

PRESIDENT SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION MAKES ADDRESS

(Continued from page four)

themselves earthquakes occur.

"Anyone who examines the Bible with an humble and a reverent mind, and compares its teachings with the ascertained facts (not the conjectures) of modern research, must have his faith in the Book confirmed. EVERY DISPUTED ISSUE OF THE BIBLE UPON WHICH THE ARCHAEOLOGIST HAS THROWN ANY LIGHT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED. The statements of the opening chapter of Genesis, the storm center of the controversy, are in accord with what is known today. Prof. Alphonso Smith, of the U. S. Naval Academy, says: 'IT IS THE ONE CHAPTER IN THE BIBLE THAT HAS MADE SCIENCE NA CHARTA OF SCIENCE.' To quote Dr. Frances Smith, distinguished longtime teacher of Natural Science in the University of Virginia: 'THE WRITER OF THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS SHOWS A CORRESPONDENCE, NOT WITH THE SCIENCE OF HIS TIME, BUT WITH THAT OF THREE THOUSAND YEARS LATER. WHICH THE ACCEPTED DOCTRINE OF PROBABILITIES MAKES IT IMPOSSIBLE TO ATTRIBUTE TO A FORTUNATE GUESS.' One does not have to be an erudite scholar to understand this. Long and high-sounding words are not needed to prove the proposition.

"Genesis says: 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' No definite time is fixed—whether six thousand years or six million years. The time is expressly indefinite and gives a place for all that geology may discover. It was revealed to the historian that God was the source of all. The mind of the typical man rests upon that explanation. He knows there must have been a first cause; his intellectual faculties demand an adequate cause for every effect; his experience and observation agree with these faculties; he is in a universe of insoluble riddle without the first verse of the Bible; with that verse he has the solution in a personal Being who is sufficient for all things. The bewildered Darwin, in his experimentations, reached his limit and held up his hands with the exclamation that behind all may be a 'somewhat.' Herbert Spencer's nearest approach to a personal God was the recognition of an 'Infinite and Eternal Energy' from which all things proceed. Huxley contemptuously dismisses the subject of Deity with the words: 'It is but the weary chatter of endless logomachy.' I do not worship the 'somewhat' of Darwin, nor the 'Eternal Energy' of Spencer: I worship the one true and living God who satisfies my reason and answers the requirements of my conscience. His revealed ways are not wearying to my soul. 'They are my meditation day and night.'

"The scientist is unable to account for matter, he is impotent to create matter or life. Neith-

er can he unravel the mystery of the process of development. HOW DID INVERTEBRATES DEVELOP BACKBONES AND MAMMALS DEVELOP BREASTS? EXPLAIN THE ORIGIN AND TRANSMISSION OF THE EYE—the most perfect mechanism known to man. The simplest Christian with his Bible can tell more about origins than Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, and Tyndall all together. Upon this one phase of the subject he knows more than they by searching could find out. 'By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear.' Heb. 11: 3. The first chapter of Genesis gives an authoritative account of the primal source of matter, life and species. WHY SHOULD A CHRISTIAN EXCHANGE A RATIONAL ACCOUNT OF THE ORIGIN OF MATTER, LIFE, AND SPECIES FOR THE BARREN NEGATIONS, ILLOGICAL CONJECTURES, AUDACIOUS DOGMATISMS AND POISONOUS GASES OF GRASSHOPPER SCIENTISTS AND KANGAROO SKEPTICS? Why should he not the rather confidently walk with Paschal,—the prince of French writers, the peer of all scientists, and the finest of mathematicians—in the proved paths of the satisfying scriptures?

Consider the order of the creation of life. According to the first chapter of Genesis: vegetable life appeared first, fish and fowl second, vertebrate animals third, and man fourth and last. THAT ORDER IS IN AGREEMENT WITH THE KNOWN FACTS OF GEOLOGY. The earliest form of life found in earth's grave is sea weed. Plants in abundance appeared before animals. Scientifically, this is necessarily so. for animals could not subsist upon mineral matter. Animals feed upon plants or other animals. The horse cannot directly assimilate minerals; he must be fed upon corn, oats, hay, alfalfa,—these must exist before he can subsist. This is common sense and scripture. 'And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so.' Gen. 1: 11.

"The second order in Genesis is recorded: 'And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.' Geology teaches that the first animals were the shell fish. Later, fish with a backbone appear and still later the frog and reptile. So much is not known scientifically about birds but they undoubtedly preceded mammals. HOW DID THE AUTHOR OF GENESIS HAPPEN TO HIT UPON THE ORDER WHICH GEOLOGY AND BIOLOGY DISCOVER? THERE IS BUT ONE SUFFICIENT ANSWER: GOD MADE IT KNOWN TO HIM.

"The third order in Genesis is vertebrate animals: 'And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it was so.

And God made the beast of earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good.' Gen. 1: 24, 25. The non-Christian geologist must concede that mammals appeared after plants and fish, and before man. He must also admit that there is no evidence in the rocks of unbroken progression, of intermediate forms, of transitional stages among various species. HE SHOULD SEE THAT THE CONCLUSION OF HIS OWN INVESTIGATION REQUIRES EITHER CREATION OR METAMORPHOSIS —NOT EVOLUTION. Darwin admitted the force of this reasoning: 'Geology, assuredly, does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this perhaps is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory.' The Bible account is not disapproved but rather strengthened by true science. I PROTEST AGAINST THAT PREACHING OR TEACHING WHICH TREATS THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT OF CREATION AS ABSURD. Point out the absurdity. Do not deal in glittering generalities, in sneering innuendoes, in veiled reflections, in smiling ridicule. Specify the particulars and present the evidence. MOSES WAS BETTER INFORMED THAN HIS CRITICS. GENESIS ANTICIPATES THE LATEST SCIENCE.

"Once more, Genesis places man as the last and highest order in creation. 'And God said, Let us make man in our image after our likeness.' Gen. 1: 26. To quote Professor Keyser: 'First came the oblique forms of life, which were obviously vegetable; then the primal forms of animal life; then the higher forms; lastly man himself like a crown upon the pedestal of creation.'

"Contrast the language used in the creation of man with the language used in the creation of plants, of fish, of beasts. A dignity is conferred upon man: 'Thou hast made him little lower than God.' Psalms 8: 5. Between him and the highest order of beasts there is a vast chasm. Hence, no beast could be his consort: God made him a companion, a gentle woman.

"Man, as portrayed in the Bible, is a rational, moral, social, spiritual being; he is the only earthly creature with religious feeling, moral sense and perception of the sublime. Such he has been as remotely as history traces him. Such he is now. He is conscious of an impassable gulf separating himself from the lower animals. He is, and has ever been, their superior and master. Argue as much as you please about fossil, speculate to your heart's content about processes, the everyday man has an intuitive and ineradicable conviction that he is above and over all other animals, that he has something within him not akin to them, that his destiny is diverse from theirs. The only explanation I have ever seen of this difference which appeals to my reason is the one contained in the Bible. WHY APOLOGIZE FOR THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT? WHY CALL IT ALLEGORICAL WHEN IT IS INSEPARABLY

CONNECTED WITH THE SUCCEEDING HISTORY? WHY NOT PROCLAIM ITS ACCURACY SINCE IT SATISFIES INTELLECT AND CONSCIENCE AND WITHOUT IT WE ARE IN A HOPELESS MUDDLE?

"Go as far back into the past as you can and man is not very unlike the man of the present. A Columbia University professor recently had the candor to say that 'ALL OUR RESEARCH FAILS TO REVEAL ANY DEVELOPMENT OR MATERIAL CHANGE IN THE INTELLECTUAL, PHYSICAL, OR MORTAL NATURE OF MAN FROM HIS REMOTEST HISTORICAL APPEARANCE UNTIL THE PRESENT.' If we could trace man back to the first man my belief is that we would find the first will resemble the last. THOSE WHO HAVE A THEORY TO PROVE HAVE SOUGHT IN VAIN FOR A FOSSIL THAT CLEARLY PROVES MAN'S ANIMAL ORIGIN. The best they can produce is the Java specimen with their far-fetched conclusions. Why, four thousand years from now, if the world stands so long, some speculative and illogical geologist may find the skeleton of a deformed negro of flat forehead, club feet, six toes and fingers, such as you may have seen in

THE ROYAL CONFLICT

(Continued from page eight)

of your judgment. It would have been refreshing if the Bible writers had devoted a few chapters, even a few verses, to telling how they composed their productions; but unfortunately our wishes have been ignored. The only thing for us to do is to conclude that they wrote their books just as other conscientious authors have written theirs."

Margaret's face was a study. "Are you positively sure that the Bible writers have nothing to say about how their books were written?" she asked.

"As far as I can remember," he said, "I do not think a single writer refers to the origin of his writings, and even if there is any such reference, I am sure that it contains no claim of inspiration on the part of the author."

"I wish I could recollect some passages on this subject," she said.

(Continued in next issue)

the flesh, and exhibit that skeleton to prove that people of the twentieth century were that type.

"There is another expression,

(Continued on page ten)

TRY THIS TEST ON YOURSELF.

1. Do you know what Evolution is?
2. Do you know what effect fulfilled prophecies have on Evolution?
3. Do you know what Evolution is doing to the students in the Schools and Colleges where it is taught?
4. Do you know what it is doing in our Public Schools today?
5. Are you willing that YOUR child be taught that the Bible is a pack of lies?
6. Are you content to be FORCED to pay teachers to teach such Things to your children?
7. Can you prove to an Evolutionist that the Bible IS GOD'S WORD?

SUBSCRIBE FOR THE CONFLICT.

AND YOU WILL

1. Learn what Evolution teaches
2. Learn how absurd and untrue this teaching is.
3. Be forewarned as to the danger of such teachings.
4. Learn what Evolution does for those who believe in it.
5. Learn how to fight it.
6. Be convinced that it should be excluded from our tax-supported schools.
7. Be convinced that the Bible is really God's word and learn facts whereby you can refute argument of Evolutionists and others seeking to discredit the Bible as God's word.
8. Aid in making the paper what it should be—a power in this fight.

This fight is your fight and affects your Children. Fill out the coupon below today—

THE CONFLICT PUBLISHING CO.

Blue Mountain, Miss.

Dear Sirs:

I am enclosing \$1.50 for 1 years subscription to THE CONFLICT.

Name

Address

Important—write name and address plain as Print.