rather than drained from it. Then, eventually, in modern years they developed the art of giving transfusions whereby the blood supply is built up, and perfected it by the use of plasma until countless thousands of wounded upon the battlefields of our recent world

conflict lived to return to their loved ones. At last science issued the statement, profound as it might seem, that the life of the individual is in the blood. Therefore, when one is weakened by anemia or as a result of surgery, he can be given a fighting chance by the injection of additional blood into his veins.

But that idea is not new. If medical science had not been so prejudiced against God's Word, long since their practitioners could have read that very thing as God spoke it to Noah. For I turn to Genesis 9:4, and read that the life of the flesh is in the blood. Moses revealed that thousands of years before science acknowledged it.

Take our modern laws of sanitation as another example. We now know the use of antiseptics and proper precautions against germ-infection. But all of our discoveries are of recent years. Do you know that hundreds of years before Christ came into the world, Moses provided in the law that no one would be permitted to come in contact with one who had an infectious sore, and was not even permitted to touch the bed, stool, eating utensils or plates used by such an individual? Those who carried, by necessity, the clothing or other articles from such an one were under strict rule. Let me read, "And whosoever toucheth anything that was under him shall be unclean, and he that beareth any of those things shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water" (Leviticus 15:10). Read the entire chapter for one of the outstanding legal regulations for sanitation. It sounds almost like the regulations in our modern hospitals.

Our own nation, right down to the present, has been greatly infected with hookworm. Research in this century has shown that the hookworms are thrown off from the body in the natural bowel eliminations, and if such are not completely buried, they enter the skin of the feet, work through the bloodstream into the intestinal tracts, fasten to the inner wall, and lay their eggs. These hatch into worms which not only suck the blood and make one sluggish but are once more discharged, and the deadly circle keeps up. In many places, in the south especially, where proper toilet facilities were not provided, and where people occasionally go barefoot because of the mild weather, efficiency was lowered, and

the whole economy was affected. Our government, though laughed at for the project, engaged in the erection of proper outdoor toilets. The reason was to guarantee that this disease would be conquered eventually. Isn't it surprising that Moses took some two million people through the wilderness, and that the Jews were strangely free from this infection which lessens energy and kills ambition? The reason was simply that Moses legislated for sanitation, and made proper provision for such matters. In Deuteronomy 23:13, God anticipated the laws which would be passed to govern even our own soldiers in their jungle warfare.

Again, we now know the value of quarantine and isolation. Modern hospitals have wards known as "Isolation Wards." Homes are placed under quarantine when epidemic diseases are discovered therein. Before we practiced these precautions, millions of people died like flies in time of plagues which virtually swept some cities off the map. But medical science had to learn by experience, what God taught hundreds of years before. Jehovah established an isolation ward for lepers thousands of years ago. Listen while I read, "All the days wherein the plague shall be in him, he shall be defiled; he is unclean: he shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be" (Leviticus 13:46).

Geographers once believed that the earth was flat. They thought that it was a level plane, and if one sailed so far he would drop off into oblivion. Christopher Columbus asserted his belief that the world was round. He was hooted, jeered and sneered at for his conviction. In vain did he point out to the scientists of his day that when ships hove into view you saw the peak of the sail first upon the horizon, and then the remainder of the ship came into sight gradually. Little boys, patterning after their elders, followed him on the street and tapped their foreheads significantly as they pointed at him. But now we know that this earth is a globe. Men have sailed around it on sea and in the air. At last science has had to admit it. But long years ago, the Word of the Lord declared of Himself, "It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers" (Isaiah 40:22). Remember that, the next time you hear some of these grasshopper and katydid scientists spouting off about how antiquated the Bible is, and how far behind they have left it.

It used to bother science considerably to know what kept the earth in place. The ancient philosophers finally decided that it was supported and held up by a huge giant whom they called "Atlas." They forgot to enquire what it was that Atlas stood on while he held it up. Before that they concluded that it was balanced upon the back of a huge turtle which was under the ocean. Centuries went by in which disputes were renewed with ever-increasing vigor. But eventually the law of gravitation was discovered by Newton, who was basking under an apple tree when one of the pieces of fruit dropped loose and hit him a resounding whack on the head. He fell to wondering why everything always dropped toward the earth instead of falling upward. In his discovery of the law of gravitation, it was also evolved that the earth is suspended upon nothing, and that has now been accepted as a demonstrable fact. But, why all the fuss and fuming about it? I turn to the pages of the Bible and read, "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing" (Job 26:7). Thus is taught in the inspired Word of God, hundreds of years before Christ, the idea now commonly accepted of suspension in space.

Do you recall the story of the race between the tortoise and the hare? The rabbit ran away briskly, but concluded he was so far ahead he could take a snooze. While sleeping, the tortoise came on past, and went to the goal. The rabbit awakened, rubbed his eyes, looked back and concluded that the turtle was not even in sight yet. But when he ambled off to the goal, lo, there sat the tortoise, which the hare thought was so far behind. Thus modern science may conclude that the Bible is behind the times, but when they make a new discovery, they generally find the Bible is there waiting for them, and has been for a good many hundreds of years. How did the writers of the Bible know all of these things in advance? The answer is that they spoke as God, Who knoweth all things from the beginning, directed them!

REVELATION AND EXPERIMENTATION

The great scientist Galileo demonstrated that water cannot be drawn up with a suction pump, or other equivalent device, to a height greater than approximately 34 feet. He died without being able to explain the reason for this limitation, but his friend and co-worker, Toricelli, renewing his experiments, at last arrived at the conclusion that the atmosphere has weight, and exerts pressure, and by a simple calculation he arrived at the idea that the amount of this pressure is about 15 pounds to the square inch. Prior to this time, science had come to the conclusion that air was a vacuum, without weight. Yet we turn to the writings of Job, who was one of the patriarchs living before the days of Moses, and we hear him state, "God understandeth the way thereof, and He knoweth the place thereof. For He looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heavens; To make the *weight for the winds*; and He weigheth the waters by measure." How did this ancient shepherd and farmer, without the use of modern technical apparatus, know that wind could be weighed?

For years and years, men wondered about the movement of the winds and aircurrents. They conceived the idea that there must be some regularity about these movements but could not explain the direction or continuity. Then by a series of tests, scientists of our modern day determined that the temperature and density had much to do with the air currents. Finally it was proven that these currents move from the poles to the equator and then back again in regular successive flows. So accurate are these movements that we even label our wind currents now as "northeast trade winds," "southeast trade winds," etc. But, do you realize that long before man in his puny experiments revealed these circulation phases of the atmosphere that Solomon said, "The wind goeth toward the south, and turneth about unto the north; it whirlleth about continually, and the wind returneth according to his circuits" (Ecclesiastes 1:6). How did Solomon learn that without the use of barometers and other modern equipment?

For untold centuries, men stood upon the shores of the oceans, and as they beheld the rivers emptying their great burden of water

into these mighty depths, they asked why the ocean did not overflow. They pondered and debated why it was never any more filled though years went by. Then at last someone came up with the explanation of evaporation. The rivers flowed into the sea, but by the power of the sun's rays, the water was lifted from the ocean, taken up into the atmosphere, transported back to the heads of the rivers, and there once more deposited to start the endless process of flowing into the ocean to be picked up again. It was hailed as a wonderful triumph of science. But let me read you again the words of Solomon, "All the rivers run into the sea: yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again" (Ecclesiastes 1:7). How did Solomon know that? How did he learn it? He was not privileged to go to one of our great modern universities. He had no laboratory in which to experiment. He didn't even see the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean. Then, how did he learn these things?

The answer is simply that Job and Solomon had these facts revealed unto them by the One who created the air currents, the winds and the waves. The apostle Peter, speaking of these ancient times, declares that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter 1:21). How foolish does the Bible make our modern reasoning appear. How puny are we as weak mortals to think that we are the discoverer of the universe and all of its treasures. The Bible is far in advance of the teachings of those who think in their arrogance that they have learned everything!

Once, when I was in school, the class placed some snowflakes under the microscope. I have never seen anything more beautiful. Each flake was different in form than the rest. The teacher informed us that the beauties of these treasures in snow were brought to light in 1885 by W. A. Bentley, of Jericho, Vermont, who discovered the attractive forms and began to photograph them. By the spring of 1904, he had collected over 1100 photographs, no two of which were alike. He wrote, "Altogether, the snow fills a most important part in nature's plan. Not only is it beautiful in itself, composed of the most graceful forms that occur in nature, but it plays an important part in beautifying earth and sky, forest, and mountain."

I do not want to detract from the discoveries of Mr. Bentley. Still, I cannot resist reading to you these words, written by one who lived and died many, many centuries before 1904. Listen! The record is by Job, but it is the Lord who speaks to him. "Hast thou entered into the treasures of the snow? or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail, which I have reserved against the time of trouble, against the day of battle and war?" Once again the Bible anticipated the discoveries of modern science!

Have you ever watched the ducks and geese flying south in the autumn, and returning again in the spring? I know that you have. Science has had a hard time accounting for this great movement twice per year. You may jump at the conclusion that the reason the birds leave the north in the winter is because the lakes and ground freeze over, and thus they go to escape the cold, and secure ample food. All right, what makes them go back into the north in the spring? It isn't because the southland freezes over, and it is not due to lack of food. And what guides them so unerringly? The only way to account for it at all is to conclude that it is an instinct. That is what science admits. But where did the birds get this instinct, and why do they not all have it? I answer that it is divinely given, and long before man knew of the migratory instinct the Bible says, "Yea, the stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle dove and the crane and the swallow observe the time of their coming; but My people know not the judgment of the Lord" (Jeremiah 8:7).

Please observe that the Word says, "The stork knows her appointed time." Before there can be an appointment, there has to be someone to do the appointing. Who did it in this case? Was it the stork? If so, then the stork has more sense than modern scientists, for it figured out something which they are not able to account for. Personally, I prefer to believe it was God, for I would much rather admit that God knew more than I did, than to be forced to admit I didn't know as much as a stork. Still it is implied in this very passage that there are some people who have not as much plain common sense as a stork, turtle dove, crane or swallow. They obey implicitly the instinct which God has given them. They do not stop to question why. When the

time comes to go, they obey, and speed onward. But God declares in sadness, "My people know not the judgment of the Lord."

If some people would learn a lesson from the ducks, we would not have so many "quacks" in the world. If they would study the swallows of Capistrano they would not need to swallow their disappointment at their own shortcomings. It is far better to *learn* from a wild goose than it is *to be one*.

I challenge all who doubt the Bible as being the Word of God to answer these questions from Job, chapter 38. "Then the Lord answered and said, Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou Me. Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou has understanding. . . . Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened, or who laid the cornerstone thereof? . . . Or who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb? When I made the cloud the garment thereof, and thick darkness a swaddlingband for it, and brake up for it My decreed places, and set bars and doors, and said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shalt thy proud waves be stayed? Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days; and caused the dayspring to know his place: that it might take hold of the ends of the earth, that the wicked might be shaken out of it? . . . Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea? or hast thou walked in search of the depth? Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death?"

God is Almighty! He is our creator, benefactor, and preserver! Worship Him! Believe Him! Obey Him! It will be to your honor and for your everlasting life. Do not reject the Bible for the theories of men!

PLAIN COMMON SENSE

At the present time there is a trial pending judgment in the courts of Illinois. Three judges in Champaign are soon to render their verdict. The school officials in that city have followed the practice of dismissing their pupils each week for a brief period of religious instruction. This incurred the bitter opposition of the wife of one of the professors at the state university, and being an avowed atheist, she brought trial against the members of the school board asking the court to cause a cessation of any teaching having a Biblical basis. There was nothing compulsory about the classes in Bible. Students did not have to attend, and it in no way affected their credits in education if they remained away. But the woman who brought suit hates the Bible, detests God and bitterly opposes religion.

Such individuals always prate about their "reason." That is the catch-word of atheism and the banner under which modern infidelity parades. I think it would be worth our time today to do a little reasoning concerning the opinions of these blatant infidels and self-appointed censors of the Bible. It is a fact that in rejecting God, they unconsciously set themselves up as a god. It is absolutely impossible for anyone to KNOW that there is no God. To know that, he would have to possess all of the characteristics and attributes which are ascribed to God.

Unless a person was omnipresent, he could not affirm that God did not exist in the universe. He cannot be in all places at the same time, and since he cannot, then how does he know that God is not in the place where he is not?

One would have to be omniscient to say positively that there is no God. By that we mean that he would have to possess all knowledge. But no man possesses all knowledge, therefore he cannot truthfully say that he is aware of all the causes and effects which pertains to the universe. Then, if he doesn't know ALL causes, he does not know that there is not a great Cause for the existence of the heavens and the earth. Even if man was wise

enough to know all of the creative causes in the whole world except one, he still could not affirm that there is no God, for he would not know but what the one cause he was unfamiliar with might be God.

It is affirmed by the unbeliever and the pagan materialist that the Christian does not employ reason. That is a lie of the deepest dye. The Christian acts in perfect harmony with reason when he accepts the testimony given in nature and corroborated by the Bible, that there is a God. He demonstrates a wisdom which the agnostic and atheist do not possess, or at least do not employ. Let me prove that!

It is admitted by all that a wise man is one who plans for the future, and who is interested in securing for himself and his kindred proper protection. In the common affairs of this temporal sphere in which man resides it is only good common sense and reason to fortify one's self against evils which may confront us. We vaccinate against typhoid and diphtheria. We inoculate ourselves against the common cold. We lay up proper provision for the winter that we know will come. We fill our bins with coal to protect us from the chilling blast, and our basements with canned fruit to guarantee a sufficient amount of food. We take the means at hand to place a buffer between old age and destitution. We insure our dwellings, our cars, our crops and our lives against possible destruction. It is reasoned that the danger of loss is so great one should not take an unnecessary risk. Is that good judgment? Is it good sense? All of us are universally willing to admit that such manifests clear-headed foresight!

Now, if it is sensible to make such provision, and to fortify ourselves against the temporal calamities which might come upon us, is it not also good judgment to make provision for the future spiritually? But the atheist asks how we know that man possesses a spirit? We ask in return how the atheist knows that he does not have one? Suppose that the atheist is finally proven to be correct and it turns out that there is no God, no heaven, no hell, and that when man dies he is like a beast which lies down to rise no more, has the Christian lost anything? Has he lost anything in this life by being kind, considerate and compassionate? Has he

lost anything in the family circle, the fellowship of the church, or in his daily walks among men?

Now comes the startling question! An atheist is not infallible! Suppose, then, that the atheist proves to be wrong, and the Christian is proven right, what about the destiny of the atheist? It staggers one's mind to imagine what shall take place, if the arrogant unbeliever stands before the God of Heaven whom he has reviled, ridiculed and sneered at. What will he do if there is a Christ? What will he do if the Bible is right and there is a hell? The atheist will lose everything. The Christian will gain all! And yet, the atheist has the audacity to talk about reason, as if he were the only one upon earth who employed it.

There is no doubt in my mind about Jesus. I believe in Him. I believe that He was born of the virgin, lived among men, died in writhing agony upon the Cross of Golgotha, was buried and resurrected from the dead and that He now sits at the right hand of the Father above. I believe that. The atheist says that I am a fool for accepting it. But suppose it turns out that I am right, and Jesus Christ was the Son of God. Even if it turns out that Jesus never lived, I have lost nothing. But my faith is on a plane above all doubt and quibbling.

The Christian life is far preferable to that of the atheist. A Christian lives in a moral sphere of regulation and propriety. By self-discipline he does without those things which harm the body and bring it down to an untimely grave. He sits down at his fire-side at night and reads from the sacred book of the ages with calm and placid faith. He retires, sustained by a conscience which knows no evil and arises refreshed to face the tasks of a new day. When the setting sun of life approaches, he can watch the shadows lengthen, knowing that a brighter and better world awaits him. It is not so with the atheist. He has nothing but cheerless darkness awaiting.

Death, not life, provides the acid test of a man's doctrine. The infidel is all too often like a child, bragging and blustering before its playmates while the sun shines, and running like a craven coward when the eventide deepens. Perhaps one of the greatest agnostics who ever took the public platform to deny the Bible was

Robert G. Ingersoll. Yet, when the time came for him to deliver the funeral eulogy over his brother's body, he uttered these pitiable words, and these groping sentences:

"Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry. From the voiceless lips of the unreplying dead there comes no word; but in the night of death, hope sees a star and listening love can hear the rustle of a wing!"

What consolation for an atheist! How cheering to admit that life is a narrow vale between cold and barren peaks. With a faith that is sublime, the Christian sees no snowcaps upon the peak ahead. Instead, the radiant sun of a new and better day floods the farthest reaches with the golden light of hope and promise.

Remember, you are going to die. There is no escaping that appointment. The atheist will die just as will the believer. The two of them may leave this earth at the same moment. What lies ahead? What hope is there for the skeptic? Walled in during life by cold and barren peaks, he has only the outer darkness facing him in the great beyond from which no man can return to this fleshly bourne. What about the Christian? For him there is vibrant hope in this world, and joy instead of sorrow! And beyond, if he is right, there is eternal and everlasting bliss.

Make provision today. Do not insure your house against fire and neglect to insure your soul against hell. Do not insure this life against death and forget to take out a policy against the second death. Do not insure the crops in your field, and then sow a crop of wild oats which will bring an eternity of regret. The wise man is the one who provides protection against the future. The Christian is a wise person. Only the fool will say in his heart that there is no God.