

A large flock of sheep with thick, light-brown wool is gathered in a field. The sheep are looking in various directions, some towards the camera. In the background, there are rolling hills and mountains under a blue sky with light clouds. The overall scene is a pastoral landscape.

THOUGHTS ON EDUCATION

COLLECTED PERIODICAL ARTICLES

A. T. JONES

Sources:

Advent Review
American Sentinel
Bible Echo
Christian Educator
Signs of the Times

Cover:

Flock of Sheep

These particular sheep belong to a research flock
at the US Sheep Experiment Station near Dubois, Idaho, USA

Photo by Keith Weller

[wikimedia commons](#)

*Tracy
Hougen Jones*

Fonts:

Liberation Sans Narrow
Linux Biolinum
Linux Libertine



April 2026

practicaprophetica.com
srac.info

Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| About the “Fragments” Series..... | i |
| About This Volume..... | iv |
| 1. Light Literature..... | 1 |
| 2. The Uncertainty of Geological Science..... | 6 |
| <i>Part 1 – The Geological Evidence.....</i> | <i>6</i> |
| <i>Part 2 – The Argument From Physics.....</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>Part 3 – Further Considerations.....</i> | <i>15</i> |
| <i>Part 4 – Closing Proofs.....</i> | <i>21</i> |
| <i>Synopsis.....</i> | <i>26</i> |
| 3. “Evolution” and Evolution..... | 29 |
| <i>Part 1.....</i> | <i>29</i> |
| <i>Part 2.....</i> | <i>36</i> |
| <i>Part 3.....</i> | <i>41</i> |
| <i>Part 3.....</i> | <i>48</i> |
| 4. The Foundation of Morality..... | 54 |
| 5. An Important Discussion..... | 60 |
| 6. What Are the Rights of Conscience?..... | 68 |
| 7. The Bible Is Religious Only..... | 74 |
| 8. Morality in the Public Schools..... | 79 |
| 9. Some Reasons for Some Virtues..... | 83 |
| 10. The Grounds of Right..... | 89 |
| 11. What Is the Guide to Morality?..... | 97 |
| 12. True Morality..... | 104 |
| 13. Shall Religion be Taught in the Public Schools?..... | 117 |
| <i>Origin and Intent of Public Schools.....</i> | <i>118</i> |
| <i>The Duty of the State in Public Education.....</i> | <i>119</i> |
| <i>The Difficulties of Teaching Religion in Public Schools.....</i> | <i>119</i> |
| <i>Proper Relationship of Religion and State.....</i> | <i>121</i> |
| <i>The Bible in the Public Schools.....</i> | <i>124</i> |
| <i>Declaration of Principles.....</i> | <i>126</i> |
| 14. The Science of Salvation..... | 127 |
| <i>Introduction.....</i> | <i>127</i> |
| <i>God’s Thinking.....</i> | <i>128</i> |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>High Authority</i> | 131 |
| <i>What the Angels Learn</i> | 133 |
| <i>A Study for Eternity</i> | 134 |
| <i>An Astronomical Statement</i> | 136 |
| <i>Gravitation and the Bible</i> | 137 |
| <i>The Chief Science</i> | 142 |
| <i>A Great Scientist</i> | 146 |
| <i>The World's Need</i> | 148 |
| <i>The Foolishness of Man's Wisdom</i> | 152 |
| <i>Salvation Is the First Science</i> | 157 |
| 15. The Teacher and the Textbook..... | 159 |
| 16. The Bible Is Science..... | 162 |
| 17. Salvation Is Science..... | 168 |
| 18. God the Teacher In the Sciences..... | 173 |
| 19. Science With and Without the Bible..... | 178 |
| 20. The Science of Salvation – I..... | 183 |
| 21. The Science of Salvation – II..... | 187 |
| 22. The Bible the Leading Educational Book..... | 191 |
| 23. The Bible First..... | 194 |
| 24. The Bible First in Language..... | 196 |
| 25. Our Schools..... | 200 |
| 26. What Will Our Schools Teach?..... | 202 |
| 27. Our Schools, Teachers, and Students..... | 206 |
| 28. True Moral Science..... | 209 |
| 29. Some Good Principles in Education..... | 214 |
| 30. Science Falsely So-called..... | 216 |
| 31. Christian Education – I..... | 219 |
| <i>Part 1</i> | 219 |
| <i>Part 2</i> | 225 |
| <i>Part 3</i> | 232 |
| <i>Part 4</i> | 241 |
| 32. Christian Education – II..... | 248 |
| <i>Part 1</i> | 248 |
| <i>Part 2</i> | 254 |

33. The Bible as a Textbook.....261
 Part 1.....261
 Part 2.....266

34. Wanted: An Education That Will Truly Educate.....274
 As to the State.....274
 As to the Church.....277
 True Education.....279

35. A “Needed Educational Reform”.....281

36. That “Needed Educational Reform” Again.....284

37. More on That “Needed Educational Reform”.....290



A. T. Jones, a colorized version of a drawing

About the “Fragments” Series

THE *Fragments* series is composed of 12 books of articles, gathered from the various Periodicals which A. T. Jones contributed to during his lifetime. There is a separate and parallel series devoted to the writings of Jones’ companion in the gospel, E. J. Waggoner.

In order to bring some cohesion to these articles, the books are topical: that is, articles are organized according to their topic, and there is a separate book for each topic, as follows:

1. Grace Greater Than Sin [The Gospel]
2. Healing and Temperance
3. Life, Death, and Spiritualism [Conditional Immortality]
4. Money and Work
5. Religious Liberty
6. The Bible
7. The Church
8. The Holy Spirit
9. The Law and the Sabbath
10. The Name [Character] of God
11. The Prophetic Word
12. Thoughts on Education

Most often, the articles within each volume are grouped by the year of publication, or if one year had few articles, sometimes the group includes a range of years. In other cases, the articles are grouped by topic. In still other cases, there was sometimes a mini-series that continued through a few periodical issues, and those were grouped accordingly.

While trying to make this as complete a collection as possible, at times I have not included some smaller articles that carried only local news or material that would not be relevant to our time. Even at that, the amount of included material is quite vast.

These volumes range in size from less than 100 pages, to over 1500 pages. In the largest, the *Religious Liberty* articles, I selected only those articles that carried principles or examples that would be applicable for our day. There were many other articles (which would have made the volume about 3000 pages or more) that concerned local news and happenings. But to extract just the most essential, I left these out.

In most cases, I have left out articles that already appear in other books. For example, there was a series of Gospel articles in the *Present Truth* magazine, titled “Bible Studies on the Christian Life.” These are available as a separate book on our website, so they are not included in the *Gospel* book of the Fragments series. Also, there is a large collection of articles regarding the Papacy and Catholic errors, *The Light Shines in Darkness*. (There is a companion volume of Waggoner’s writings, *The Great Falling Away*.) Articles that are in that collection are not included in the *Fragments* series.

Sometimes Jones produced a series of articles on ancient or church history, and then later included those in his books: *The Empires of the Bible*, *The Great Empires of Prophecy*, *Ecclesiastical Empire*, and *The Two Republics*. Those articles are therefore not included in the Fragments volumes, but are published in those other books.

Also, some articles crossed over many topics. For example, an article on the Sabbath could fit into the “Law and Sabbath” book, but it might also cover “Religious Liberty,” “The Gospel,” and even “The Prophetic Word.” I did not think it wise to duplicate articles, so I tried to fit these kinds of articles into the book that most matched it’s topic, or where there were a series of articles that it belonged to. Occasionally an article is included in more than one volume.

What these books demonstrate is that A. T. Jones produced a lot of precious material, much of which was never organized or reprinted after his death. Jesus taught us to...

John 6

¹² Gather the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.

¹³ Therefore they gathered them together, and filled *twelve baskets with the fragments*.



Since much depends on how we receive and appreciate the light that God gives through His chosen messengers, I felt a burden to put these forgotten treasures into an orderly and easily accessible format. May the Spirit that gave them, bless you as you read His words!

Frank Zimmerman
practicaprophetica.com

*“If human beings would open the windows of the soul heavenward,
in appreciation of the divine gifts,
a flood of healing virtue would pour in.”*

Ellen White, Ministry of Healing, p. 116

About This Volume

THIS volume, titled *Thoughts on Education*, gathers together those articles, from the writings of A. T. Jones, which cover the work of education, as related to the Gospel work of restoring God's image in man. Ellen White expressed the aim of education clearly in the opening of her book, *Education*, p. 13:

True education means more than the pursual of a certain course of study. It means more than a preparation for the life that now is. It has to do with the whole being, and with the whole period of existence possible to man. It is the harmonious development of the physical, the mental, and the spiritual powers. It prepares the student for the joy of service in this world and for the higher joy of wider service in the world to come.

The source of such an education is brought to view in these words of Holy Writ, pointing to the Infinite One: In Him...

Colossians 2

³ ...are hid all the treasures of wisdom.

Job 12

¹³ He has counsel and understanding.

Moral education, the shaping of the character and mind to think and act in harmony with God's Spirit, is the main aim of Christian education. But without the correct understanding and experience of the Gospel, moral education often turns into a dry rehearsal of "do's and dont's," or in short: rules about how a wolf should act like a sheep! It's not surprising then, that the gospel message, which shows how to let the living power of God flow into the human soul, would have something to say about education after the order of Christ and His power to change and make lively the work in the soul.

When the moral aim taught in the classroom is not only attainable, but becomes a living experience, a miracle of God's grace, and a hand-in-hand relationship with the Creator of the Universe, such education expands the soul, and awakens every energy in the cause of good and right. Such education does not end with

Grade 12 or University. It continues throughout eternity. A student of Christ does not long for the day when school is over; but rather, the truths that are digested are life-giving, and refreshing:

John 4

¹³ Whosoever drinks of this water [worldly education] shall thirst again:

¹⁴ But whosoever drinks of the water [heavenly education] that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

The Bible is God’s manual for the human being. Through its word is imparted the creative power by which man is to be restored to his original glory. It addresses the whole man: spiritual, mental, and physical. And since we are commanded to...

Mark 12

³⁰ ...love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength,

–there is no greater educational book, than the Bible. Today, however, this assertion would be mostly scoffed at. The Bible is looked at as a book that produces narrow-minded people who are stuck in tradition. This is not the fault of God, but is a result of the failure of professed Christians to realize and pursue the excellence held out in the Bible. The treasure is there, but it has not been realized, to a large extent.

And, on the other hand, the world scoffs at the kind of mental development that the Bible promotes. It is a mental development that makes no place for sin, self-seeking, and the exaltation of human greatness. The Bible method of education involves:

- Training faculties and developing talents only for the use of the Master’s service; and not for worldly profit and glory;
- Self-control in the highest sense: every impulse held in abeyance to the higher purpose;
- Making decisions based on honesty, justice, fairness, and

mercy, even in the smallest things, where no eye can see,
but that of the Lord.

A. T. Jones, and his companion in the gospel work, E. J. Waggoner, were called to begin the light that was to lighten the world,¹ as proclaimed in this verse:

Revelation 18

¹ And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory.

This message is known as “the fourth angel’s message” because it belongs with the series of seven angels, six of whom are given in *Revelation 14*, with this one in *Revelation 18* being the fourth in the series, and the last message of mercy to be given to the world before the outpouring of the God’s wrath in the seven last plagues.² The glory of this angel (an “angel” in *Revelation 14* & *18* represents a movement of people) is the glory of God’s character, which the gospel develops within man.

Romans 1

¹⁶ For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes...

¹⁷ For therein is *the righteousness of God* [*i.e.* His glory] revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith.

This work of lightening the earth with glory, indicates the close of the gospel work, and the crowning achievement of the grace of God through Christ, in redeeming man. The people of God who participate in that final work, are to be “men wondered at,”³ at least among those who have spiritual eyesight. God will do great things, by His Spirit, in this closing work.

¹ Ellen G. White, *The Review and Herald*, November 22, 1892: “The time of test is just upon us, for the loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer. This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth.”

² See *Revelation 15* and *16*.

³ *Zechariah 3:8*.

Mark 4

²⁹ But when the fruit is brought forth, immediately He puts in the sickle, because the harvest is come.

Matthew 13

³⁹ ...the harvest is the end of the world.

This will be the last phase of the Gospel work.

Matthew 24

¹⁴ And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.

In the ministry of Jesus while on earth, the presentation of the gospel took place in two parts:

1. Declaration: His preaching and ministry; and
2. Demonstration: His trial, sufferings, and death.

So it is to be again. The declaration phase will instill the principles of God's educational plan, and the demonstration phase will reveal them in their fullness, under severe test and trial. The people who take part in that work will be living examples of what the grace of God can do, and the educational principles of God's law will be "magnified, and made honorable,"⁴ by their manifestation in the living saints who make up the church.

This book is a collection of articles that particularly focused on the educational principles that were presented during the beginning of the work of this *Revelation* 18 angel. That work did not finish in the late 1800's, when these men ministered. There has been a delay, but the work has been continued again in our day. To help those who are in the work at this time, these articles are gathered, so that the purpose of the Lord in giving this light, will finally be realized!

Frank Zimmerman
practicaprophetica.com

⁴ *Isaiah* 42:21.

1. Light Literature

Signs of the Times, April 2, 1885

Original title: Light Literature—the Bane of Purity and Peace

1 Thessalonians 5

⁶ Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober.

⁸ But let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breast-plate of faith and love; and for a helmet, the hope of salvation.

LAST week, in studying the Scripture injunction to be sober,⁵ we found that it is especially insisted upon in the last days, because that its opposite—“lightness”—will be most prevalent; and in the definition of the word we found that, “*sober* is opposed to *flighty*.” *Flighty* is thus defined:

Indulging in flight, or wild and unrestrained sallies of imagination, humor, caprice, etc.; given to disordered fancies and extravagant conduct; volatile, giddy;

—and this is exactly what is referred to in *Jeremiah* 23:32, where it is declared that “lightness” is a characteristic of the last days:

Jeremiah 23

³² Behold, I am against them that prophesy false dreams, says the Lord, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies, and by their *lightness*; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them: therefore they shall not profit this people at all, says the Lord.

It is the events foreshown in *Jeremiah* 23:16-32, to which Paul has reference, when, in *1 Thessalonians* 5:6, 8, he exhorts us to “be sober.”

Now let any sober-minded person take this definition of “flighty,” and, bearing it in mind for a week, compare with it the actions of the people generally, as they come under his notice either by direct observation, or as reported in the daily papers, and

⁵ PP Editor’s note: This article, from March 26, 1885, is included in the Fragments Series, *The Prophetic Word*; the article is titled, “Let Us Be Sober.”

we are sure that he will be ready to admit that certainly these are the times pointed out in these scriptures. And the longer he conducts the observation, the more thoroughly will he be convinced that this is so. And another thing of which he will be convinced by such observation is that the one source, more than all others, whence this instability, this flightiness, this lightness springs, is the "light" literature that is found everywhere, low and high, from the hovel to the palace, from the gamins to the pampered heirs of millions.

Light literature it is called, and properly so, for light it is. In it is embodied every element that tends to lightness. There is not a single idea contained in the definition of flighty that is not demonstrated in this light literature. The mind, like the body, is, in this respect, an assimilation of what it feeds on; and the mind that dwells upon this kind of literature soon becomes as light and shallow as the stuff that is read. It is a poison to the mind as veritably as is whiskey, or tobacco, or any other poison, to the body; and like other poisons it creates an appetite which nothing but itself can supply; and as there is absolutely nothing in it by which the mind is fed, developed, or strengthened, the more of it that is devoured, so much the more is demanded, and so much weaker and more morbid the mind becomes. And so the mind is rendered almost useless for any sober purpose; it is almost if not altogether impossible for such a mind to concentrate itself upon a subject that requires deep thought; to follow a line of sound reasoning; or to appreciate the principles that underlie the most important concerns of life.

One of the most noticeable instances in proof of this is the fact that when the attention of such is called to the benefits to be derived from the study of the Bible, the complaint is made that they cannot remember the Scripture when they do read it; while at the same time they can remember the characters and their career, in the whole course of perhaps a half-dozen of the continued stories in the *Ledger*, *Weekly*, *Saturday Night*, *Chimney Corner*, *Fireside Companion*, and other such namby-pamby papers, pamphlets, etc.

If the mind were as diligently and persistently bent to the study of the Bible, if it were brought into such sympathetic harmony with the Scripture as it is with these stories, there would not be the least difficulty in remembering it. Then all its glorious beauty would pervade the mind; its rich treasures would there be bestowed; its important truths would enlighten, and its sound principles confirm the mind, which would thus be fed, developed, strengthened, and ready for every good work.

We do not say that the Bible alone must be read, to the utter exclusion of every other book; this the Bible itself would not allow; but we do say that the Bible must be read before any other production. It must lead the way; it must guide the mind; it must be the center whence every line of thought radiates; upon its principles must every course of conduct be founded. Without this there can be no well built, properly rounded, symmetrical life in this world; with it the universe becomes our own, to study and to enjoy. The Bible will show us what we are and how to become what we ought to be; it will guide us through all the mazes of human history; it will lead us to the enjoyment of the wealth of the wondrous works of God; it will enable us to think the thoughts of the Almighty, after Him. Thus we may honor God, and be an honor to the human race. And thus the life that we now live will be simply the beginning of that to which there is to be no end; and the habits of mind, and the courses of thought, will be those which are never to cease, nor to be broken in upon.

It is not so with the light literature of which we write. Of that, the nature and the tendency are, in every respect, directly the opposite, so that in it all there is no good thing. But it is asked,

“Are not these stories pictures of real life?”

No. They are altogether fictitious; the very name, “novel,” means “a fictitious tale or narrative;” but the fictitious part is not the worst, it is...

...intended to *exhibit the operation of the passions*, and particularly love.⁶

There is expressed the dangerous, the destructive influence of this kind of literature. The passions are given full swing. All the baser elements of human nature,—envy, jealousy, hatred, strife, deception, ingenious trickery, murder,—are exhibited in their most active energy. Obscenity is forbidden by the law, but in this respect what this literature lacks in plain expression, is amply made up in suggestiveness. So that even were it granted that it is real life that is portrayed it would still be altogether objectionable, because it is the action of the worst elements of human nature that is pictured.

In the definition above given, it is said that it is “particularly love” that is intended to be exhibited, and these are sometimes called “love stories,” but, whatever may be intended, it is not love that is therein exhibited; it is simply an exhibition of extravagant, misguided passion. And this counterfeit is dressed in all the gorgeous and dazzling array that rhetoric can invent, and is paraded as love; the readers of these stories mistake it as such; and then, of course, to them, anything that lacks the distinguishing traits of the leading characters in the stories, cannot be love. So when, unfortunately, the time comes when they shall choose for themselves, the choice must be made in accordance with the most approved style of romance; it must be made in opposition to the most sacred wishes of parents and friends, so that the consummation of it must be by an elopement or a secret marriage, and then...

...Ah! then the fiction vanishes and the fact appears; then the romance ends and the reality begins; the glamour of years is swept away in a day; it is found that true, genuine love is something widely different from this dazzling array of platitudes; and that this one all-essential element of a happy wedded life is sadly lacking. Then there follows, as the inevitable consequence, dis-

⁶ Webster.

grace or a life of misery, and in the very nature of the case there is absolutely no power that can prevent it.

These dangers beset us on every hand. Parents of precious children, and even those professing to be Christians, will so far forget their duties toward God, toward their children, and toward themselves, as to spend their time in devouring this poison. Is it by filling the mind with such wild ideas, with such base thoughts, with such vain imaginations, that it is to be prepared to receive the things of the Spirit of God? Is it by such means that a people are to be prepared for the coming of the Lord?

1 Thessalonians 5

¹ Of the times and the seasons, brethren, you have no need that I write unto you.

Of a truth, “of the times and the seasons” of His coming we need not write so much, but of the duties, and the manner of life by which we must be prepared to meet Him, we must write more.

⁶ Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober.

²² Abstain from all appearance of evil.

²³ And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

2. The Uncertainty of Geological Science

Signs of the Times, May 14 to June 4, 1885

Part 1 – The Geological Evidence

Signs of the Times, May 14, 1885

ARCHIBALD GEIKIE, LL. D., F. R. S., Professor of Geology, University of Edinburgh, spoken of by the New York *Independent* as:

...an author who is surpassed by none of his compeers in scientific attainment and hardly equaled by any of them for his gifts in the imparting of knowledge,

–is the author of a *Text Book of Geology*; and also the author of the treatise on geology in the latest edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*; therefore we shall doubtless be justified in accepting his work as the latest, the ablest, and the best contribution in favor of geological science as it is at the present day. After reading and studying it through three times, the impression left by it upon my mind is that expressed by the title which I have placed at the head of this article.

In this discussion we propose no comparison of geology and the Bible. We intend to examine geological science on its own merits. We want to know upon what it rests. We want to know what its merits are. We want to know whether indeed it has any merit that would justify a comparison with the Bible.

Geology is defined as:

The science which investigates the history of the earth. Its object, [as stated,] is to trace the progress of our planet from the earliest beginning of its separate existence, through its various stages of growth, down to the present condition of things.

It seeks to determine the manner in which the evolution of the earth's great surface features has been effected.

But it is only by a proper understanding of the *present* order of things, that the *past* can be made out. He says:

Only in proportion as we understand the present, where everything is open on all sides to the fullest investigation, can we expect to decipher the past, where so much is obscure, imperfectly preserved, or not preserved at all. A study of the existing economy of nature ought thus to be the *foundation* of the geologist's training.

So, then, here we have properly, at the very beginning, laid down the foundation of geological deduction. And we may, properly enough, inquire,

“Is this foundation secure? is it a foundation upon which we can firmly stand and safely build?”

Let Mr. Geikie answer. In the very next paragraph he says:

While, however, the present condition of things is thus employed, we must obviously be *on our guard* against *the danger* of unconsciously *assuming* that the phase of nature's operations which we now witness has been the same in all past time, that *geological* changes have taken place in former ages in the manner and on the scale which we behold today, and that at the present time all the great geological processes, which have produced changes in the past eras of the earth's history, are still extant and active.

Of course we may *assume* this uniformity of action, and use the *assumption* as a *working hypothesis*. But it ought not to be allowed any firmer footing, nor on *any account* be suffered to blind us to the *obvious truth* that the few centuries wherein man has been observing nature, form much too brief an interval by which to measure, the intensity of geological action in all past time.

For aught we can tell, the present is an era of *quietude* and *slow change*, compared with some of the eras which have preceded it. *Nor can we be sure* that, when we have explored *every* geological process now in progress, we have exhausted *all the causes* of change which even in comparatively recent times have been at work.

And in another place (No. 1, under the “Age of the Earth”) he says plainly that this assumption...

...may be *entirely erroneous*.

According to this, “the foundation of a geologist’s training” is an “assumption;” and this assumption must not be allowed a “firm footing” because it may “blind us to” an “*obvious truth*,” and because it also may be “*entirely erroneous*.”

And here, after laying a—yes, *the*—foundation, he has as certainly destroyed it, and we might exclaim, not exactly with the psalmist,

Psalm 11

³ If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the [geologists] do?

If, therefore, the foundation be assumption, the superstructure can be nothing more, and this also is just as plainly stated as is the foregoing, as follows:

In dealing with the Geological Record, as the accessible solid part of the globe is called, we cannot too vividly realize that at the best it forms but an *imperfect chronicle*. Geological history cannot be compiled from a full and continuous series of documents. From the very nature of its origin, the record is necessarily fragmentary, and it has been further mutilated and obscured by the revolutions of successive ages.

Enormous gaps occur where *no record* has been preserved *at all*. It is as if *whole chapters and books were missing* from an historical work.⁷

But what degree of reliability could be placed in the deductions of one who should presume to give the exact course of events in a certain history, when “whole chapters and books were missing” from the only extant historical record of the events? None whatever. For it is entirely by conjecture that the events of the missing parts must be made up. This is particularly so of the geologists’ deductions, for, as we have seen, there are not only “whole chapters and books missing,” but they are not sure that they have the correct interpretation of those which remain. Therefore they

⁷ See Part V., *Gaps in the Geological Record*; also in the “Introduction.”

guess at the course of events in that part of the record which remains, and then supply the missing parts by other guesses; and so it is a guess all around.

Geology reveals no beginning:

It is still true that in the data with which they are accustomed to deal as comprising the *sum* of geological evidence, there can be found *no trace of a beginning*. The oldest rocks which have been discovered on any part of the globe have probably been derived from other rocks older than themselves. Geology, by itself, has not yet revealed, and is little likely ever to reveal, *a trace* of the first solid crust of our globe. If, then, geological history is to be compiled from direct evidence furnished by the rocks of the earth, it *cannot begin at the beginning* of things, but must be content to date its first chapter from the earliest period of which any record has been preserved among the rocks.⁸

If, then, it begins at an uncertain place, and follows an uncertain course, and sometimes no course at all, how can the ending be anything else but uncertain?

In Part II, “Geognosy,” he discusses the *Age of the Earth, and Measures of Geological Time* from which we extract the following. He says that the age of the earth may be attacked from either the geological or the physical side. First the geological:

This geological argument rests chiefly, upon the observed rates at which geological changes are being effected at the present time, and is open to the obvious preliminary objection that it *assumes* the existing rate of change as the measure of past revolutions,—an *assumption* which may be *entirely erroneous*, for the present may be a period when all geological events march forward more slowly than they used to do.

If we assume that the land has been worn away, and that stratified deposits have been laid down *nearly* at the *same rate* as at *present*, then we must admit that the stratified portion of the crust of the earth must represent a *very vast* period of time. Dr.

⁸Part I, Cosmical Aspects.

Crall puts this period at not less, but much more, than sixty million years.

On any supposition it must be admitted that these vicissitudes in the organic world can only have been effected with the lapse of vast periods of time, though no *reliable* standard seems to be available whereby these periods are to be measured. The argument from geological evidence is strongly in favor of an interval of probably not less than one hundred million years since the earliest form of life appeared upon the earth, and the oldest stratified rocks began to be laid down.

Yes, no doubt, “if we assume” that such and such is one case, “probably” the balance will follow. But why are we called upon to “assume” an “erroneous assumption” only for the purpose of reaching an indefinite conclusion? This “argument from geological evidence,” is like the famous essay on “Snakes in Ireland,” *viz.*,

“There are no snakes in Ireland.”

So likewise, there is no geological evidence, and he says so. Why may we not just as rightfully assume that these changes and revolutions have been wrought in short periods, or even *suddenly*? Many of them have certainly been made violently.

Part 2 – The Argument From Physics

Signs of the Times, May 21, 1885

The argument from physics is just about as inconclusive as that from “geological evidence.” He says:

1. Sir William Thompson, applying Fourier’s theory⁹ of thermal conductivity, pointed out some years ago (1862) that in the known rate of increase of temperature downward and beneath the surface, and the rate of loss of heat from the earth, we have a limit to the antiquity of the planet. He showed, from the data available at the time, that the superficial consolidation of the globe could not have occurred less than twenty million years

⁹Fourier’s theory here referred to is “the spreading of heat in a solid tending to ultimate equalization of temperature throughout it, instead of the transference of heat from one body to another by conduction through the solid considered.”

ago...nor more than four hundred million years ago;...he inclines rather toward the lower than the higher antiquity, but concludes that the limit, from a consideration of all the evidence, must be placed within some such period of past time as one hundred million of years.

2. The argument from tidal retardation proceeds on the admitted fact, that, owing to the friction of the tide-wave, the rotation of the earth is retarded, and is therefore much slower now than *it must have been* at one time. Sir William Thompson contends that had the globe become solid ten thousand million years ago, or indeed any high antiquity above one hundred million years, the centrifugal force due to the more rapid rotation *must have* given the planet a very much greater polar flattening than it actually possesses. He *admits*, however, that, though one hundred million years ago that force *must have been* about three per cent. greater than now, yet “*nothing we know* regarding the figure of the earth and the disposition of land and water would justify us in saying that a body consolidated when there was more centrifugal force by three per cent. than now, might not now be *in all respects like the earth*, so far as we know it at present.”

Thus, first, he contends that if the earth had become solid one hundred million years ago it would have been much flatter at the poles than it is, yet is willing to admit that had it become solid then, we do not know but that it would have been now just as it is. Then if the result is the same in either case, where is the use of going back one hundred million years, or ten thousand million years, for the start? And so,

Professor Tait concludes that this argument, taken in connection with the previous one, probably reduces the possible period which can be allowed to geologists to something *less than ten millions* of years.

“What a falling off is there, my countrymen!!”¹⁰ From ten *thousand* million to simply *ten* million! May we hope from this that they will finally reach the reasonable limit?

¹⁰ A rough quote from Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*, Act 3, Scene 2.

But Mr. Geikie has not yet exhausted his “argument” on the age of the earth; he presents his *third* from physics, thus:

3. The third argument, based upon the *age of the sun’s heat*, is confessedly *less reliable* than the *two previous ones*.

But the “two previous ones” themselves are confessedly unreliable, and, if the third be admitted as “confessedly *less reliable*” than they, how much reliability has geological science for the age of the earth?

The secret, however, of the whole matter is exposed in his last remark on this subject:

One hundred million of years is probably amply sufficient for all the requirements of geology.

Yes, the geological ship has been launched upon the tide of speculation, and nothing less than one hundred million years will give her sea-room.

Next in order, we come to Part IV, Structural Geology—Order of Superposition—*The Foundation of Geological Chronology*:

As sedimentary strata are laid down upon one another in a more or less nearly horizontal position, the underlying beds must be older than those which cover them. This simple and obvious truth is termed *the law of superposition*.

Again, Part V, under “*Use of Fossils*”:

The true order of superposition is decisive of the relative ages of stratified rocks.

For geological purposes, therefore, and indeed for all purposes of comparison between the different faunas and floras of different periods, *it is absolutely essential*, first of all, *to have the order of superposition of strata rigorously determined*. Unless this is done, the most fatal mistakes may be made in Paleontological chronology.

And yet again, Part VI, No. 1:

In every stratigraphical research the fundamental requisite is to establish the order of superposition of the strata. Until this is accomplished, it is *impossible* to arrange the dates and make out the sequence of geological history.

This would be all plain and easy enough, if the rocks always and everywhere were lying in their true and original position. But in some places...

...the rocks composing huge mountain masses have been so completely overturned that the highest beds appear as if *regularly* covered by others which ought properly to underlie them.

Let us bring some of these statements together in the form of a parallel that we may more readily see their mutual bearing.

| | |
|--|---|
| “The underlying beds must be older than those which cover them. This simple and obvious truth is termed the law of superposition.” | “The rocks comprising huge mountain masses have been so <i>completely overturned</i> that the <i>highest beds</i> appear as if <i>regularly covered</i> by others which ought properly to underlie them.” In such instances “the <i>apparent superposition</i> may be deceptive.” |
|--|---|

So then “this simple and obvious truth” is *not* the truth. And then what becomes of the law of superposition? We rather incline to the opinion that it has been “completely overturned” as well as have been the mountain masses, and at the same time that they were. If, therefore, the apparent superposition may be deceptive, how are we to guard against deception? If huge mountain masses are lying in a directly inverted position to that of the valleys or the plains, how can we tell which is “upside down”? And how is the true order of superposition to be settled?

Just here the geologist’s *summum bonum*, the fossil, comes in, thus:

It is by their characteristic fossils that the *divisions* of the stratified rocks can be *most satisfactorily made*. Each formation being distinguished by its own assemblage of organic remains, it can be

followed and recognized even amid the crumplings and dislocations of a disturbed region.

Again:

But it is *mainly* by the remains of plants and animals imbedded in the rocks that the geologist is guided in unraveling the *chronological succession* of geological changes.

And further, one of the uses of fossils is plainly stated to be...

...to furnish a guide in geological chronology whereby *rocks* may be classified *according to relative date*, and the facts of geological history may be arranged and interpreted as a connected record of the earth's progress.

From these statements it plainly appears that it is by the *evidence of fossils* that the "order of succession," or "superposition," or "relative age of strata" is made out.

Yet under "*Relative Age of Fossils*," is this equally plain statement:

The *chronological sequence* of fossils must be determined *first of all* by the order of superposition of their enclosing strata; [because] *there is nothing in the fossils themselves*, apart from experience, *to fix their date*.

Here are two statements that we wish to place side by side, that it may be seen what they really say. And what they do say, although it may appear surprising, can be sustained by a greater number of quotations than are here already given.

| | |
|---|--|
| "It is mainly by the <i>remains</i> of plants and animals [fossils] <i>embedded in the rocks</i> that the geologist is guided In unraveling the <i>chronological succession</i> of geological changes." | "The <i>chronological sequence</i> [succession] of fossils [remains] must be determined first of all by the <i>order of superposition</i> [chronological succession] of their enclosing strata." |
|---|--|

One of these says that the *relative age of the rocks* is determined by the fossils. The other says that the *relative age of the fossils* is determined by the rocks.

What is this but reasoning in a circle? Thus, for instance, the geologists say to us,

“Here is a stratum of rock that was deposited fifty millions of years ago.”

But we ask,

“How do you prove that?”

They reply,

“We prove it by the fact that in it are embedded organic remains of the earliest forms of life that appeared on this planet.”

But again we ask,

“How do you prove that to be the earliest form of life?”

The reply is,

“We prove that by the simple fact of their being embedded in that particular stratum of rock.”

Yes, certainly, prove each by the other, and they will then both be true. All this may be geological, but it assuredly is not logical, nor is it according to established rules of evidence.

Part 3 – Further Considerations

Signs of the Times, May 28, 1885

To show that we have not pressed any of these statements into service to make a point, we wish to continue this line a little further.

Under Part IV, “*Relative Lapse of Time Represented by Strata and by the Intervals Between Them,*” we read:

As a rule, we should infer that the time represented by a given thickness of similar strata was less than that shown by the same thickness of dissimilar strata, because the changes needed to bring new varieties of sediment into the area of deposit would usually require the lapse of some time for their completion. But this conclusion might often be erroneous.

But in all speculations of this kind we must bear in mind that the length of time represented by a given depth of strata *is to be estimated* merely from their thickness or lithological characters But the relative chronological importance of the bars or lines in the geological record can seldom be *satisfactorily* discussed merely on lithological grounds; this must mainly be decided on the evidence of organic remains [fossils]. By this kind of evidence it can be made nearly certain that the intervals represented by strata were in many cases much shorter than those not so represented; in other words, that the time during which *no deposit* of sediment went on was longer than that wherein *deposit did take place*.

Again, Part VI, No. 5:

The relative chronological value of the divisions of the geological record *is not to be measured by the mere depth of strata*. Of “two sets of rocks, the total depth of both groups together may be, say one thousand feet. Elsewhere, we may find a single unbroken formation reaching a depth of ten thousand feet; but it would be *utterly erroneous* to conclude that the latter represented ten times the length of time shown by the two former.”

“Fossil evidence furnishes the chief means of comparing the relative value of formations and groups of rock. A break in the succession of organic remains marks an interval of time often *unrepresented by strata* at the place where the break is found. The relative importance of these breaks, and therefore, probably, the comparative intervals of time which they mark, may be estimated by the difference of the *facies* of the *fossils on each side*.”

Further, Part V, under “*Doctrine of Colonies*”:

While the mere fact that one series of rocks lies uncomformably on another proves the lapse of a considerable interval

between their respective dates, the relative length of this interval may sometimes be demonstrated by the means of *fossil evidence*, and *by this alone*. But *fossil evidence may be made to prove the existence of gaps which are not otherwise apparent*.

A few species may pass from one into the other, or perhaps every species may be different. In cases of this kind, when proved to be not merely local but persistent over wide areas, we must admit, notwithstanding the apparently *undisturbed* and *continuous character* of the original deposition of the strata, that the abrupt transition from one *facies* of fossils to the other *must represent* a long interval of time *which has not been recorded by the deposit of strata*.

And so by this line of quotations we are brought again around the geological circle, thus:

“The first and fundamental point is to *determine accurately the order of superposition [succession] of the strata*. Until this is done, detailed *paleontological [fossils] classification may prove to be worthless*.” - Part V under *Subdivisions by Means of Fossils*.

“When *the order of succession of organic remains [fossils] among the stratified rocks has been determined*, they become an *invaluable guide* in the investigation of the *relative age of rocks* and the structure of the land. And the *true succession [superposition] of strata may thus be confidently established*.” Part VI, No. 4.

The grand argument is this:

1. Until the true order of succession of the rocks is accurately determined, the evidence of fossils is worthless.
2. Until the true order of succession of the fossils has been determined, the evidence of the rocks is worthless.

But:

1. It is by “fossil evidence, and by this alone,” that the succession of the rocks is determined.
2. It is by the order of succession of the rocks that the true succession of fossils is determined.

Upon which we would simply remark that, as the evidence of fossils is worthless without the true order of the rocks; and as the evidence of the rocks is worthless without the true order of the fossils; then the whole system that is built upon on such evidence (?) can be nothing less than worthless. Such is Geological Science. And we are certain that it comes within the scope of Paul's words in *1 Timothy 6:20*.

As the Science of Fossils...

...is looked upon as a branch of Geology, seeing that its assistance is *absolutely indispensable* in many of the most familiar and fundamental problems of the latter science,

—we might spend a little time in an inquiry as to the real inherent value of fossils themselves. One quotation, already made, may properly be repeated as the head of this division,—Part V, under “*Age of Fossils*”:

There is nothing in the fossils themselves, apart from experience, to fix their date.

Again, No. 2, under “*Use of Fossils*”:

Consider, for a moment, what would happen were the present surface of any portion of Central or Southern Europe submerged beneath the sea, covered by marine deposits, and then re-elevated into land. The river-terraces and lacustrine marls formed *before the time of Julius Caesar* could not be distinguished by any fossil tests from those laid down in the *days of Victoria*. . . .

So far as regards the shells, bones, and plants preserved in the various formations, it would be *absolutely impossible* to discriminate their relative dates;...yet there might be a difference of two thousand years *or more* between many of them. They would be classed as geologically contemporaneous, but the phrase is too vague to have any chronological value except in a relative sense. *Strict contemporaneity cannot be asserted* of any strata merely *on the ground of similarity, or identity of fossils*. . . . Similarity or identity of fossils among formations geographically far apart, instead of proving contemporaneity, ought rather to be looked

upon as indicative of *great discrepancies in the relative epochs of deposit*. . . .

When, however, the formations of distant countries are compared, all that we can safely affirm regarding them is that those containing the same or a representative assemblage of organic remains belong to the same epoch in the history of biological progress in each area; but we cannot assert that they are *contemporaneous unless* we are prepared to include within that term a *vague period* of perhaps *thousands* of years.”

These extracts show a considerable degree of uncertainty about fossil science, but the uncertainty is made absolute by the following relation of the discoveries of M. Barrande, a distinguished author of a geological treatise.

[He] drew attention more than a quarter of a century ago to certain remarkable intercalations of fossils in the series of Silurian strata of Bohemia. He showed that, while these strata presented a *normal succession* of organic remains, there were nevertheless *exceptional bands*, which, containing the fossils of a *higher zone*, were yet included on different horizons among inferior portions of the series. He terms these *precursory bands*, “Colonies,” and defined the phenomena as consisting in the partial co-existence of two general faunas, which, considered as a whole, were nevertheless successive. . . .

This original and ingenious doctrine has met with *much opposition* on the part of *geologists and paleontologists*. Of the *facts* cited by M. Barrande, there has been *no question*, but other explanations have been suggested for them. . . .

Much of the opposition which his views have encountered has probably arisen from the feeling that if they are admitted, they must *weaken* the value of *paleontological evidence* in defining geological horizons. A paleontologist, who has been accustomed to deal with certain fossils as *unfailing* indications of particular portions of the geological series, is *naturally unwilling* to see his *generalizations upset* by an attempt to show that the fossils may occur on a *far earlier horizon*.

But:

There seems every probability that such migrations as M. Bar-
rande has supposed in the case of the Silurian fauna of Bohemia
have again and again taken place.

Here, then, is a doctrine based upon “facts” of which there has
been “no question,” which have again and again taken place, yet it
meets with “much opposition” from geological scientists simply
because it weakens the theory which they have adopted; simply
because they are unwilling to have their “generalizations upset.”
A queer kind of “science” that, that holds to “generalizations” in
the face of unquestioned “facts” which prove such generalizations
to be wholly false. A very questionable kind of science indeed, we
think, that clings tenaciously to a theory against the evidence of
facts.

Nor is this all. It is impossible to lay down lines by which can
be marked the distinction of periods of either strata or fossils.
Some would be geologists talk learnedly of “six periods” of geo-
logical development, clearly defined according to the period the-
ory of the days of *Genesis* 1. Hugh Miller was probably the most
prominent instance of this, and when he lived it was admitted on
the theory of the “generalizations” above mentioned, which, as
we have seen, have been “upset.” Proof of this we have in the *En-
cyclopedia Britannica*, article “Hugh Miller”:

When he occupied the chair of the Royal Physical Society of
Edinburgh, in 1852 [he died in 1856], he could look the most emi-
nent representatives of contemporary geology in the face, and
claim their assent to the possibility of drawing definite lines of
demarcation between the Tertiary, Secondary, and Paleozoic
strata. He could speak of the “entire type of organic being” as al-
tering between these periods. “All on the one side of the gap,” he
could dare to affirm, “belongs to one fashion, and all on the other
to another and wholly different fashion.” In the thirty intervening
years [to 1882] every form of the cataclysmal [the deluge]
scheme of geological progression has been discredited. It has be-
come *impossible* to obtain anything like a *consensus* of opinion
among scientific men as to the placing of those frontier lines be-

tween period and period. “Geographical provinces and zones,” says Professor Huxley, “may have been as distinctly marked in the Paleozoic [primary, first] epoch as at present, and those seemingly sudden appearances of new genera and species which we ascribe to new creation, may be simple results of migration.”

All these things simply demonstrate the conclusion before reached as to the utter worthlessness of the deductions of the geological scientists.

Part 4 – Closing Proofs

Signs of the Times, June 4, 1885

In closing these proofs of the untrustworthiness of fossil evidence, we can do no better than to present the words of Dr. Geikie himself, in Part V, under “*Use of Fossils.*” He says:

As fossil evidence furnishes a much more satisfactory and widely applicable means of subdividing the stratified rocks of the earth’s crust than mere lithological characters, it is made the basis of the geological classification of these rocks. Thus we may find a particular stratum marked by the occurrence in it of various fossils, one or more of which may be distinctive, either from occurring in no other bed above or below, or from special abundance in that stratum. These species might therefore be used as a guide to the occurrence of the bed in question, which might be called by the name of the most abundant species. . . . But before such a generalization can be safely made, we *must be sure* that the species in question *really never does* appear on any other platform.

But by Barrande’s “facts” in regard to Colonies we never can be sure that a certain species “really never does appear on any other platform,” until the whole earth has been explored outside and inside, from center to circumference. This is even admitted in the argument which we read further.

This evidently demands wide experience over an extended field of observation. The assertion that a particular species occurs *only on the horizon* manifestly rests on *negative* evidence as much as

on positive. The paleontologist who makes it cannot mean more than that he knows the fossil to lie on that horizon, and that, so far as *his experience* and that of others goes, it has never been met with anywhere else. But a *single example* of the occurrence of the fossil on a different zone would *greatly damage* the value of his generalization, and a *few* such cases would *demolish it* altogether.

Now, as we have seen that the undisputed facts, as developed in Barrande's "doctrine of Colonies," show that just "such cases," "have again and again taken place," therefore it is proven that whatever generalizations have been built up on the evidence of distinctive species of fossils, are, by these facts, "demolished altogether." So it is said:

Hence all such statements ought at first to be made tentatively [experimentally]. To establish a geological horizon on limited fossil evidence, and then to *assume* the *identity* of all strata containing the same fossils, is to *reason in a circle* and introduce utter confusion into our interpretation of the geological record.

If, now, it be true, as the Professor states in his introduction to the subject of fossil science, that without some knowledge of this "progress in modern geology would be impossible;" according to the *very knowledge* of fossil evidence displayed in these quotations, how much of the progress of modern geology is reliable?

After showing so forcibly as he has, the utter unreliability of fossil evidence in giving the succession of strata, he proceeds to the discussion of that very subject—the succession of strata—and shows that it is by such evidence that that is fixed. Of the Upper Silurian group he says:

The formations which in the British Islands are classed as Upper Silurian, occur in two very distinct types. So great, indeed, is the contrast between these types that it is *only* by a comparison of *organic remains* that the whole can be grouped together as the deposits of one great geological period.

Again, under the "Cambrian," he says:

Murchison worked out the stratigraphical order of succession from above, and chiefly by the help of organic remains. He advanced from where the superposition of the rocks is clear and undoubted, and for the first time in the history of geology ascertained that the transition-rocks of the older geologists could be *arranged into zones* by means of *characteristic fossils* [the very thing which he has just shown is unreliable] as satisfactorily as the secondary formations had been classified in a *similar manner* by William Smith. *Year by year* as he found his Silurian *types of life* [fossils] *descend farther and farther* into lower deposits, *he pushed backward* the limits of his Silurian system.

The limits of the Silurian system, therefore, are fixed by the evidence of fossils, and by that alone. This too in the face of the statement that until the order of succession of the strata is accurately determined, fossil classification may prove to be “worthless.”

Of the Old Red Sandstone, he says:

It is important to observe that in no district can these three [lower, middle, and upper] subdivisions be found together, and that the so-called middle formation occurs *only in one* region—the north of Scotland. The classification, therefore, does not rest upon any *actually ascertained* stratigraphical sequence, but on an *inference from the organic remains*” (fossils).

And:

This view *has been accepted everywhere* by geologists.

Until recently, Professor Geikie alone has called in question, “the existence of any *middle* division.”

The Old Red Sandstone, otherwise called Devonian, is an established group in geology, and has been accepted everywhere by geologists, consequently it forms an important, integral part of the whole geological system, and yet it confessedly rests *only* upon an “*inference*” *from fossils*, while the Professor has previously abundantly shown that no reliable, “positive” inference can

be drawn from fossils, and that the order in time of fossils themselves *must be established* “first of all” by the order in position of the stratified rocks.

This, as well as each of the other divisions of this subject, might be easily carried much beyond its present length; but we do not wish to extend it immoderately. However, this is sufficient to demonstrate from the oldest geological treatise itself, that in this single instance does the science proceed upon any certain data. And even this is plainly stated by Professor Geikie:

From all these facts it is *clear* that the geological record, as it now exists, is *at the best* but an *imperfect* chronicle of geological history. *In no country* is it complete. The lacune of one region must be supplied from another. And *in proportion to the geographical distance* between the localities where the *gaps occur* and *those whence the missing intervals are supplied*, the *element of uncertainty* in our reading of the record *is increased*.¹¹

If, then, there be a distance of a foot between the place where a gap occurs and the place where the missing link is found, there is uncertainty to just that extent. And if the distance be a hundred feet, or a thousand feet, or a thousand miles, or ten thousand miles, the “element of uncertainty” is proportionally “increased.” Therefore, is a “gap” be found in Kansas, and the “missing interval” be found in Siam, this being the utmost “geographical distance” that could possibly occur, the “element of uncertainty” would be infinite.

The one essential element that is lacking in all these productions on geology is *demonstration*. Assumption upon assumption, and inference upon inference, are proposed upon confessedly uncertain data, and from that, then *speculation*, to an unlimited degree, is indulged in, and all this is offered to us in the name of science! But we would respectfully enter a demurrer, and ask:

¹¹ See closing portion of *Gaps in the Geological Record*, in Part V.

“Geological gentlemen, give us *demonstration*, instead of speculation, and then every point so established we will gladly accept.”

But again: *Geology is not susceptible of demonstration*. Astronomy is. Therefore there is no speculation upon the courses of the planets and stars, and the times of their revolution. When in 1845 and 1846 Adams in England, and Leverrier in France, virtually weighed the solar system, and found that another planet was required to give the true balance, and then each in his place made his calculations upon paper, as to where the then unknown planet should be, and each from his place wrote to an astronomer telling him to direct his telescope to a certain point in the heavens, and find the required planet, and he did so, and found it, *that was science*. When, from the fall of an apple, Newton reached the law that governs every particle of matter in the universe, *that was science*. Let geology give us some such instances as these, and we will believe all that is proved by them.

We have said that geology is not susceptible of *demonstration*, and for proof of this, quote:

Hebrews 11

³ Through *faith* we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear;

—also verse 1,

¹ Faith is...the evidence of things *not seen*.

If the formation, the growth, and the structure of the earth, can be *shown* by geology, if it can be demonstrated, so that it may be a *matter of knowledge*, just then it will be removed from the field of faith. As faith is the evidence of things *not seen*, just so soon as geologists can cause us to *see how* the worlds *were framed*, just that soon there is no longer any faith about it. But the God of the universe has placed “the framing of the worlds by His word” at the very head of the list of the objects of faith, and we doubt, exceedingly, whether it shall ever be removed from that chief place,

before the dawn of that glorious day when faith itself shall be utterly lost in sight. But,

When that illustrious day shall rise,¹²

–and we shall dwell amidst and above those worlds of light, and shall see the face of Him who sits upon the throne, and...

1 Corinthians 13

¹² ...know even as we are known,

–and,

Revelation 14

⁴ ...follow the Lamb wherever He goes,

–*then*, we hope to *fully know* the awful sublimity of the Almighty Fiat.

Of the evidences of the uncertainty of geological science as deduced in this series of articles, we now, in conclusion, present the following synopsis.

Synopsis

1. ASSUMPTIONS

1. “Only in proportion as we understand the present, can we expect to decipher the past.”
2. But “we must be on our guard against the danger of assuming that nature’s operations” at present are the same as in the past.
3. “We may assume this.”
4. But “this assumption may be entirely erroneous.”

2. THE GEOLOGICAL RECORD

1. The Geological Record “is at the best but an imperfect chronicle.”
2. “Enormous gaps occur” wherein there is “no record at all.”

¹²Isaac Watts, Hymn: *Am I a Soldier of the Cross?*, 1721.

3. In that which is considered as “the sum of geological evidence there can be found no trace of a beginning.”
4. Therefore “it cannot begin at the beginning of things.”

3. STRATA

1. “The stratified portion of the crust of the earth, must represent a very vast period of time.”
2. But “no reliable standard seems to be available, whereby these periods are to be measured.”

4. THE SOLID GLOBE

1. Geological Science “*contends* that had the globe become solid ten thousand million years ago,” it “must have” had a much greater flattening at the poles than it now has.
2. But it “*admits*” that had the globe become solid then, “nothing we know” would justify us in saying but what it would have been now just as it is.

5. THE LAW OF SUPERPOSITION

1. “The underlying beds *must be* older than those which cover them.”
2. But “huge mountain masses have been so *completely overturned* that the *highest beds*” are *under* those which *ought* to be under them.
3. And “in such instances the apparent superposition *may be* deceptive.” Exactly, it “must be” one way, and it “may be” another, and so.
4. “This simple and obvious truth is termed the law of superposition.”

Oh! ah! yes, very (?) “simple,” exceedingly (?) “obvious,” sublime (?) “truth.”

6. RELATIVE AGES OF STRATIFIED ROCKS

1. “The true order of superposition is decisive of the relative ages of stratified rocks.” “It is absolutely essential *first of all*

to have the order of superposition of strata rigorously determined.”

2. “Unless this is done, the *most fatal mistakes* may be made in paleontological [fossil] chronology.”
3. But “*it is by* their characteristic *fossils* that the divisions of the stratified rocks can be most satisfactorily made.”
4. Yet, “the chronological sequence [succession] of fossils must be determined *first of all* by the order of superposition [succession] of their enclosing strata.”

7. ORDER OF SUCCESSION

1. Until the true order of succession of the rocks is accurately determined, the evidence of fossils is worthless.
2. But it is “by fossil evidence and by this alone,” that the true order of succession of the rocks is determined.

Such is geological science as it is. Here we close our examination of it for the present. We have endeavored in every instance to get at the real gist of the statements of the science, and to do it fairly. We are satisfied that we have not pressed a single point beyond what it will legitimately bear. Therefore the proposition stands proven to a demonstration that, as for the present state of geological science, the only *certain* thing about it is its UNCERTAINTY.

3. “Evolution” and Evolution

Signs of the Times, June 11 to July 2, 1885

Part 1

Signs of the Times, June 11, 1884

IN VIEW of the fact that not only Henry Ward Beecher and Dr. McCosh but almost all of the acknowledged scientific teachers, not only in the United States, but in Europe, are avowed evolutionists, it may be of interest, and perhaps of value, for us to notice briefly what evolution really is, and what is its manifest tendency. Some time ago the *Independent* presented the following list of evolutionists:

Of all the younger brood of working naturalists whom Agassiz educated, every one—Morse, Shaler, Verrill, Niles, Hyatt, Scudder, Putnam, even his own son—has accepted evolution. Every one of the Harvard professors whose departments have to do with biology—Gray, Whitney, A. Agassiz, Hagen, Goodale, Shaler, James, Farlow, and Faxon—is an evolutionist, and man’s physical structure they regard as no real exception to the law. They are all theists, we believe; all conservative men. They do not all believe that Darwinism—that is, natural selection—is a sufficient theory of evolution; they may incline to Wallace’s view, but they accept evolution. It is not much taught; it is rather taken for granted.

At Johns Hopkins University, which aims to be the most advanced in the country, *nothing but evolution* is held or taught [italics ours]. In the excellent University of Pennsylvania all the biological professors are evolutionists,—Professors Leidy and Allen in Comparative Anatomy, Professor Rathrock in Botany, and Professor Lesley in Geology. We might mention Michigan University, Cornell, Dartmouth, or Bowdoin; but what is the use of going farther? It would only be the same story. *There is scarcely an exception be found.* Wherever there is a working naturalist, he is sure to be an evolutionist. We made an inquiry of two ex-presidents of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. One wrote us, in reply:

“My impression is that there is no biologist of repute nowadays who does not accept, in some form or other, the doctrine of

derivation in time, whatever be the precise form in which they suppose the evolution to have occurred.” His successor replied, “Almost without exception, the working naturalists in this country believe in evolution. . . . In England and Germany the belief in evolution is almost universal among the active workers in biology. In France the belief is less general, but is rapidly gaining ground. . . . I should regard a teacher of science who denied the truth of evolution, as being as *incompetent* as one who doubted the Copernican theory.” We challenge the *Observer* to find three working naturalists of repute in the United States, or two (it can find one in Canada) that are not evolutionists. And where a man believes in evolution, it goes without saying that the law holds as to man’s physical structure.

In this article, however, we do not propose a complete analysis of evolution, but only an examination of the leading phase, and of its manifest tendency; and that is, as stated by Mr. James Sully, joint author with Prof. T. H. Huxley, of the Article Evolution in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, ninth edition, this:

It is clear that the doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of creation. Just as the biological doctrine of the transmutation of species is opposed to that of special creations, so the idea of evolution, as applied to the formation of the world as a whole, is *opposed* to that of a *direct creative volition*.

In view of this statement of the highest authority on the subject of evolution, is it not equally clear that these professors of Harvard, and Yale, and Brown, and Bowdoin, and Amherst, and Princeton, and Cornell, and Johns Hopkins, and Michigan, and Pennsylvania Universities, and the teachers of science in England, Germany, France, and the United States, and those who accept their teaching, are all in direct antagonism to the Bible? For whatever else the Bible might be held to teach, it assuredly does teach this one thing, that God created all things.

And it is purposely that we write “Bible,” instead of “Genesis” alone; for it is not alone the testimony of *Genesis*, but of the whole Book, that “God *created all things*.”

Genesis 1

¹ In the beginning God *created* the heaven and the earth.

²¹ And God created great whales, *and every living creature* that moves.

²⁷ So God *created man*.

Genesis 6

⁷ And the Lord said, I will destroy *man* whom I have *created*.

Deuteronomy 4

³² God *created man upon the earth*.

Isaiah 42

⁵ Thus says God the Lord, He that *created* the heavens,...

Isaiah 45

¹² I have made the earth and *created man* upon it.

Malachi 2

¹⁰ Has not one God *created* us?

Now the words of Christ,

Mark 13

¹⁹ For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God *created* unto this time.

Of man He says,

Mark 10

⁶ But from the beginning of the *creation*, God *made them male and female*.

Ephesians 3

⁹ [God] *created* all things by Jesus Christ.

Colossians 1

¹⁶ By Him were *all things created* that are in heaven and that are in earth, *visible and invisible*.

Revelation 4 [also Revelation 10:6; 14:7]

¹¹ You have *created all things*.

So just as surely as evolution is “directly antagonistic to the doctrine of creation,” so surely are those who hold to evolution placed “directly antagonistic” to the Bible. And this will plainly appear from their own words as we proceed.

Because the disciples of Darwin have pressed his *theories* into service as *facts*, evolution has come to be considered (and not improperly) as almost, if not entirely, synonymous with Darwinism. Yet there is a distinction claimed, and this claimed distinction it is which has given rise to the two kinds of evolution suggested in our heading. It is stated as follows by the *Independent* of January 8, 1880:

In the first place let it be clearly understood that evolution, or development, is not synonymous with Darwinism. A man may be an evolutionist and not be a Darwinian. Let us explain.

The doctrine of evolution is this: That all the existing forms of animal and vegetable life have been produced through the process of successive birth and generation from original vital germs. This is all. The doctrine of evolution does not assert how the first germs came, whether by God’s special creation, or by the unaided action of law out of inanimate matter. Nor does the doctrine of evolution assert how or why, whether rapidly or gradually, under what laws or what providence, the evolution has proceeded as it has. These are theories of evolution, which are brought forward to account for its operation; but they are not the doctrine of evolution itself. *The doctrine of evolution is opposed to the doctrine of creationism*; and it teaches simply that living and extinct species of animals and plants were not directly created out of dead matter by the fiat of God, but were produced by birth out of plants and animals previously existing.

Now, Darwinism—properly so called—is not evolution, but a theory or hypothesis of evolution. It has become confused in the unscholarly popular mind with evolution, because it was the way in which Charles Darwin first explained evolution. Darwinism is the theory that evolution is explained by the law of Natural Selection; *i.e.*, a law of variation by which the young of any animal vary slightly from their parents. Those of the young whose varia-

tions help them in the struggle for existence are more likely to live and propagate their kind. . . . Thus, by slow gradations, and by the retention of favorable minute changes, all present life was evolved. This is one theory of evolution, and is called by Darwin's name, "Natural Selection," or by Spencer's name, "Survival of the Fittest." This Darwinism is not necessarily atheistic. Darwin himself allowed that life may have been started by a few created germs. But, once started, on Darwin's theory, there is no further need of God. Law produces everything, from the diatom to the oak, from the amoeba to the man. According to him, even mind, heart, conscience, are just as much the produce of physical evolution as is the physical structure itself. Given two or three germs at the beginning perhaps—or perhaps not—and given the laws which we find, then there is no more use for God, and all things have come out as we find them with none of his supervision. There may have been a God once, but law and not God is the great Creator.

Apparently, there is a great deal said here, but in reality there is very little. Let us analyze this statement, and see wherein lies the actual difference, if any, between these two statements of evolution and Darwinism.

1. Evolution says all forms of life come in successive births and generation from original germs. Darwinism says the same.

2. Evolution does not say how the first germs came. Neither does Darwinism.

3. Evolution says that living and extinct species of animals and plants were not directly created out of dead matter by the fiat of God. Darwinism says exactly the same.

4. Evolution says these were produced by birth, out of plants and animals previously existing. Darwinism is identical with it here also.

5. Darwinism holds that this birth and generation of plants and animals in succession, is according to established law. Evolution being "directly antagonistic" to *creationism*, how else can succes-

sive birth and generation proceed but in accord with the law universal of birth and generation? So in this also they are identical.

6. Darwinism says that the process of evolution has been very slow. The foregoing statement of evolution says that it *does not assert* whether the process has been rapid or gradual, but we have abundance of evidence to show that this is not correct. And we need go no farther than the editorial columns of the *Independent* to prove its incorrectness. In an editorial entitled “Deliver Us from Our Friends,” in December (?) 1879, appears a quotation from Wallace’s *Natural Selection*, as follows:

We can with tolerable certainty affirm that man must have inhabited the earth a thousand centuries ago, but we cannot assert...that there is any good evidence that he positively did not exist for a period of ten thousand centuries.

And the whole tenor of the article, which is a defense of evolution, is that the evolution of man is a process of ages upon ages; and it says that the evidence that man was pre glacial, *i.e.*, that he existed scores or hundreds of thousands of years ago, and that he was fashioned out of apes,

...is so strong that it is *very unsafe* to deny” it. [italics his]

Again, what room has evolution to show its successions of “birth and generation” if the earth by only six thousands years old? The very language in which evolution is defined and explained, asserts that the process has been gradual. And further, if evidence were produced that the process had been rapid, it would immediately turn the scale in favor of creationism, and evolution would be destroyed. Admitting, however, that evolution makes no *assertion* either way, does it not make very loud *demands* for “hundreds,” or “thousands,” or even “tens of thousands of centuries”? If not, to say nothing of Darwin, why do Wallace, and Le Conte, and A. S. Packard, and De Quatrefages, Hughes, Evans, and all the rest, speak and write of it in no other language than such as the above? And these *demands* are nothing short of an *as-*

sertion of the absolute poverty of evolution with less than “thousands and tens of thousands of centuries,” and therein asserts its “gradual” process, and fully agrees with Darwinism where it says:

The high antiquity of man . . . is the *indispensable* basis for understanding his origin.¹³

7. The process “once started in Darwin’s theory there is no further need of God.” Evolution says the same, as the following from Professor Huxley shows:

If all living beings have been evolved from pre-existing forms of life, it is enough that a single particle of living protoplasm should once have appeared on the globe as the result of no-matter-what agency. In the eyes of a consistent evolutionist any further independent formation of protoplasm would be sheer waste.

Again:

But living matter once originated, there is no necessity for another origination, since the hypothesis postulates the unlimited...modifiability of such matter.¹⁴

So again we see that *consistent* evolution and Darwinism are identical.

It is unnecessary to pursue this line further, as everything that might be brought to bear upon the subject would simply confirm the points already made, that consistent evolution and Darwinism are essentially synonymous. The simple fact is, and is plainly shown by Mr. Sully, that to Darwin, first of all, belongs the honor of first reducing the theory of evolution to “a substantial basis of fact.” And whether in England, Germany, or the United States, evolution without Darwin is, as the phrase goes, the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out.

¹³ *Descent of Man*, 1, p. 3.

¹⁴ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Article “Biology.”

Part 2

Signs of the Times, June 18, 1885

But now as evolution is so “directly antagonistic to the doctrine of creation,” what do those persons, who pretend to hold to both evolution and the Bible, do with those scriptures which speak of the creation of the world, of man, etc.? Why, that is all set aside as “not historical,” “not historically correct,” etc. Wm. Hayes Ward, D.D., editor of the *Independent*, in his issue of February 26, 1880, says:

For reasons which almost, if not quite, compel their assent, one of which is the general acceptance of the doctrine of evolution, many believe as I do, that the story of the creation and fall of man, told in *Genesis*, is *no more the record of actual occurrences* than is the parable of the prodigal son [italics ours]. Dr. Dorner, the greatest among German evangelical theologians, whose name is honored here as in Germany, holds that this story *is not to be accepted as history*. So hold perhaps a quarter, perhaps a half, of the educated ministers in our leading evangelical denominations. When Dr. Boardman, of Philadelphia, repeated with great applause and then published a year ago his lectures on the Bible cosmogony, *taking this view*, I do not remember that *a single Baptist paper in the North found any fault*. . . . Nevertheless, Paul doubtless believed that the story of the fall was true historically, and used it as an illustration convenient and pertinent for the purpose he had in mind. But it cannot be proved *that God might not properly allow* Paul to use the illustration, which occurred to him as being to his purpose, *even though it were not an actual verity*.

But (“be astonished, O you heavens, at this”!!)...

...we do know that a commandment given on Sinai assumes as a reason for working six days and resting on the seventh, that God made the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh; *but we know* that this statement *is not historically correct*. The world was *not* made in six days.

Now is it sufficient to say simply that evolution is antagonistic to creationism? Is it not antagonistic to the whole Bible, and even to the Creator himself, when in reply to the words of Jehovah, spoken with a voice that shook the earth,

Exodus 20

¹¹ In six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth,

—the evolutionist boldly asserts,

“We *know* that the world was *not* made in six days”?

It is sufficiently astonishing in itself, to realize that a man could be so boldly irreverent as to thus flatly contradict the living God in the only words ever written by his own hand; but our astonishment is increased when we realize that this same man claims to be a Christian, and not only that, but is a “Rev.,” a “Doctor of Divinity;” and more, that he is only one of thousands of the same titled gentlemen who hold to the same views.

Again Dr. Ward says in an editorial:

But we are told that certain statements—for example, as to the origin, the early history and character, and the age of man—are made in the Bible, and that their acceptance as historical facts is binding upon any one who accepts the Christian system taught in the Bible. To this we have replied that if this true, Christianity is already gone, and to the educated mind the Bible is already gone, or very soon must go, because the scientific authorities, the only authorities on which we can depend, are now substantially agreed in holding and teaching certain theories about man’s origin, as well enough established, which are quite inconsistent with the story in *Genesis* of the creation of man and woman. This we have stated as a fact, and have concluded that the friends of the Christianity which we so heartily believe in and support, must adopt a theory of the Bible which will not put God’s word into direct contradiction with the teachings of our best authorities in science. We have said that we, laymen in science, are compelled to allow the now well-nigh unanimous authority of our best teachers, that man was physically, at least, evolved from irra-

tional animals, and has lived on the earth scores of thousands of years.¹⁵

So, then, it appears from all this that the Bible is of no authority at all, but the “scientific authorities are the *only* authorities on which we can depend;” and to these “authorities,” we all, and the Bible, and even the Lord himself, must bow in unquestioning credence; for, as is said in another place:

It is so generally taught that it is inevitable that our thinking and scholarly young men will generally accept it on the word of those whose business it is to study the matter.

And by this same token the “inevitable” result is that the word of man supplants the word of God. And right in the face of all this, we are gravely told that this evolution is held and taught in harmony with the Christian faith. And that it is not and cannot be so held and taught, is betrayed by Prof. Francis L. Patton, in an article on this subject originally published in the *Interior*, and quoted in the “Editorial Notes” of the *Independent*. He says:

Neither the preacher who cries “infallible Bible” without showing that it is infallible, nor the priest who cries “infallible church” without giving proof of her claims, will satisfy the man who, with all earnestness in his eye, and all uncertainty in his speech, asks, “What must I do to be saved?” Thus church must defend the doctrines she preaches. The pulpit must meet the skeptic with something better than assertion and something more satisfying than earnestness. And if the pulpit has not the time to do this work, and the existing societies have no interest in it or no means of carrying it on, it is not a day too soon for those who know the importance of the controversy to put their heads together to *devise a scheme* for the preparation of a *literature suited* to the wants of the doubters of the day.” [Italics ours]

Exactly! the literature of the Bible is not suited to the wants of the scientific doubters of the day, and therefore the evolutionists

¹⁵This is from the editorial before quoted, entitled, “Deliver Us from Our Friends.”

must devise a scheme to prepare something that will suit them. And what a blessed scheme that will be, of man's devising, and above all, when he is an evolutionist! It will suit though. And then when the man, not with all "earnestness" in his eye and "uncertainty" in his speech, but with all pride in his eye, and all arrogance in his speech, asks,

"What must I do to be saved?"

—the answer comes from that splendid scheme,

Believe in evolution; deny the plain statement of positive facts of the Bible; flatly contradict the words of the Lord, although spoken with His own voice, and written by His own blazing finger on tables of stone; and instead accept evolution "on the word of those whose business it is to study the matter," and hold them as "the only authorities on which you can depend," and you shall be saved.

Yea, evolution and Darwinism shall be the stability of your times and strength of salvation; and great shall be the peace—of the apes.

That will suit them every one and every time. And even if it should not, all that will be necessary is simply to "devise" another "scheme" "suited to the wants of the doubters" of this.

But not to treat them cavalierly, we will examine that other form of evolution known as "Theistic Evolution;" that is, a form of evolution which acknowledges God; and inquire where in the theory this acknowledgment comes in, and why. It is plain from all that has gone before that this acknowledgment of God, especially as a Creator, does not lie at the beginning; because, as has been often stated, "evolution is opposed to creationism," is "directly antagonistic" to it. And as evolution is opposed to creation generally, or once for all, so biology, its chiefest handmaid, is opposed to special creations; *i.e.*, of any interference of a creator after the process has started. And in this, evolution and biology are both plainly consistent, and reasonably so, too; because it is cer-

tainly a reasonable position before quoted from Prof. Huxley, that:

If all living beings have been evolved from pre-existing forms of life, it is enough that a single particle of living protoplasm should once have appeared on the globe as the result of no-matter-what agency. In the eyes of a consistent evolutionist any further independent formation of protoplasm would be sheer waste.

Further he says:

If the hypothesis of evolution be true, living matter must have arisen from not-living matter; for by the hypothesis the condition of the globe was at one time such that living matter could not have existed in it.

Now surely, upon this basis, it is no more than reasonable and consistent, to suppose that if living matter could arise entirely of its own evolutionary power from not-living matter, and start onward in its progress without a Creator, it certainly could keep itself a-going just as easily without Him.

Then what is it that impels these other gentlemen to the adoption of theistic evolution, *i.e.*, that God has interfered in a certain place? There is just one thing, and that alone, and herein is the pivot upon which turns the whole theistic process; and that one thing is, *the immortality of the soul*. Believing as these men do, in the immortality of the soul, it is impossible to adopt such an idea, or doctrine, as that immortality should be evolved from materiality, and therefore God must have interfered in the process just at the place where the immortal soul was bestowed upon man.

But the moment that view is adopted, there appears the inconsistency also; for theistic evolution, holding, in common with evolution "straight," the antagonism to the doctrine of creationism; when it admits the interference of God in behalf of the immortal soul, it therein admits the doctrine of creation; for assuredly the bestowal of immortality upon that which has been evolved from apes and lower forms of animals is nothing short of a creative act,

or volition, of God. And the inevitable consequence is, the doctrine is inconsistent with itself.

Part 3

June 25, 1885

Now for proofs that the soul is the *main*, if not the only, point of distinction between these two forms of creation. It appears dimly in our first-quoted statement of Darwinism; thus:

According to him, even mind, heart, conscience, are just as much the product of physical evolution as is the physical structure itself.

And again in the foregoing list of leading evolutionists the qualifying word “physical” is applied thus:

Man’s *physical* structure they regard as no real exception to the law.

And where a man believes in evolution, it goes without saying that the law holds good as to man’s *physical* structure.

Plainly implying that his *mental* structure is held as an exception. But Darwin has shown conclusively, not by speculation, but by genuine science, that the difference in the mental power of man and that of the lower animals consists not in kind but in degree. And surely none of these theistic evolutionists, ultra as he might be, would deny at least some mental structure to the lower animals. Consequently, when they differ from Darwinism, it can only be on that one point of the immortality of the soul.

Happily, however, we are not left to this conclusion drawn from qualified statements, necessary though it may be, but we have the unqualified statement itself by one of the highest authorities on evolution. Mr. Sully, before quoted, says:

At first sight it might appear that the doctrine [of evolution] as applied to the subjective world, by removing the broad distinction between the human and the animal mind, would discourage the hope of a future life for man’s soul.

Exactly; and this is consistent with evolution throughout, and consequently when these “orthodox,” “evangelical” gentlemen, holding fast to that intensely “orthodox” and “evangelical” doctrine,—the immortality of the soul,—adopt evolution, they are compelled to adopt such a form of it as will admit this doctrine, even though it involve them in the glaring inconsistency of antagonizing “creative activity,” and then being obliged to antagonize their antagonism to save their theory.

But of what worth is all this “contrivance to save appearances” if the soul be *not immortal*? It is “nothing worth.” And as the soul is absolutely *not immortal*, but in this,

Ecclesiastes 3

¹⁹ ...man has no pre-eminence above a beast,

—this consideration removes the whole and sole ground of distinction between the two forms of evolution; and then this would-be *theistic* evolution appears just where consistency and the logic of pure evolution demand that it should appear,—that is, in the bald reality of *atheistic* evolution,—and brings out the plain truth that there is no such thing as theistic evolution.

But when this so-called theistic evolution, resting only upon a fallacy the exposure of which so surely lands it in atheistic evolution, is so wide-spread, so almost all-pervading in the orthodox and evangelical churches, schools, and colleges, are we not brought in another form to the contemplation of the text,

Luke 18

⁸ Nevertheless, when the Son of man comes, shall He find faith on the earth?

Not alone,

“Shall He find faith in His second coming?”

—but,

“Shall He find faith at all?”

In studying these evil tendencies of the times, we are persuaded that “when the Son of man comes,” He will not find faith in His word, He will not find faith in himself, He will not find faith in God the Lord, the Creator of all. And we are also persuaded that we are again coming fast upon the time in the world’s history, when...

1 Corinthians 1

²¹ ...in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom [will know] not God;

—and when again, as of old, it shall please God...

²¹ ...by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

And in view of it all, we feel as never before, how holly, how unblamably, how sacredly, we whom it may please God to call to do the preaching, should conduct this holy work—how humbly, meekly, and again, as of old, not with excellency of speech or of wisdom,—not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in *demonstration of the Spirit* and of power. May God help us all, in these dark and trying times, and when they become still more fearfully dark and trying.

Now just a few words before closing, upon the foundation of evolution. In a former article, is a quotation of the words of a, then, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, saying that he...

...should regard a teacher of science who denied the truth of evolution as being as incompetent as one who doubted the Copernican theory.

Does this president mean to assert that the theory of evolution is as well established as is the Copernican theory? If so, will he or any other evolutionist please give three laws in proof of it that will correspond to Kepler’s Three Laws? Or will he give us *one* law that will correspond to *any one* of Kepler’s Three, and which will be as susceptible of demonstration as are Kepler’s? Nay, verily. It is with this as with geology,—simply and only “perhaps,”

“no doubt,” “probably,” and “must have been,” and these repeated over and over again, and then all of them capped with an “assumption.”

Professor Clifford says:

Of the beginning of the universe, we know nothing at all.

Professor Huxley says:

The fact is, that at the present moment there is not a shadow of trustworthy direct evidence that abiogenesis [spontaneous generation] does take place, or has taken place, within the period during which the existence of life on this globe is recorded.

Yet he says that this...

...fact does not in the slightest degree interfere with the conclusion from other considerations, that at some time or other, abiogenesis must have taken place.

What kind of *science* is that wherein *facts* do not in the *slightest degree* interfere with a hypothesis? And why is it that they do not? Oh! because:

If the hypothesis [supposition] of evolution be true, living matter must have arisen from not-living matter.¹⁶

To be sure. And so the Creator, revelation, reason, and *facts*, even as acknowledged by themselves as facts, must all stand aside, so that a *supposition* may have free course to run and be glorified. With a little more of this kind of “science” we should, “doubtless,” be almost tempted, “perhaps,” to cry out for “about the space of two hours”:

“Great is the science of the evolutionists!”¹⁷

Mr. Sully says, after speaking of the “gaps” in their knowledge, and the limits set to the explanation, of evolution:

¹⁶ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Biology.

¹⁷ *Acts* 19:34.

The question arises whether these apparently permanent gaps in our scientific knowledge can be filled up by extra-scientific speculations.

That is, these gaps are to be filled not only by “speculations,” but they are not to be even scientific, but...

...extra [above, outside of] scientific speculations.¹⁸

Now we come to Darwin himself, who Mr. Sully says is entitled to...

...the first notice as the one to whom belongs the honor of working out this theory of evolution upon a substantial basis of fact;

—and of whose work Professor Huxley says:

The Origin of Species appeared in 1859, and it is within the knowledge of all whose memories go back to that time, that henceforward the doctrine of evolution has assumed a position and acquired an importance which it never before possessed.

Owing to the important place which he holds in this doctrine, we hope we may be pardoned for giving him quite an extended notice; but it will need to be in nothing but his own words; for, as will be seen, the words themselves are all-sufficient to show the “substantial” (?), “scientific” (?), or “extra” scientific basis of evolution. We quote from Darwin’s *Descent of Man*, Appleton’s Edition, 1871, [Italics ours]:

No doubt he [man] inherits the power [of smell] in an enfeebled and so far rudimentary condition from some early progenitor to whom it was highly serviceable, and by whom it was continually used. We can thus *perhaps* understand how it is as Mr. Mandsley has truly remarked, that the sense of smell in man is singularly effective in recalling vividly the ideas and images of forgotten scenes and plans. [Page 23]

¹⁸ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, “Evolution.”

It is *probable* that the early ape-like progenitors of man were likewise social. Although man, as he now exists, has few special instincts, having lost any which his early progenitors may have possessed, this is no reason why he should not have retained from an extremely remote period some degree of instinctive love and sympathy for his fellows. [Page 81]

In order that an ape-like creature should have been transformed into man, it is necessary that this early form, as well as many successive links, should all have varied in mind and body. It is *impossible* to obtain *direct* evidence on this head; but it if can be shown that man now varies. . . . there can be little doubt that the preceding intermediate links varied in a like manner. [Page 103]

Nevertheless it may be well to own that *no explanation*, as far as I am aware, has ever been given of *the loss of the tail* by certain apes *and man*. [Page 144]

In regard to bodily size or strength, we do not know whether man is descended from some comparatively small species like the chimpanzee, or from one as powerful as the gorilla. [Page 150]

The early progenitors of man were *no doubt* inferior in intellect, and *probably* in social disposition, to the lowest existing savages. [Page 151]

It is therefore highly *probable* that with mankind the intellectual faculties have been gradually perfected through natural selection, and this conclusion is *sufficient* for our purpose. Undoubtedly it would have been very interesting to have traced the development of each separate faculty from the state in which it exists in the lower animals to that in which it exists in man; but neither my ability nor my knowledge permits the attempt. [Page 154]

If the anthropomorphous apes be admitted to form a natural sub-group, then, as man agrees with them,...we may *infer* that some ancient member of the anthropomorphous sub-group gave birth to man. [Page 189]

But we must not fall into the error of supposing that the early progenitor of the whole simian stock, including man, was identi-

cal with, or even closely resembled, any existing ape or monkey. [Page 191]

At the period and place, whenever and wherever it may have been, when man first lost his hairy covering, he *probably* inhabited a hot country. We are *far from knowing* how long ago it was when man first diverged from the Catarrhine stock, but this may have occurred at an epoch as remote as the Eocene period. [Page 192]

In attempting to trace the genealogy of the mammalian, and therefore of man, lower in the series, we become involved in greater and *greater obscurity*. [Page 195]

The early progenitors of man were *no doubt* once covered with hair, both sexes having beards; their ears were pointed, and capable of movement, and their bodies were provided with a tail, having the proper muscles. . . . At a still earlier period the progenitors *must have been* aquatic in their habits; for morphology plainly tells us that our *lungs* consist of a modified *swim-bladder*, which once served for a float. The clefts on the neck in the embryo of man show where the *branchia* once existed. These early predecessors of man...*must have been* as lowly organized as a lancelet or amphioxus, or still more lowly organized. [Page 198]

The most humble organism is something much higher than the inorganic dust under our feet. [Page 205]

Yes, of course, to be born of an ape is vastly higher than to be fashioned by the perfect hand of the living God!!! And we are given to understand by the president of the American Association, etc., that such a string of great swelling words as this is from beginning to end, is no more to be doubted as science than is the Copernican theory, which is demonstrated by the exact science of mathematics! It is scarcely to be wondered at that such a theory is atheistic. And no warning of the Bible is more pertinent to the present times than that one in:

1 Timothy 6

²⁰ O Timothy, *keep that* which is committed to your trust, avoiding profane and *vain babblings*, and oppositions of science *falsely so-called*:

²¹ Which some professing have *erred concerning the faith*.

Part 3

July 2, 1885

Of those who have read, attentively, these articles on Evolution, and those on Geology would precede these, no one can fail to see the striking similarity in the essential characteristics, and the manner of treatment, of the two so-called sciences, as drawn from the writings of their most eminent representatives. To carve this, as it were, in bold relief, on the brazen faces of these two sciences, we present the following:

In the *Independent* of May 27, 1880, appeared an article by President Gregory, of Lake Forest University, Ill., on the question, "Is Evolution Science?" in which occurred the following quotation, and comment:

Take, as illustration of the quality of the so-called science, the well-known passage from Mr. Darwin: "The early progenitors of man were, *no doubt*, covered with hair, both sexes having beards. Their ears were pointed and capable of movement, and their bodies were provided with a tail. . . . The foot...was prehensile, and our progenitors, *no doubt*, were arboreal in their habits, frequenting some warm, forest-clad land. . . . At an earlier period the progenitors of man *must have been* aquatic in their habits."

When men laud this as "advanced science," we have to say that it is a double "no doubt," and a "must have been" resting on a hypothesis which is conceivable, but has not a fact to support it. We protest, in the name of sound thinking, against the almighty *must-be-ity* with which the evolutionist constructs his system; and we do it for the same reason that we protest against the equally patent *must-be-ity* and *per se-ity* of the speculative philosophers and theologians. . . . Let us have real science, and not sham science.

Now we present for comparison with the above from Darwin's *Descent of Man*, an extract from Geikie's *Geology*, and see whether President Gregory's "protest" will not lie with equal weight against each.

The third paragraph under Part III., “Dynamical Geology,” reads as follows:

At an early time in the earth’s history, *anterior to any of the periods of which a record remains* in the visible rocks, the chief sources of geological action *probably* [italics ours] lay within the earth itself. The planet still retained a great store of its initial heat, and *in all likelihood*, was the theater of great chemical changes, giving rise, *perhaps*, to manifestations of volcanic energy somewhat like those which have so marvelously roughened the surface of the moon. As the outer layers of the globe cooled, and the disturbances due to internal heat and chemical action became less marked, the influence of the sun, which *must* always *have* operated, would then stand out more clearly, giving rise to that wide circle of superficial changes wherein variations of temperature and the circulation of air and water over the surface of the earth came into play.

So on this we too would say, “When men laud this as ‘advanced science,’ we have to say that it is simply” a “probability” linked with a “likelihood” and sustained by a “perhaps,” and all supported by a “must have operated,” with not a fact to underlie any of it, because it is all concerning periods of which there is no “visible record.” In the words of President Gregory,

We protest, in the name of sound thinking, against the almighty “probabilities,” and “perhaps’s,” and “must have’s,” with which the geologist, as well as the evolutionist, constructs his system.

And with him we say,

Let us have real science, and not sham science.

We would not be understood as being, in the slightest degree, opposed to true science. On the contrary, we will yield to none in genuine admiration of science; but it must be “real science, and not sham science,”—a science which, when it says “doubtless,” means doubtless in its absolute sense of having removed all doubt by sound reasoning and demonstrative evidence; and not as it is

used by the “falsely so-called” science of our day, simply to give expression to a whole system of doubt. The truth is, that the most charming book, the Bible always excepted, of course, that we have ever had the pleasure of reading, is the most profoundly scientific book that we ever read. That is, Maury’s *Physical Geography of the Sea*. He does not deal much in such terms, but when he *does* say “doubtless,” it *is* doubtless. As an illustration of what we regard as genuine science, we give the following from Lieutenant Maury’s treatise, sections 88-93:

In December, 1853, the fine new steamship, *San Francisco*, sailed from New York bound for California with a regiment of United States troops on board. While crossing the Gulf Stream she was overtaken by a fearful gale, and by one single blow of a terrible sea, one hundred and seventy-nine persons,—officers and men,—were washed overboard and drowned, and the ship so crippled that she was simply adrift. The next day she was seen by a vessel, and again the next day by another; but neither of these could render any assistance, and so she was left still adrift. When these two ships reached the United States, they reported the matter; and vessels were sent out by the Government to search for and relieve the drifting ship. But the questions were, “Which way should they go?” and “Where should they look?” Appeal was made to Maury, and he, sitting in the National Observatory, prepared a chart of the Gulf Stream for that time of year, and from a point where the disabled ship was last seen, he drew, as it were, upon the waters of the trackless ocean, two slightly diverging lines, thus, and said that the ship had drifted between them. Then one of the relief cutters, which was at New London, Conn., was told to go along a dotted line between these two lines, thus, to the last dot, and there she would see the object of her search. And right in sight of that very place the disabled ship was found.¹⁹

That was science in the fullest sense. When evolution can show such accuracy as that, it may lay claim to being a science; but it is entitled to no such claim as long as “facts can in no way interfere

¹⁹For full particulars see the work referred to.

with the theory.” And yet Lieutenant Maury was so much a lover of God and the Bible that he saw God’s greatness manifested in every and all of the winds, currents, and creatures of the air and the ocean, and constantly found the beautiful truths of the Bible, most beautifully demonstrated in the “wind in his circuits,”²⁰ and by the rivers which “run into the sea,”²¹ as well as in the “sweet influences of Pleiades,”²² and held his reverence for the Bible at such a height that in one instance at least, and which he had recorded, he actually gave up, entirely, a generally accepted theory, because, for one reason, as he himself says,

I found evidence in the Bible which seems to cast doubt upon it.

And so, like the true scientist that he was, he gave up the human theory, adopted the view that the Bible seemed to present, and soon demonstrated it as a scientific truth, although it was in direct opposition to one of the most eminent geologists of the day. That is the kind of science that we love; because, being based on the truth of God, it is a part of the truth of God itself. And so, consequently, when a man depart from the truth of God as recorded in nature, we can expect nothing else than, as we think is plainly shown by the evidence of this series of articles, that they will depart from the truth of God as recorded in revelation.

But as evolution, with all its “no doubts” and “must have been’s” has never been able to give, as Mr. Darwin says, an explanation of the “loss of the tail” by “man,” so on the other hand, geology with all its “probabilities,” etc., cannot tell whether its changes have been wrought by the means conjectured, or by other, and totally different means and at the same time much more rapidly than is allowed in any of the calculations of geologists. And therefore we, as evolutionists, are willing to admit as a “working hypothesis” that man, as man, was *created*, and created,

²⁰ *Ecclesiastes* 1:6.

²¹ *Ecclesiastes* 1:7.

²² *Job* 38:31.

without a tail. And as geologists, we will admit as a “working hypothesis” that “once upon a time”...

Genesis 7

¹¹ ...the windows from on high were opened, [and]...the fountains of the great deep [were] broken up,

–and that a flood of waters covered the whole face of the earth.²³ And the “probabilities” are, “no doubt,” that, “in all likelihood,” we, as evolutionists and geologists, “must be” just as near right about these things as “perhaps” are the evolutionists and geologists of the “advanced science” school.

But that geology and evolution are essentially alike, is not all. Evolution is absolutely dependent upon geology. Without geology, evolution can have no place. Proof:

The *high antiquity of man*,...is the *indispensable basis* for understanding his origin.²⁴

So geological science goes before and gives to the earth, all the way from *ten millions* to *ten thousand millions*, of years of growth and development, and thus the course is laid wide open, and the field entirely cleared, so that there is nothing to obstruct, in the slightest degree, the wildest flights of even the evolutionary imagination. Thus geological science furnishes to the full, the element of “high antiquity” which is demanded as “the indispensable basis” of evolution. Then evolutionary science follows after, and upon this “basis” builds up its atheistical structure. And thus the two “falsely so-called” sciences unite, not only to destroy faith in the word of God, but to rob the Creator of his prerogative and remove Him from His throne.

Geological science goes before and upon the basis of its deductions demands that we give up the *first chapter of Genesis*. With this as its “indispensable basis” evolution follows after, and upon *its* deductions demands that we give up *the whole Bible*. But that

²³ Genesis 7:17-20.

²⁴ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, Vol. 1, p. 3, Appleton’s Edition of 1871.

Book, from beginning to end, has been given to us as being, what it is in truth, *the word of God*, and:

2 Timothy 4

¹ I charge you *therefore* before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom:

² PREACH THE WORD.

Isaiah 40

⁶ The voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field:

⁸ The grass withers, the flower fades: but THE WORD OF OUR GOD SHALL STAND FOREVER.

4. The Foundation of Morality

American Sentinel, January 30, 1890

Original title: No Morality Possible Without Religious Doctrine

LAST week we printed the offer of the *American Secular Union* of a \$1,000 prize for the best essay embodying:

...the purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrines.

Personally, we are considerably interested in this thing. Our interest, however, is one of curiosity rather than of practice; because such a manual as the *Union* desires, will be a curiosity in itself, if such a thing can be created at all; and it will also be a curiosity to see how it is done when it is done.

The circular announcing the prize says:

It is desired that the manual for which this premium is offered shall not be a *reading* book for schools nor a mere code of morals, much less a *system* of ethical philosophy, but rather a concise yet comprehensive and suggestive exhibit, with familiar and practical illustrations of those universal foundation principles and axiomatic truths which underlie all sound morality and *rightfulness*, thus developing and educating that inherent *moral sense* which is more or less common to all rational beings. In short, to show how to teach children the *natural* and *essential* difference between right and wrong, and the reasons therefore.

It is perfectly proper to teach children, as well as older people, the essential difference between right and wrong; and every reasoning creature, not only desires, but absolutely demands to know the reasons therefore. But in moral things, in inculcating the principles of moral right or wrong, it is impossible to give reasons for it without inculcating a religious doctrine. The reason for that which is right or wrong must be based upon authority. But to leave out of these reasons all idea of any authority, except the authority of man, is to have in fact no basis for morality. The human conscience refuses to recognize the authority of man in the realm

of morals. If it rests upon the authority of man, one man has just as much authority as another. Each man's idea of that which is morally right is, to him, more authoritative than any other man's idea of right can be.

Therefore, to carry into effect the intent of this prize offer, there must be established an aristocracy of ideas in regard to what is morally right or wrong. Not only that, this aristocracy of ideas might be established; those ideas might be embodied in a manual; but how shall the children and the people at large be caused to receive them as authoritative? Every person will assert his right to reject the whole thing, reasons and all. If it be said that the State shall adopt this for the public schools, and enforce it, then there is at once established a despotism of ideas in morals, and freedom of thought is no more. It is impossible to escape this if once there is a step taken in that direction. But we understand that the *Secular Union* recognizes the absolute equality of mankind, and the absolute freedom of thought. These being the principles of the *Union*, it never can set forth any system of morals with any authority at all, according to the plan suggested in this announcement.

In the realm of morals, the mind and the conscience of man require reasons resting upon authority, and that authority must be superior to man's. That authority is the authority of God; the conscience of man will recognize no other; and the logic of the question will admit of no other. That authority is expressed either by the Lord, through His word, to the individual conscience, or by man assuming the place of God and by despotic power forcing its dictates upon men, crushing out individuality and freedom of thought.

The authority of man in the place of God, is expressed in two ways and only two. One of these ways is exemplified in the Papacy and its history. With this, the *American Secular Union* is well acquainted, and justly abhors it. With the other form, we are persuaded the *Union* is not so well acquainted, or it would never have made the offer it has on the basis upon which it has made it.

According to the idea of the *Union*, and in fact according to the abstract idea, somebody's view of what is right or wrong must be taken as the authority; and as the *Union* requires that the reasons for right or wrong shall be kept strictly upon the basis of the natural within the realm of the secular, in this case it must be the view of the majority. What the majority shall say is right or wrong, that is right or wrong.

But while it is only the views of men, the mind and conscience of man will refuse to receive it as authoritative in the realm of morals. Therefore, as we have seen, if it is to be made effective, it must be so by the assertion of power, and in this case the power of the State, which, in the government of the people, is simply the power of the majority. But even though it be a majority, when it embodies the views of the majority upon questions of right and wrong, and makes those views authoritative, and compels everybody to accept those views, that is a despotism crushing out freedom of thought, no less than is the ether, though it be not under the name of Papacy. And no less than the other also, this is simply man putting himself and his authority in the place of God and His authority. *This is paganism.*

The proposition of the *American Secular Union*, in this matter of its \$1,000 prize, is the very philosophy of Roman paganism in particular. In the Roman system, the idea of the State, that is, of the majority, was the highest idea of the science of right and wrong. What "the Senate and people of Rome" said was right, that was right. What they said was wrong, that was wrong. The Senate and people expressed their voice and their will, in this matter, in law, therefore, a maxim of the Roman law was:

"What the law says is right."

But *the Roman State was the supreme deity*; and thus originated the maxim,

"*Vox Populi Vox Dei*—the voice of the people is the voice of God."

This is the philosophy of the circular of the *American Secular Union* calling for a manual of morals based upon the authority of man. It is true, the *Union* does not, in set terms, propose to make the State openly a deity. Nevertheless the result is the same, and by such a system, the majority is put in the place of God, and asserts the power and authority of God upon the mind and conscience of man. These are the two means by which morality, and the reasons and the authority for it, are discovered and asserted by man. One is the Papacy, the other is paganism. Both are false.

The truth lies above them both in genuine Christianity. Real Christianity takes the moral code as it came from the hand of God asserting the eternal principles of right and wrong, resting upon the authority of God—Christianity takes these principles and, depending alone upon the power and the gracious influences of the Spirit of God, it seeks by persuasive argument and sound reason to impress them upon the individual conscience, and enables men, through faith in Christ, to attain to the perfect manifestation of “the purest principles of morality.”

It is both logically and practically impossible to inculcate the purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrine, because, as we have seen, in the realm of morals the mind and conscience of man uncompromisingly requires authority above the authority of man—that is, above the natural and the secular. But just as soon as we get above the natural and the secular, we are at once in the realm of religion, in the realm of the recognition of God, and that is religion.

Thus it is demonstrated by the experience of man, that, in the very nature of things, it is impossible to give instruction in the purest principles of morality without inculcating the purest religious doctrine, and that the religious doctrine of Christianity. Because in Jesus Christ God is revealed; and in the will of God there is announced, and in the faith of Jesus Christ there is secured the practice of, the purest principles of morality that ever can be known to the mind of man.

The trouble is that the *American Secular Union* makes a mistake in this and aims at too much. It requires that which it is impossible to secure by the means which the *Secular Union* is disposed only to employ. The object of the *Union*,

...the complete separation of Church and State in practice as well as in profession,

–is a laudable object. It is worthy of the sympathy, the support, and the cooperation of every Christian as well as every other man. In this, it has the hearty sympathy and cooperation of the *American Sentinel*. But in *its* effort to assure this, the *Secular Union* undertakes too much. In its opposition to the encroachments of the religious upon the civil authority it allows the pendulum to swing too far and would cause the civil authority to encroach upon the realm of the religious. In its attempt to keep separate the spiritual and the secular powers, the *Secular Union* attempts to do, by the secular power that which can be done only by the spiritual. It attempts to do by the civil power that which can be done only by the religious power. It attempts to inculcate and secure the practice of the purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrine, while it is absolutely impossible to instruct in the principles of morality, whether pure or impure, without inculcating religious doctrine; and while it is absolutely impossible to separate morality from religion.

We say it kindly: Let the *Secular Union* revise its position. Let it draw its lines more clearly. Let its object be indeed a complete separation of Church and State in practice as well as in profession. Let it confine itself to the secular, to the maintenance of which it is pledged and for which it in fact exists. And while doing this, let it leave to the Church matters pertaining to things spiritual. While opposing the encroachment of the Church upon the power of the State, let the *Secular Union* see to it that, so far as in it lies, the power of the State shall be kept within its proper jurisdiction, and that it shall not invade the realm of the Church. Let the *Union* see to it that the State shall have to do only with

things civil, while it leaves to the individual conscience that which pertains to religion and morality.

Let the *Secular Union* draw here its lines here and it will be relieved of the heavy burden of trying to do that which it is impossible to do with the means which the *Union* would only employ. It will also thus be relieved of the inconsistency of contradicting itself by even unintentionally attempting to do the very thing which it exists for the sole purpose of preventing.

What the *American Secular Union* wants in the prize manual for which it has advertised, is a manual clearly defining the principles in which the State may give instruction without trenching upon the domain of the religious: the principles which the State may inculcate within the proper limits of the civil jurisdiction. And, in fact, we are inclined to believe that this is what the *Union* intended to secure; but the *Union* makes the unfortunate mistake of confounding morality with civility, and asking for a manual upon the purest principles of *morality* without inculcating religious doctrine while it means only *civility*. The State is secular and exists in the realm of the natural and has only to do with that which is civil. It can never have anything to do with that which is spiritual, moral, or religious. The *Secular Union* and its work belong in the realm of the State and cannot, under its title, have anything to do with things spiritual, moral, or religious. Let the *Secular Union* confine itself within the limits of its proper jurisdiction and it will do well.

We have now favored the *Union* with printing its announcement, and with our comments upon it, and we sincerely hope that the *Union* will favor us with the earliest copy of the prize manual that it can possibly send to our table.

5. An Important Discussion

American Sentinel, February 6, 1890

MONDAY evening, January 13, at the annual meeting of the *Presbyterian Union* of New York City, there was a discussion upon the question,

“To what extent, if any, should religion be taught in the public schools?”

Dr. Josiah Strong, secretary of the *Evangelical Alliance*, and Dr. David G. Wylie, argued in favor of religion in the schools; Doctors D. H. Greer and Howard Crosby argued against it. It was an interesting discussion. Dr. Strong led.

He began by criticizing the Roman Catholic position. He said that position is to be regretted but not to be wondered at. The object of the public school is to make good citizens; the object of the parochial school is to make good Catholics. The removal, therefore, of the Bible from the public schools as a concession to Catholics would be a needless sacrifice, because the primary object of Roman Catholic teaching is the Roman Catholic religion, and any school in which that is not taught is not acceptable to the Catholic Church.

In answer to the Roman Catholic call for the division of the school fund, he said it would probably destroy the public school, and would certainly violate the principle of the entire separation of Church and State. He argued that the public schools are not Protestant because distinctive Protestant doctrines are not taught.

Now it is certainly a distinctive Protestant doctrine that the Bible, without note or comment, is the Word of God. And when Protestants insist that the Bible, without note or comment, shall be read in the public schools, and the Protestant Bible at that, and then claim that the schools are not Protestant, and that no distinctive Protestant doctrine is taught there, is to be guilty of a casuistry that stultifies every one who makes such an argument.

The speaker next turned his attention to the “secularists.” He said:

The secular theory is built on a wrong application of a right principle. The right principle is the entire separation of Church and State, while the wrong application of the principle is a failure to make a distinction between the Church and religion. There must be a separation between Church and State, but there must not be a separation between religion and the State. Our Government is, and always has been, religious. The principle of separation between Church and State forbids sectarian teaching in the public schools; but the principle of the union of religion and the State does not forbid undenominational religious instruction.

But he did not tell how the State was to discover what is undenominational. He said,

Self preservation is the first law of nature. If the State has a right to exist, it has the right to do whatever will perpetuate that existence.

This is not a valid argument at all. It bears the blemish of the whole National Reform system; that is, that the State is an intelligence separate from the people who compose it. If the State were an individual, as really as is any individual person, then this argument might be allowed. But the State is no such person.

The State has a right to exist simply because it is impossible for it to do otherwise. The State cannot commit suicide; the State exists in the nature of things as the result of the existence of man in society. In the sense in which the words were used by Dr. Strong, the State has not the right to do whatever will perpetuate its existence. Because, especially in religious things, what seems to the State necessary to perpetuate its existence, is often only a cruel, unmitigated tyranny. And even then it is doubtful whether the existence of the State is perpetuated thereby.

In the early days of Christianity, the Roman State considered its existence to be in danger. It decided that as the State had the right

to exist, it had the right likewise to do whatever was necessary to perpetuate that existence, and that it was, therefore, necessary to put a stop to Christianity. It therefore punished with many untold torments, even unto death, the profession of Christianity.

Without entering upon the question as to whether the existence of the Roman State was perpetuated or not by such proceedings, it is certain that the Roman State had no shadow of right to do to Christianity what it did. This, we are persuaded Dr. Strong himself will concede because, assuredly he cannot justify it without condemning Christianity; but in conceding this, his whole argument is gone.

The truth and the sum of the whole matter is, that with religion the State can have nothing to do whether professedly to perpetuate its existence or not. The speaker further argued that:

The State must teach fundamental religious truths because it is good for the State. The State cares nothing about another life.

But the State cannot teach religious truth, fundamental or otherwise, without having to do with another life. Religion relates primarily to the recognition of God and another life.

Next he argued that it is not so much preceptive instruction that is required as it is practical. He said,

The lying of children in this country is not because of a lack of knowledge of how to tell the truth but because of a lack of will.

But he did not attempt to tell how the State is to create in the mind of a child the will to tell the truth when the disposition is there to tell a lie instead.

In answer to the suggestion that the children be taught religion in the home and the Sunday-school, he inquired:

How are all those children to be got into the Sunday-school? And, as they cannot readily be got into the Sunday-school, how are the children to be taught reverence for God, for man, for woman, and for law. There is little reverence and therefore little

authority in the American home—except that of children over the parents. In the school is where the State can touch children with a molding hand, and if reverence is to be taught who shall do it, if not the State?

Throughout his speech, the Doctor seemed to have forgotten entirely that there is such a thing in the world as the Church. Certainly these defects exist which he has named. There is sore need that religion and reverence and authority all should be taught.

But so far as his speech went he could discover none but the State to teach these things. But it is impossible for the State to teach them; and the task of teaching these things was never committed to the State by the Source of all authority, religion, and reverence.

Is it true that the Church has so fallen from its place and so far lost the true idea of her mission as not to be worthy of consideration in such a question as this so that the only alternative is to have the State to do it?

He argued that the question as to what, and how much religion should be taught, “should be settled by a local authority;” and:

Especially in the cities great care must be exercised and a middle course pursued between secularizing and Protestantizing the schools.

Dr. Strong was followed by Dr. Greer, Episcopalian, rector of St. Bartholomew’s Church, New York City. No synopsis can do any manner of justice to Dr. Greer’s speech, and it was impossible for us to obtain a verbatim report. It was an overwhelming rejoinder to Dr. Strong, and at the same time a masterly assertion of immutable principles both Christian and American.

In answer to Dr. Strong’s attempted distinction between the Church and religion, he said:

Such a distinction is impossible. The introduction of religion into the public schools is the introduction of the Church into the

public schools, and is, therefore, a union of Church and State. The distinction is further attempted upon the question of religion, that it is not dogmas of faith, but fundamental truths of religion, that is to be taught. But how shall religion be taught without dogmas? It may be taught without some dogma in which you do not believe; but it cannot be taught without some dogma in which you do believe. We cannot conceive of a church without doctrine. And religion cannot be introduced into the public schools unless it is doctrinal in the sense of being definite, positive, and precise. To speak of the Church without doctrine is to talk of daylight without the sun, of an effect without a cause.

But it is said that nothing denominational shall be taught, but only those points in which all Christians are agreed. Who will tell us what these points are in which all Christians are agreed? Is it the infallibility of the Pope? Is it the divinity of our blessed Lord? "The doctrine of God," you say. What God? And what kind of a God is it in which all Christians are agreed? Is it a God who proposes to save men through the purifying processes of purgatorial fire, or is it a God that proposes to have all men without any fire at all? Is it the God in which the Unitarian believes, or is it the God in which the Trinitarian believes?

But it is asked, "Should not the Bible be read?" The mere reading of a few words from the Bible from day to day is not of such a positive sort of religious instruction as yet to have excited any special conflict. In the event of a conflict, which is easily possible, the State to be consistent would have to prohibit even the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Here also the question arises, What Bible? Is it the Bible that says "repent," or is it the Bible that says "do penance?" Is it the Bible that says "immerse" or is it the Bible that says "baptize?" Is it the Bible that contains the Apocrypha, or is it King James' version?

The question of the reading of the Bible in the schools might become a burning question, and the State would then have to decide what Bible should be read. And as soon as the State does that, then some denomination will secure political control in its own interests, as is the case with Mormonism in Utah today. But it is said that this makes the schools "godless." This cry is more rhetorical than true, and, to many, sounds worse than it is. It

might be brought with equal propriety against those schools which teach only business and penmanship, and schools of mechanics, and of arts. These are in the same sense godless. But they are not ungodly. They are godless because they are schools with a definite purpose in view, which purpose is not the teaching of religion. That purpose is followed without reference to religion. Not that those who give instruction there are atheistic or irreligious men, but because those schools do not exist for the purpose of giving instruction about God or about religion.

The Church can best do its work when it does it without any connection with the State. The State can best do its work without any connection with the Church. This is the theory to which we are committed by the Constitution. Let the Church arise to an apostolic faith; let her be inspired by an apostolic zeal; let her be fired with an apostolic zeal; let her be clothed with apostolic power; then she can face the world as the apostolic church did, and by force of character can influence the State and the school vastly more than it would be possible to do with all the power and machinery in the State at her command. By this means it is possible for Christians to make Christianity so dominant that nothing but Christian personality will influence the public schools. It is not the reading nor the reciting of a set form of words that makes truth effective; it is the character, the living personality that is behind the words. The schools are here for everybody and for every class. The schools must be kept broad and comprehensive, and must not be encroached upon by any religious body upon any pretext whatever.

Dr. Wylie was the next speaker. He is a thorough-going national reformer. After speaking in opposition to the Roman Catholic theory, he denounced the secular theory as "atheistic," and then argued for a religious State at once. A goodly portion of his argument was also an appeal to sentiment and was simply a begging of the question.

Dr. Crosby's speech was rather a summing up then a decided argument and was quite brief. Of this speech we were able to obtain quite a full report. He said:

We have been subject of late to an educational craze in which we have forgotten and overrun the limits of American principles, both in the matter of attempting the teaching of religion by the State and of teaching the higher sciences by the State, with both of which, in my opinion, the State has nothing to do. It has no right to be teaching the higher education. The best thing that could be done with the Normal College—and I hope President Hunter is here to hear me—would be to turn it into a grand central police station. The best thing that could be done with the College of the City of New York—and I wish General Webb was here—would be to turn it into a prison for boodlers.

I think we have no more right to instruct freely the children of all citizens in the higher mathematics and the calculus and philosophy than we would have to tax the people to give each child a thousand dollars to set him up in business. And on the same democratic, American principle I think that half of what is done in the public schools could be done away with. The only argument for schools established by the Government at all is to make citizens able to understand what our Government is. In other words, we should only teach children in the public schools to read, to write, to cipher, and to know what the American Constitution is. That should be the entire curriculum in the public schools. Beyond that we have no right to go.

We have got into an educational craze in this matter, and the way to get out of it is to limit the work of the State to where it belongs. We should no more expect to teach religion in the public schools than to teach it in a mechanics' institute for the learning of a technical trade. We have many excellent organizations for benevolent work that are not concerned with the subject of religion. Are these benevolent institutions atheistic or irreligious?

It is not the business of the State to teach religion. It is the business of the Church. The State teach religion? I want the State to get a little religion first. Of course, if we are to have religion taught by the State in this democratic country, we shall have it taught by the local government. We cannot take a single step in the teaching of religion without injury. We have no right in this country, which invites all persons of all creeds, to set up one of our religious notions as against the religious notions that any one

else may honestly hold. Just as far as we do it just so far we encroach on the stability which is the basis of our Government.

The State has no right to go further than to teach the simplest branches of education. The whole curriculum can be gone through within three years, and when we limit public education to that, we shall solve this problem which has been agitating, and is agitating us, and will continue to agitate us. We must learn that in our public schools we must recognize the rights of all.

There were about two hundred and fifty or three hundred people present, and although there were quite a number who were in favor of the idea of religion in the schools, it was easy to see that the great majority were decidedly against it; which, we were very glad indeed to see.

There is one point, however, that is of considerable importance. Dr. Strong is secretary of the Evangelical Alliance of America. He is fully committed to a union of Church and State, and, as far as in him lies, he commits the Alliance with its influence and its methods, to the same things wherever he can.

6. What Are the Rights of Conscience?

American Sentinel, March 13, 1890

Original title: That Representative Decision. What Are the Rights of Conscience?

JUDGE BENNETT'S answer to the question as to what are the rights of conscience is only an assertion of the doctrine of the majority conscience, in support of which he argues thus:

The plaintiffs and their children must not forget that other people have consciences, and are protected in those rights of conscience as well as themselves. Suppose the Board of Education in this school district, and the great body of the patrons of the school, conscientiously believe that the Bible should be read in the public school, as strongly and fully as the plaintiffs believe it should not be? Whose conscientious scruples must yield?

Without hesitation and without qualification we say the conscience of the majority must give way. Otherwise there is no such thing as rights of conscience. If the majority is to rule in matters of conscience, then the constitutional provisions guarding the rights of conscience are "a mere parchment barrier," a tantalizing delusion.

It is solely to protect the conscientious convictions of the few, or even the solitary individual, that these provisions are made a part of the Constitution. There is no danger that the majority, "the great body," of the people will infringe or interfere with their own conscientious convictions.

The Constitution did not mean to inquire how many or how few would profess or not profess this or that particular religion. If there be but a single individual in the State who professes a particular faith, he is as much within the sacred protection of the Constitution as if he agreed with the great majority of his fellow-citizens. (9 Cal. p. 514)

But not altogether to set up our own view alone in answer to Judge Bennett's question, we present the following words of Hon. Stanley Matthews:

If it be said that the Protestant conscience requires that the Bible be read by and to Protestant children, and that it is a denial of a right of conscience to forbid it, waiving at present the obvious and conclusive answer that no such right of conscience can require that the State shall provide out of the common taxes for its gratification, it is enough to say that Catholics then, too, have the same right to have their children taught religion according to their views—not out of the Douay Bible if they do not consider that sufficient, but—by catechism and in the celebration of the mass, if they choose to insist; that the Jews have the same right to have their religion taught in the common schools—not from the English version of the Old Testament, but—according to the practice of their synagogues; and infidels have the same right to have their children taught deism, or pantheism, or positivism.

They have no right to insist upon Protestant practices at the public expense, or in public buildings, or to turn public schools into seminaries for the dissemination of Protestant ideas. They can claim nothing on the score of conscience which they cannot equally concede to all others. It is not a question of majorities or minorities; for if the conscience of the majority is to be the standard, then there is no such thing as a right of conscience at all. It is against the predominance and power of majorities that the rights of conscience are protected, and have need to be.

It is most likely that the people of the United States think they have the rights of conscience guaranteed to them—and in fact they have by their Constitution—but they seem not to realize how easy it is for a court by a few words to sweep away all constitutional guaranties.

It is likely that the people of Wisconsin think their rights of conscience are secure; but if Judge Bennett's decision expresses the law in that State they have no rights of conscience at all. It may be indeed that the Protestants of the city of Edgerton feel that they are secure, even under this decision, because they are

the majority, and the decision says the majority conscience must rule.

But if this were made a State question, these same Protestants would probably be surprised to know that the Roman Catholics are more than one and a half times as numerous as the Protestants in that State; and if the Roman Catholics should assert the majority-conscience doctrine it is certain that the Protestants would very soon discover that the constitutional safeguards themselves, rather than Protestant dogmas, need to be guarded by the courts. Let the Protestants of Wisconsin protest against this sweeping away of these rights of conscience.

One of the arguments made by counsel for the plaintiffs was, that the Constitution was adopted to “insure domestic tranquility,” and that the reading of the Bible in the public schools “tends to create discord,” and that therefore the reading of the Bible in the public schools is unconstitutional! It must be confessed that this argument is more ingenious than profound; but the Judge’s answer to it is far worse than the argument. The answer does not possess even the merit of ingenuity. The Court’s reply was this:

It is claimed by both parties to this litigation, that the New Testament at least contains the gospel of peace. This was declared by the angel of the Lord at the birth of the Saviour. We read in Luke, ch. 2,...verses 13, 14, “And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.”...If the reading of the Bible concerning the words and wonderful works of the Divine Being whose advent into the world was so beautifully, grandly, and sublimely announced by the angel of the Lord, would produce dissension and discontent, and not peace on earth and good will toward men, then it would follow that the “angel of the Lord” was mistaken.

Indeed, and indeed!! And therefore that the reputation of the angel of the Lord for truth and veracity may not suffer in the community about Edgerton, Wisconsin, the State Circuit Court,

Judge Bennett presiding, must needs come to the rescue and give him a certificate of good character!

Let us carry the Judge's argument a little further. Let us put it to the test of the Scripture, and see how it will work. Thus: The New Testament at least contains the gospel of peace. This was declared by the angel of the Lord at the birth of the Saviour. We read:

Luke 2

¹³ And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying,

¹⁴ Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will toward men.

Now in the same book of *Luke* we read the words of the Saviour himself whose advent was so grandly announced, saying:

Luke 12

⁵¹ Suppose you that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division:

⁵² For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three.

⁵³ The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law-against her daughter-in-law and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.

Now the rest of the Judge's argument comes in: If the coming of the Divine Being whose advent into the world was so beautifully, grandly, and sublimely announced by the angel of the Lord, would produce dissension "and division" and not peace, then it would follow that the "angel of the Lord was mistaken."

Well, Judge, really now how is it? Was the angel of the Lord mistaken or was he not? Was the angel of the Lord mistaken or was the Lord himself mistaken?

Again: the plaintiffs might have appealed the case to the Supreme Court, and upon the strength of Judge Bennett's argument might have pleaded thus:

The Circuit Court has decided that we have “created discord, and ought not to be heard” (page 54). Now the Saviour said He came to send division and discord on the earth. If, then, there be not division and discord, it will follow that the Saviour was mistaken. Therefore the decision must be in our favor, or else the Supreme Court will be involved in the serious matter of sanctioning a grave reflection upon the character of the Lord.

If Judge Bennett’s argument in defense of the angel is good, this argument would be much better in defense of the Lord, as He is “so much better than the angels,” as to have “obtained a more excellent name than they.” *Hebrews 1:4*.

We do not present this seeming conflict in the Scriptures to sanction for a moment any such idea as that either the angel or the Lord was mistaken, for they both told the truth: we simply present this the more fully to show what is already apparent, that in assuming the role of defender of the angels, and attempting to expound Scripture from the bench, Judge Bennett entered into a field where he had no business to go. The character of the angels of the Lord needs no defense from the Circuit Court of Wisconsin.

In closing his decision the Judge said:

The Bible remains and it would seem like turning a good, true, and ever faithful friend and counselor out of doors, to exclude it from the public schools of the State.

This observation confirms what is apparent throughout the whole decision, that Judge Bennett assumed the position of an advocate instead of retaining that of a judge. He sat there as an advocate to plead for his “ever faithful friend,” and at all hazards to keep him where he was, instead of sitting as a just judge to decide fairly whether, in the first place that “faithful friend” ought to have been where he was.

To us the Bible is as much of an ever faithful friend and counselor, as it can be we think to Judge Bennett or anybody else; and

we want to see it become the same to everybody else as far as possible.

But we know that friendship is not very readily formed nor very firmly cemented, nor are the admonitions of a counselor very respectfully received, by being forced upon people at their expense and against their will, as has been done with the Bible in the public schools of Wisconsin.

7. The Bible Is Religious Only

American Sentinel, September 25, 1890

THE *Christian Union* wants the Bible used in the public schools simply as history and literature, just as Xenophon and Homer are used. It says:

If our Catholic, Jewish, or Agnostic brethren object to opening schools with acts of worship, such acts of worship should, in our judgment, be discontinued. It is not the business of the State to conduct public worship against the objection of any considerable proportion of tax-payers, but, the use of the Bible as history and literature is no more sectarian than the use of Xenophon or Homer.

Yes; it is true enough that the use of the Bible as history and literature is no more sectarian than any other book of history or literature, but the Bible is not that; the Bible is neither history nor literature; it was not written for any such purpose.

It is true there is history in it, but the only purpose for which that history was written, is religious. It is likewise true that there is a literature in the Bible, but the sole worth that it has as literature is the religion that is in it.

Take the literature of the Sermon on the Mount, what is it worth without the religion that is in it? That was not spoken as a piece of literature; the Saviour did not declaim that to display His eloquence. It was spoken as the word of God; spoken by Him who came down from heaven bringing the salvation of God to man, and it was to impress the thoughts of God upon the minds and hearts of men that Christ uttered it, and to take that idea and thought out of it, takes everything out of it; if it is not that, it is not anything at all.

It is the same with any other part of the Scriptures, there are fine passages, there are heights of eloquence and depths of pathos, but whether it be height or depth, it is the inspiration of the religion of Christ that makes it so, that makes it what it is.

There is another point in this. There is a good deal of sophistry about this idea of using the Bible as a history. We should like some of those who talk that way, to tell us in what the history of the Jewish people consists, that is of any material worth, aside from the religion. What value has the history of the Jewish nation if you take the religion out of it?

They were not scientists; they did not cultivate art in any particular form. The form of government that they had was set aside by the Lord himself, and such a form is forbidden to be any more among men. Then, as a model government, it is worthless. In art or science it is worthless.

The only thing in the history from beginning to end, the only thing that ever was in it, the only thing that was intended to be gathered from it, is religion. And if it be separated from its religious purpose, there is taken away from it all the value that it has.

To prove this, attention needs but to be called to the record. Take up the history that is found in the Bible anywhere, and it is inseparable from the religious idea, and the religious thought.

The history of Abraham, for instance, is that God called him from among his people to a land that He would show him, and that he went not knowing whither; that the Lord promised to him, when as yet he had no child, that his seed should be as the stars of heaven—innumerable, and that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

The seed referred to in that word is Jesus Christ, and the sole purpose of the history from Abraham to Christ, was to bring the people to Him. And when He came and that people rejected Him, their history, as connected with the Bible ceased forever. In fact, there is a period of more than four hundred years before Christ came, during which there is not a word of history; which in itself shows that the history of that people is not the object of the writing in the Bible.

Again, start with the children of Israel, as they were about to leave Egypt, and it is but an account of miracle after miracle. In fact the whole story, from that time till Israel entered into the land of Canaan, for a period of forty years, is scarcely anything else than a record of a series of miracles.

- The Red Sea was divided that Israel might pass;
- Then as they passed into the wilderness they came to the bitter waters which were made sweet that the people might drink.
- Afterward, water was more than once given to the people by Moses merely striking the rock with his rod;
- And then at Sinai, the Lord appeared in glory on the top of the mount, and also at the door of the tabernacle;

And, to say nothing of the constant, almost daily, repetition of miracles, there was the pillar of fire by night, and the pillar of cloud by day, constantly over the tabernacle, by whose direction they moved or remained. Thus it was all through the forty years wanderings in the desert of Arabia. When they passed into the promised land, it was when...

Joshua 3

¹⁵ ...the Jordan overflowed its banks.

The priests took the ark of God, and started into the water. As soon as they touched the water that which came down from above stood still, and that which was below flowed on. And so it stood till the whole of Israel passed over.

Soon after this they came to Jericho and laid siege to that city by merely marching around it once a day, for seven days, blowing trumpets of rams' horns; and on the seventh day they marched around it seven times and then set up a mighty shout, and the walls of Jericho fell down. The siege was ended and the city captured.

Not long after this there was a battle with the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land. They were defeated, but to make the vic-

tory forever sure, the sun stood still and the day was prolonged, so that there was no such day before nor after it.

And so the whole history might be followed through, step by step, as it is written, from that day when the sun stood still, unto the last historical record in the Old Testament, and all the time the record is to be found inseparable from signs, wonders, miracles, and interpositions of the Lord.

All of which demonstrates that the object of the Bible is not historical, but religious wholly. It also demonstrates that it is impossible to use the Bible as a history. And those who ask that it may be used in the public schools simply as history, know that this is so, and if it were not for its religious character not one of them would ever write ten lines of a plea for its use in the public schools as history.

If the record of that people be so valuable, as a history only, as to make it essential that above all others it shall be used as a history, then why is it that those who want it so, do not insist that the history of that people since Bible times shall be taught also. But no such request was ever heard of, and never would be if the Bible were history only, as Xenophon or Tacitus is history.

But these men, knowing that it is impossible for the State to teach religion, and knowing that it is wrong for the State to tax all the people in order to teach to all, the religion of a few—knowing all this they have not the face to ask that the Bible shall be used in the schools for what it is, and therefore they hope to get it used for what it is, by getting the State to adopt it and use it for what it is not. The plea is essentially dishonest, and it is difficult to see how those who make it do not know that it is dishonest.

As for the New Testament there is no pretense that this is history in any sense. In the four gospels there is a sketch of the four years of the life of Christ, but the fullest of these contributions to the sketch says plainly, that no attempt is made to write a complete record because no reasonable number of books could contain it if it were written; but what is written, was written...

John 20

³¹ ...that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you might have life through His name.

The Bible record, from beginning to end, is but a record of Jesus Christ. This verse which we have just quoted not only tells the object of the writings of the gospel, but the object of the writing of the whole Bible, and that is that men might believe that Christ is the Son of God; and that believing they might have life through His name.

- He is the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world. *Revelation 13:8*.
- He is the seed of the woman, that was promised before the first pair were driven from the garden. *Genesis 3:15*.
- He is the one to whom almost the last words in the Bible are addressed, "Even so come Lord Jesus." *Revelation 22:20*.
- "He is the alpha and the omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last," all the way through the Bible. *Revelation 22:13*.

And therefore any proposition that is ever made by any one to teach the Bible, or to use it in any way, other than as the record of Christ, is to propose that the record of Christ shall be taught with Christ left out. It is, in short, only an attempt to rob the world of Christ and His gifts to men.

And such will be the only tendency wherever the Bible is used for anything else than just what it is, namely, the revelation of God concerning His eternal purpose in Christ Jesus the Saviour of men.

8. Morality in the Public Schools

American Sentinel, February 26, 1891

UPON the question as to whether morality should be taught in the public schools, we would suggest that it would be well for those who demand it, to agree upon what morality really is, what is its basis, and what are its sanctions.

If this should not be clearly discerned and taught, even granting that it is the province of the State to teach morality, it is certain that the teaching would be no better than that which is now given in the public schools, and the probabilities are, that it would be much worse.

It is also certain that those who favor the teaching of morality in the public schools cannot agree upon what morality is, nor upon what are the grounds of moral responsibility.

This question was studied “thoroughly and practically” for four years by the *Evangelical Ministers’ Association* of Boston. In 1882 an able committee of that body, composed of representative men of all denominations, was appointed for the purpose of preparing “a book of morals for the public schools.” Two of that committee were Drs. Joseph T. Duryea and Edward Everett Hale. The result of the four years’ study of the question by this committee was expressed by Dr. Duryea in 1885, in a letter to the chairman of a committee in New York, appointed to consider the same subject. The following is the material part of that letter:

32 Union Park, Boston, Dec. 5, 1885.

MY DEAR SIR: The committee appointed to consider the matter of a book of morals for the public schools, have been trying faithfully to find out what can be done. Difficulties have been met and not overcome. We are trying to evade them....

The desire was for a graded series. This would involve a book worthy to go into the high schools. This could hardly omit reference to the grounds of moral responsibility. The committee have seriously doubted the wisdom of debating the basis of moral

choice and action before youth. To show them that apparently good men differ concerning the very foundation of morality, might be harmful before they are developed and informed sufficiently to understand how there can be differences as to theories, and yet substantial agreement as to practical morality.

I think, now, the tendency is to admit that it is better to address the moral intuitions, and not to theorize about them; also to treat moral matters as they come up in the life of the pupils, and their associations in the school and on the play-ground.

But it has been deemed practicable to prepare a book, or a series of books, after the pattern of the "Book of Golden Deeds," prepared for youth in England.

The moral affections and sentiments might be exhibited in expression, and moral principles might be embodied in characters, and concretely presented in deeds. An outline including all the virtues, and incidents under each of them, might be selected. Also deeds might be presented involving all the moral rules drawn out of the root principles of morality.

This is as far as we have been able to go, with expectation of meeting with general approval, and securing the admission of the book or books.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH T. DURYEY.

This is an interesting letter, and coming as it does as the result of years of special study on the subject by such men, its statements are of more than common importance.

First, difficulties have been met and not overcome, and they are difficulties of such a nature as, from the circumstances of the case, to seem insurmountable, because instead of battling with them with a real endeavor to overcome them the committee tried to evade them. But upon such a question, to evade the difficulty is not to escape it, for it is still there and there it remains.

This statement simply reveals in a more forcible way than is usually done, the fact that upon the question of the Bible, or religion, or morality, in the public schools, there are difficulties

which cannot be overcome with justice to all. Of course we use the word morality as meaning much more than civility.

Second, the committee could not insert in a book for the public school any reference to “the grounds of moral responsibility,” because:

- that is an unsettled question even among those who were to compile the book; and because
- the wisdom of debating before youth the question of what is the basis of moral choice and action, is seriously to be doubted; and, further,
- because it might be harmful for the youth in school to discover that the very reason why they should choose, and act, a certain way in a given case, was an unsettled question among college graduates and doctors of divinity.

These reasons certainly ought to be sufficient to put a check upon the efforts of any such committee. They ought also to be sufficient to put a damper upon the zeal of very many who are now so ardently in favor of forcing this question to an issue in the management of the public school.

Because when men of mature and trained minds, graduates of the best colleges and the highest universities, and of theological seminaries, and who, of all men, are most intimately and constantly associated with the consideration of this very question in all its phases,—when these cannot agree upon what is the ground of moral responsibility, or the basis of moral choice and action, it certainly would be perfect folly to demand that school-children should decide the question.

The committee did well to say it might be harmful; the committee might have gone farther and said not only that it might be harmful, but that it could not be anything else than harmful.

Yet it was not exactly this phase of the question that the committee referred to when it said it might be harmful. It was the fact that the children would discover...

“...that apparently good men differ concerning the very foundation of morality,”

–and would thus be led to doubt whether there is any real foundation for morality, and consequently would be landed plumply into skepticism.

Of this the committee might well be afraid, because it would be the inevitable result of every attempt of the State to inculcate morality.

9. Some Reasons for Some Virtues

American Sentinel, March 19, 1891

THE subject of the public schools, is one of deep concern to every American citizen, and the question, What shall be taught therein? is of the greatest interest.

The churches are demanding that religion shall be taught in the public schools; and although the influence and support of this demand are great, the majority of the people are as yet opposed to it; because anybody who has taken the time to think of the matter to any extent, knows that such a system of teaching would destroy the public schools.

There is another demand for a system of instruction in the public schools which is no less dangerous in itself, and much more dangerous on account of the more general support that it has; that is, the teaching of what is called morality, without religion. Such a system might not destroy the public schools so quickly as the religious, but it would more quickly destroy the State.

Although there is much demand made that instruction in morals, without religion, shall be given in the public schools, very few of those who make the demand have ever attempted to define what shall be taught as morals, and why it shall be taught; and fewer yet have attempted to formulate a system or manual of morality which should be a part of the public school curriculum.

About a year ago the *American Secular Union* offered a prize for such a manual; but it has not yet been published. There is, however, a book already in existence, issued in 1888, which sets forth "a system of ethics for society and schools." It has been highly recommended. It is entitled, "The Virtues and Their Reasons." It was written by Austin Bierbower, and is issued by George Sherwood & Co., Chicago. The preface states the object of the book, and, in view of what the book contains, is worthy to be quoted in full. Here it is:

This treatise, while intended for the general reader, and emphasizing those virtues which have a particular interest at this time, is especially adapted for moral training in the public schools and higher institutions of learning.

Moral instruction is often excluded from public schools on account of the different religions represented, and the want of text books acceptable to them all. This exclusion has led to serious attacks on our public-school system, threatening its existence.

In presenting systematically that morality which is common to all civilized peoples, the author has had no occasion to take notice of religious differences. Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and unbelievers may use this book with equal approval.

As this subject is one of much interest just now we shall notice it quite fully. In this article, we shall notice the reasons which are given for the virtues which are recommended.

The virtues which are discussed are:

- kindness (in its several forms and manifestations, and its antagonistic vices),
- truth,
- honesty,
- family duties,
- public duties,
- self-development,
- industry,
- self-support,
- self-control,
- temperance,
- self-respect,
- purity, and
- conscientiousness.

The “reason” for the virtue of *deference*, is that:

...one who neglects such courtesies is disliked as mean; few get more respect than those who yield in trifles....One who can make more by giving up than by retaining, is foolish not to give up.
(Page 44)

Now according to *The Sentinel's* idea of morality, that is not a sufficient reason for virtue, nor a sufficient incentive to keep men virtuous, because, on the other hand, it might be said with equal reason that one who can make more by retaining than by giving up, is foolish not to retain.

The reason for the virtue of *politeness* is this:

To wear a smile is to have a great power in society, making often all the difference between the popular and unpopular person....The polite man only is considered a gentleman....To be polite is to appear elegant and dignified. (Page 45)

Now the query is, if a person practices politeness, in order to have great power in society, to be popular, to be considered a gentleman, and to appear elegant and dignified, then in that case is politeness entirely a virtue?

The reasons for the virtue of *cheerfulness*, are as follows:

The cheerful man has a great power in society. As an orator he gets attention by his quick sympathy; his good fellowship makes him desired as a companion; men like to trade with him, and women are more apt to love him. (Page 74)

Again, we ask, If a person is cheerful for such reasons as that, then in that case is such cheerfulness a virtue? Is it not rather a vice?

Next, the author discusses the vices which are antagonistic to the virtue of kindness; the first of which is *hate*. The reason why hate "is not the proper feeling to have for anything," is because:

...hate has no utility. It gives no pleasure, furnishes no protection, reforms no depravity...So that if one has simply his own happiness in view, he should avoid hate as unprofitable. . . . Nor

is there any corresponding action for hate that is at all useful.
(Page 82)

This is to argue if hate had utility, or if it gave great pleasure, or were profitable or useful, then it would be perfectly proper to exercise it for all it is worth. This is utilitarianism with a vengeance.

As for us, indeed, we should not want our children to be taught that kind of morality in the public schools or anywhere else. His reasons for not indulging *anger* are to the same purpose. Merely, it is “useless” and gets little respect from either friend or foe.
(Page 86)

One of the chief reasons for the virtue of *veracity* is this:

No trait has more commercial value than veracity. When one is known to be unflinchingly true, so that in every circumstance he can be relied on, and especially in the greatest temptation, he becomes a man much sought after....To be true and to have a reputation for truth is thus a large capital for the average man....He who would lie much, and preserve a reputation for truth, will find his task harder than to tell the truth uniformly, and in the end less successful. The disadvantages of lying are obvious.
(Pages 102, 103, 104)

Now from the “commercial” point of view, everybody knows that there are very often times when the advantage of lying is the most obvious thing in the world. Does anybody suppose that to all the millionaires in this country, the disadvantages of lying have always been obvious?

But whether anybody supposes this or not, the questions still recur, Is that a sufficient reason for the virtue of veracity? are such reasons as this sufficient proof that veracity is a virtue? In other words, if lying had more commercial value than telling the truth, and was a larger capital to the average man, and if the advantage of it were obvious, then, according to this system of morality, would not lying be a virtue?

The reason for honesty, is the same precisely as that for veracity, as logically, it ought to be. Here it is:

Honesty like truthfulness has much commercial value. (Pages 119)

And again, we may merely inquire, If it should be found that dishonesty has greater commercial value than honesty, that is, if a man can make more by being dishonest than by being honest, then is not dishonesty a virtue? These reasons throughout, it will be seen, are a large improvement upon that which we have so often heard that “honesty is the best policy.” By this system of morality, honesty is the best policy—*if you can make it pay.*

It is evident that if all these virtues should be exercised, for the reasons that are given in this book, the result in every case would be nothing else than a supreme selfishness clothed with a perfect self-satisfaction. This is not only the logic of the subject; it is the teaching of the book.

The reasons for the “virtue” of *pride*, are these:

To take satisfaction in keeping within the virtues, and not merely within the fashions, is a worthy gratification, as also to take a lively interest in your abilities and not in your superficial accomplishments. (Page 258)

Yes, that is so. We remember having read somewhere, in an old book, a description of an individual who took satisfaction in just that kind of gratification, because of that kind of virtue. The description reads thus:

Luke 18

¹¹ The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank you, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican.

¹² I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.

This is a genuine and authentic description of the character that would be developed by conformity to the teachings of the book

now under consideration. Every reason that is there given for every virtue that is there described, is summed up in one word, selfishness. To such an extent is this so, that by the teaching of the book, unselfishness itself is turned into selfishness; for it said:

Selfishness is not necessarily self-sacrifice, but, as it is to our advantage to be unselfish, the unselfish man enjoys his own life more than does the selfish. (Page 32)

Thus the logic of this system of morality is supreme selfishness. And that is proposed as a system of ethics for society and schools. There is enough selfishness in society already, without making it the chief element in the instruction of all the children in the country in the public schools.

This is also the logic of every system that proposed to teach morals without religion.

10. The Grounds of Right

American Sentinel, March 26, 1891

IN further notice of Mr. Bierbower's system of "Ethics for Schools," we are brought to the discussion of the grounds of morality or right. Last week we found that the only "reasons" which he gives for the virtues, are all summed up in the one word, "selfishness." So entirely is this so that unselfishness itself is by this system turned into selfishness; thus every virtue is transformed into a vice, because selfishness is the root of all vice and of all sin.

Now in examining the grounds of morality or right which this author propounds it is found that this also ends at the same place — in supreme selfishness. Thus says the book:

As to what constitutes right, thinkers differ; some maintaining it to be a course in harmony with the necessary order of things; others, the will of God, as revealed in Revelation or nature; others, utility, happiness, or the general good of mankind. This question leads into speculative philosophy, which we shall not here enter. It is enough now to observe that, whatever men's opinions touching the ground of right, they all deem those things right which are thought best for men, and consider that morality which will bring them most happiness.

They all deem those things right which are "thought" best for them. Thought by whom? Who is to do the thinking? Men themselves of course. Well then, if they themselves are to do the thinking, and by that decide what is best for men, then it follows that whatever men think best for themselves, that is right. This is, in fact, the statement of the book. The very next paragraph after the one just quoted, begins with these words:

Accordingly when people are asked to do right, they are asked to do simply what is best for themselves.

Now it is a fact that multitudes of men often do what they know to be wrong simply because they do think it best for them-

selves. Yet, according to this system, whatever men may think best for themselves, that is right, and there is an end of it. In other words, that which a person knows to be wrong, becomes right if only he thinks it best for himself. And that is to be considered the ground of morality or right! But it is written:

Proverbs 14

¹² There is a way that seems right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.

This latter quotation from his book suggests another thought; it says,

When people are asked to do right...

This suggests that some people are not doing right, and that they are to be asked by others to do right. But the rule has been already established that men do right when they do that which they think to be best for themselves.

Now when it is suggested that anyone shall be asked to do right, it is thereby argued that somebody else has taken it upon himself to think and decide what is best for the other man; and to decide for the other man what is right. Thus one man's views of right are allowed to be the standard of action for another man, when that other has just as much right to think for himself as has anybody else on earth.

In such a system of morality as this propounded by Mr. Bierbower, there is no morality at all. It is either selfishness on one hand, or man-worship on the other, and in either case is only naturalism.

The truth of the matter is that, as respects real virtue and right, this whole book is but a series of platitudes. As regards virtue, it simply mentions as that which ought to be done, what everybody already knows ought to be done. Every person knows that he ought to be kind, cheerful, honest, truthful, deferential, and all the other things in the catalog. The difficulty is not that men do not know that they ought to do these things: the difficulty is to do

that which they know they ought to do, and which they know to be right.

Having noticed the “reasons” which Mr. Bierbower gives as to why these things ought to be done; and the reason why it is right to do them; it is of interest next to inquire the means by which he proposes that they may be done.

That men do not always do what they ought to do, is admitted by the book. For instance, one of the virtues inculcated is “thinking kindly of others,” yet, it is admitted that some do think badly of others. Thus says the book:

If we think badly of others, it is more the result of a bad heart than of a good judgment.

“Family love” is one of the virtues inculcated, yet it is admitted that in some families love is not manifested. Thus says the book:

If one does not think highly of his parents, it is not because they are unworthy, but because he is....One who does not love his parents cannot well take on any virtue.

Another virtue inculcated, is love for all mankind; yet, it is admitted that this is not manifested by all. Yet another virtue inculcated is kindness, which it is likewise admitted, is not always shown by all. Thus we might go through all the book, naming the virtues and finding the constant admission that those virtues are not always manifested by all. These which we have named, however, are sufficient to show that such a condition of things among mankind, is clearly recognized in this proposed system of morality.

Now, what help does the book give, or what source of help does it suggest, to enable men to do the good which is required? When it is admitted that to think badly of men is evidence of a bad heart rather than a good judgment, what remedy is proposed for the bad heart? Here it is:

We should make it a habit of judgment to think well of everybody until we learn the contrary.

Can a bad heart be made good by “a habit of judgment”? More than this, where is the habit of judgment to come from? As he thinks in his heart, so is he. Then, as to think badly of another is more the result of a bad heart, than of a good judgment, this is to say the judgment is bad also. In other words, the bad judgment is the result of the bad heart.

Then if the heart is bad, how can it possibly be that the judgment may form a habit to think well? This is to say that the heart can reform itself, that the bad heart can make itself good.

Jeremiah 13

²³ Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?

Then may you also do good, that are accustomed to do evil.

But the Ethiopian cannot change his skin, neither the leopard his spots. The heart being bad, it never can make itself good, nor can it ever create a habit of judgment that will think well of everybody.

Yet, we are reminded that the book does not say without qualification that the habit must be to think well of everybody. You are only to think well of everybody “until you learn the contrary.” Then, we suppose this system of morality and virtue would allow it to be virtuous to think ill of men. But “charity,” and that is morality, “thinks no evil,” at any time.

Again, the book says, that if one does not think highly of his parents, it is because “he is unworthy,” and such a one cannot well take on any virtue. In this case, therefore, the key of the whole situation lies in that unworthiness being turned into worthiness. Lack of love for his parents is evidence of a fault in himself, and until this fault is remedied, he cannot well take on any virtue. How, then, shall the fault be remedied? Well, only nine pages before this statement, under the heading of “Love for all,” are these words:

Nobody can be unkind to one whom he well knows....It is our duty, therefore, to know men well enough to love them.

But if a man does not know his parents, who in the world can he know? And if he does not know them well enough to love them, how can he ever find anybody whom he can know well enough to love? Especially when the reason that he does not love his parents is not in them but in himself. The lack of love for his parents is admitted not to be in his lack of knowledge of them, but in his own unworthiness.

This brings us to the same point as before, that the fault is not primarily in the judgment, nor in outward circumstances but in the heart. And if the condition of the heart is such that he does not love the very ones whom he knows best and to whom he owes the most of all on earth, then how is that heart to be brought to a condition in which it will love anybody?

The book says that it shall be “by thinking of them more and understanding them better.” But his heart is already impure, unloving, and bad; how, then, can thoughts of love come from it? The Ethiopian cannot change his skin. The heart cannot change itself. If love is not in the heart, it cannot appear in the thoughts, nor in the life.

Again, when an individual does not find kindness manifesting itself in his conduct toward others how shall this lack be remedied? This book says it is...

...the object of ethics to engender this kindly feeling as the most general guarantee of morality.

How then is it proposed that this system of ethics shall engender kindly feeling? Here is the “how”:

This may be done by concentrating the will unswervingly upon it and keeping the resolution to be continually kind.

Yes, that is quite a nice prescription if it was worth anything; but everybody knows by a lifelong experience, that it is utterly

worthless. Every person knows for himself that he has attempted many a time to concentrate his will unswervingly upon such things as that, and he knows that his will has swerved many a time.

Everybody knows that he has made resolutions of this sort an infinite number of times—New Year’s days, birthdays, and many other anniversaries—and he knows that the difficulty is not in making the resolutions, but in keeping them.

It is written, and it is the living experience of every man on earth, that:

Romans 7

¹⁵ That which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.

¹⁶ If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good.

¹⁷ Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwells in me.

¹⁸ For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh), dwells no good thing; for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.

¹⁹ For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that do I.

²¹ I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.

There is over every man a law which prevents him from doing the good that he knows, and that he wills to do—a law which causes evil to appear in the very best efforts of men to do strictly and continually what is right. That law is as fixed as the law of the seasons or of gravitation: and it will hold every man in the bondage of an everlasting and wretched captivity unless he will be delivered by Him who is above that law, that is by Jesus Christ.

Jesus Christ has power and grace to deliver men from this law of sin and death, and to clothe them with the power to do the good, not only which they already know, but all additional good that may be made known by the Spirit of God.

Professed philosophers, eminent teachers, and would-be saviours, in large numbers, have set forth systems of morality and rules of life; but they not only failed to bestow the power to perform, but they themselves failed to perform the duties which they enjoined.

The excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, the Lord, is in that He not only set forth the grandest system of right known to the universe, but He imparts the power to perform it. Therefore no man need ever be ashamed of...

Romans 1

¹⁶ ...the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God, unto salvation to every one that believes.

And the power of God, working in him who is of faith, enables him...

Philippians 2

¹³ ...both to will and to do of God's good pleasure.

Without this power no man can ever do the good that he knows. Not to do the good that he knows is immorality. To tell him that he ought to do the good that he already knows, without telling of the power by which alone he can do it, does not help him a particle.

To tell him of the power by which alone he can do it, is to point him to Jesus Christ. To point him to Christ, to obtain this power, is to inculcate faith in Christ, because the power is manifested only to those who believe in Him. This is to teach distinctively a religious and even a sectarian doctrine.

Therefore the culmination of the logic of the whole matter is that upon which *The Sentinel* has always insisted, that aside from a living faith in Jesus Christ, there is no morality in this world; and that, as the State cannot teach faith in Christ, by which alone morality can be attained, the State cannot teach morality.

This work was committed by Christ to the Church. To the Church, and not to the State, He said,

Matthew 28

¹⁹ Go...and teach all Nations...

²⁰ ...whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you.

Upon the Church, not upon the State, He bestowed the gift of the Spirit of God, by which is manifested the power of God to men, enabling them to will and to do the good which every one may know. Instruction in morality, therefore, can be given only by the Church of Christ through the power of God.

If the professed church of Christ has lost the power and Spirit of God, that is her fault. But when this loss is discovered, let not the State, either by the professed church, or by any other consideration, suffer itself to be drawn into any attempt to do the work of the Church, and supply her lack.

Let the civil Government keep its place, and attend to that which is civil. Let the State inculcate the principle of civil rights, not moral right. This the State can always do with profit. But the State can never touch the ground of moral right, without obtruding its clumsy form into the realm of faith and conscience, and working only irreparable wrong.

We have yet another article to present upon the system of ethics propounded in this book; therefore we shall close this one with the single observation that the grounds of morality or right presented by Mr. Bierbower—are only sinking sand, and will swallow up in both civil and moral perdition, all who put their trust in them.

11. What Is the Guide to Morality?

American Sentinel, April 2, 1891

AT THE END of his discussion of the subject of “Ethics for Schools,” Mr. Bierbower comes to “conscientiousness.” In fact this point is touched upon in the very beginning of the introduction of the book, so that the beginning and the end, the first and the last, deals with the question of conscience. In stating “the ground of right,” the second paragraph in the book says:

We recognize right by our judgment of what is best, and by a feeling—conscience—which indicates, as the result of many impressions, what we ought to do, and impels us thereto.

And the last chapter of the book begins with the following paragraph:

The most general rule of morality is to do what you believe believe right and good, and to preserve the perpetual consciousness of this by instantly performing your duty, when seen. Goodness is simple when thus reduced to one rule. For you have but to look at your conscience to see your duty, conscience being the sense of what we ought to do, which results from all our thought and information on the subject. (Page 283)

This ground of right is just as treacherous as that which was discovered in the previous article on this subject; in fact, it is the same thing only stated in other words; yet as it enters the realm of conscience it touches the real ground of supreme right, and ultimate good. If conscience were a true guide, then this rule would be good enough; but conscience is not a true guide. Conscience as a guide is as erratic as any other faculty in man. The truth is that conscience itself must be guided. This is admitted by the book now under notice. One statement to this effect is as follows:

It is important then in taking conscience as a guide, to have it in working order. (Page 284)

Yes, we should naturally suppose so. Any kind of an instrument that is not in working order is not of much use; and especially in questions of conscience and of ultimate right. And in this case even to think of taking as a guide an instrument that could ever by any possibility get out of working order, seems a most singular suggestion. Another statement to the same purpose is as follows:

We cannot do right today on yesterday's wrongs; so that men should often straighten out their conscience to get its legitimate indications. (Page 284)

And again:

Inspect your conscience as well as your observance of it, or, rather, look after your views of right as well as your conformity thereto. (Page 290)

Of what use is a rule of right which goes so much awry and becomes so easily kinked that it needs "often" to be straightened out? And, of what use is a guide that has to be held up for inspection every little while? Again we read:

Though conscience may err, it is the best judgment we have—the pointing of the compass after all the conflicting forces which would diversely impel us, and so coming of our knowledge to a head in the will. (Page 283)

With how much certainty can a compass be depended upon which not only may, but confessedly does, often point the wrong way? What insurance company or ship-owner would send a ship to sea with such a compass as that? What captain or sailor would think of starting to sea with such a compass? The strangest part of this whole system of ethics, is that conscience would be recommended as a guide, when it is stated repeatedly not only that it may err, but that it does err, often.

There is another question which arises here. How is conscience to be inspected? Who is to conduct the inspection? Who shall straighten it out? By what standard shall it be compared when it

is straightened, to know whether it is straight or not? As to who shall do this, the directions are plain enough. Inspect your own conscience:

Men should often straighten out their conscience.

That is, each individual is to be the judge of his own conscience, as to whether it is in working order, or as to whether it is straight or not. This being so, then who is really to guide the individual, or the conscience of the individual? Clearly the individual; but this directly reverses the order of the book.

The proposition of the book, is that conscience is the guide to right, and the indicator of what we ought to do. And when the one who is to be guided must needs inspect and straighten out, and put in working order, that which is to guide him; then the one who is to be guided becomes in fact the guide. In other words the one who is guided, must guide his guide.

This brings us once more round the circle to the starting point, that whatever each individual thinks to be right, in his own case, that is right.

As to the standard with which the conscience is to be compared when straightened, to know whether it is straight or not; to know whether it is in working order; and to know whether it fitly passes inspection,—this is the same as that discovered in our examination of the grounds of right, namely, whatever each one thinks best for himself. So says the book, as follows:

Nothing is duty which cannot be clearly done. Duty being that course which, in view of all the circumstances, is best....Duty is indicated by the preponderance of interests, which when learned makes conscience clear. It is sometimes difficult, indeed, to learn this and so to determine duty, so that the knowledge of right is not always without effort. We must work hard to know our duty, as well as to do it, which labor then becomes part of our duty. But when we once decide what is best, conscience takes it up.
(Page 292)

Thus it appears that the individual by “working hard” must discover where the preponderance of interest lies, in order to find out what is best, and so determine duty and attain to the knowledge of right. And this “makes conscience clear”!

Without this effort of the individual, conscience is cloudy, it is not in working order, it will not pass inspection. But when all this is done, so that the individual knows just what is right, then conscience becomes clear. Conscience takes it up and says,

“Very good, I agree to that.”

But in such a system, conscience is not only not a guide, it is not even a helper; for all the work must be done and the knowledge of right attained, before conscience is clear, and before conscience takes it up.

Then, according to this system, of what earthly use is conscience? None whatever. In fact, this statement demonstrates that in this system of ethics, conscience really has no intelligent place at all. It is virtually destroyed. And again we are brought round the circle to the original starting point, that whatever each individual may think best for himself, that is right, and ending in supreme selfishness.

By the evidences already given, it will be seen that in the final analysis, this system of ethics comes dangerously near to the fatalistic doctrine that:

Whatever is, is right.

This would be bad enough if it stopped with going dangerously near, but it does not stop there, it goes all the way, as logically every system of morals without religion must do; and here is the evidence:

Though conscience may err, it is the best judgment we have—the pointing of the compass after all the conflicting forces which would diversely impel us, and so the coming of our knowledge to a head in the will. If we go wrong by following it, then wrong is

inevitable and any other course would still more likely be wrong. If the result is not good, it is the best we can have. For, going by conscience, we simply go on our best information. (Page 283)

This is in very substance the doctrine that:

Whatever is, is right.

It is fatalism, and fatalism only. In fact it cannot be anything else, proceeding upon the theory which it does. It proposes to leave religion out of the question and to teach morality without religion. But when man is separated from religion, he is left wholly to himself; himself is his only resource, and in searching for the supreme right and ultimate good, he starts for himself and whatever course he follows, he is inevitably brought back to himself.

This is precisely what this book has done three times. And when men do this, over and over again, groping round and round in the narrow circle of self and finding only “apples of Sodom” at the end of every circle, they are driven to the precise point to which, by this system of ethics, they are driven, that is, to the despairing sink of fatalism.

Another name for it is paganism, for it is the identical conclusion to which paganism came in its supremest day. Compare with the foregoing the following from Marcus Aurelius:

What then is that about which we ought to employ our serious pains? This one thing, thoughts just, and acts social, and words that never lie, and a disposition which gladly accepts all that happens, as necessary, as usual as flowing from the principle and source of the same kind. Willingly give yourself up to Clotho [one of the Fates], allowing her to spin your thread into whatever things she pleases.

The final conclusion of Mr. Bierbower’s proposed system of ethics for society and schools in the United States, in this nineteenth century, is identical with that of the pagan, Marcus Aurelius, in the second century. And this open and sheer paganism, it

is seriously proposed, shall be taught to the children and practiced by society in the United States!

And Mr. Bierbower actually seems to have so much confidence in his proposed system, that he thinks that:

Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and unbelievers may use this book with equal approval.

For our part we should like very much to see a single Catholic, or Protestant, or Jew, or unbeliever who, having examined the book, would use it with any manner of approval whatever.

Again, we say that which is so often admitted by this book: conscience itself must needs have a guide. And faith is the guide and the only guide of conscience. Whatever a man believes to be right, to that his conscience will freely assent. Therefore a right faith is essential to a good conscience. Now the only right faith in this world, is the faith of Jesus Christ. Without faith in Jesus Christ, there can be no right conscience; without a right conscience there can be no genuine morality.

This is the logic of the question and it never can be escaped; and it only demonstrates once more by proofs that cannot be refuted, the position which *The Sentinel* has always occupied: that morality without religion is a misnomer. And more than this, that morality without the religion of Jesus Christ, is a misnomer.

Jesus Christ is the author of the right faith through which He leads men to the right morality. The teaching of this faith, by which alone right morality can be attained, He committed to the Church. The Church He endowed with the Spirit of God by which the teaching may be performed with power. If the Church or the family does not teach it, it never can be taught. The teaching of it was never committed to the State; the power by which alone it can be inculcated has never been bestowed upon the State.

Therefore as genuine morality can come only from a right conscience, and a right conscience can come only from a right faith, and a right faith can come only by Jesus Christ, it is demonstrated

that there is no genuine morality outside of a genuine faith in Jesus Christ.

And as the State cannot teach faith in Jesus Christ, as the State cannot teach the religion of Jesus Christ, the position of *The Sentinel* is impregnable, that the State cannot teach morality.

- Civility is the realm, and the conservation of it the prerogative, of the State.
- Morality is the realm, and the conservation of it the prerogative, of God.

Matthew 22

²¹ Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and unto God the things which are God's.

12. True Morality

American Sentinel, May 21, 1891

Original title: Questions and Answers—True Morality

WE HAVE received from a friend in Illinois, a series of questions called out seemingly by our discussion of Mr. Bierbower's book on *Ethics for Society and Schools*, with the request that the questions be answered in *The Sentinel* for the benefit of the writer and others. We willingly comply:

Question 1. Tell us, please, is true morality based on the ten commandments? And if so on what was it based prior to the delivery of the law on Sinai?

Answer: True morality is based on the ten commandments. Yet more properly speaking the ten commandments are the expression of the supreme moral rule. They are the summary of morality itself, because they are the expression of the will of God. For says Romans 2:18,

Romans 2

¹⁸ ...[You] know His will,...being instructed out of the law.

And the law there referred to, as the context plainly shows, is the law which teaches that men should not steal, nor commit adultery, nor idolatry. Men delight to do the will of God only when His law is written in their hearts.

Psalms 40

⁸ I delight to do your will, O my God: yea, your law is within my heart.

These texts, with many others which might be cited, show plainly that the law of God, the ten commandments, is the expression of the will of God in respect to character, and God's will is supreme morality, because it is the expression of the will of Him who is supremely moral.

True morality was based upon the ten commandments before the delivery of the law on Sinai as well as afterward, because the ten commandments existed before Sinai as really as afterward. Abraham knew the will of God, and kept the commandments.

Genesis 26

⁵ Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.

Sin is the transgression of the law of God, and by the law also is the knowledge of sin.

1 John 3

⁴ Whosoever commits sin transgresses also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.

Romans 3

²⁰ Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.

Sin is not imputed where there is no law, for where no law is, there is no transgression.

Romans 5

¹³ For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

Romans 4

¹⁵ Because the law works wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression.

The law of God, therefore, was known to man before he sinned, and his sin was the transgression of that law.

1 John 5

¹⁷ All unrighteousness is sin,

—and as sin is the transgression of the law of God, it follows that that law is the expression of the righteousness of God, that is, it is the expression of the supreme idea of right. Accordingly, it is written,

Psalm 119

¹⁷² My tongue shall speak of your words for all your commandments are righteousness.

And,

Isaiah 51

⁷ Hearken unto me you that know righteousness; the people in whose heart is my law.

Therefore, as the law of God,—the ten commandments,—is the expression of the will of God, in respect to character, and is the expression of the supreme idea of right doing, it stands demonstrated that the ten commandments are the basis and the expression of all true morality or ethics.

The delivery of the law at Sinai, therefore, was not by any means the beginning of the existence of that law. It was there given upon the tables of stone to perform its part in the work of the gospel which was shadowed forth in the sanctuary and its services. For the tables of stone were placed in the Ark of the Covenant beneath the mercy seat in the most holy place; into which the high priest, as the representative of Christ in His priesthood, went alone once a year in the great day of atonement to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. Thus,

Romans 5

²⁰ The law entered that the offense might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:

²¹ That as sin has reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

The law of God, the ten commandments, existed before Sinai as really as afterward, for it is a truth well and eloquently expressed by Gibbon:

The God of nature, has written His existence in all His works and His law in the heart of man.²⁵

²⁵ *Decline and Fall*, chap. 50, p. 14.

Question 2. If the principles of the moral law are implanted by the Creator in every person's heart, does it not follow then that every person has morality within himself?

Answer: It does not follow, because all have sinned, transgressed the law, and come short of the glory of God.²⁶ Morality does not consist in a *knowledge* of the law of God, but in *the doing of it*. He has written His law in the heart of man, but by transgression man has made himself unrighteous. God has planted in the heart of man a knowledge of morality, a knowledge of right, but by transgression man has made himself immoral, and by that also has obscured the knowledge of morality which was at the first planted there, and which would have ever remained had man remained moral.

More than this, by his transgression, by his immorality, man has robbed himself of the power to do fully according to the measure of right which even yet he knows. Every man on earth knows this is so, therefore we say again as we "said in our notice of Mr. Bierbower's book that it is not enough for men in this world to know what is right to do, but they must have the power to do the right which they know. This power comes alone by faith in Jesus Christ for...

Romans 1

¹⁶ ...the Gospel of Christ...is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes.

This whole matter is clearly expressed in:

Romans 3

¹⁹ What things soever the law says, it says to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.

²⁰ Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified [accounted moral] in His sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin [immorality].

²⁶ *Romans 3:23.*

²¹ But now the righteousness [the morality] of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets;

²² Even the righteousness [the morality] of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference:

²³ For all have sinned, [have become immoral] and come short of the glory of God;

²⁴ Being justified [accounted moral] freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus:

²⁵ Whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness [His morality] for the remission of sins [immorality] that are past, through the forbearance of God;

²⁶ To declare, I say, at this time His righteousness: [His morality] that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believes in Jesus.

Therefore we have always said and always do say, that outside of a genuine abiding faith in Jesus Christ, there is no genuine morality, in this world.

Question 3. Did Demosthenes, Aristotle, Socrates, and many other Greek philosophers teach morality? And if not did they teach immorality?

Answer: They taught what they called morality, but they taught and practiced what was really immorality. Solon and Zeno both practiced what was really immorality. The Greek worship of Venus like that of its Babylonian and Roman counterpart was but open prostitution. The celebration of the mysteries, which was the supreme rite of Greek worship, was but the practice of things unfit to be named, and of which the Scripture has well spoken that...

Ephesians 5

¹² It is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.

Plato taught both the expediency and the lawfulness of exposing children to die in particular cases, and Aristotle counseled abortion. Both at Sparta and at Athens the exposure to die, or even the killing of infants, who were weak and imperfect in form, was practiced. Customary swearing was commended by the example of Socrates and Plato. Aristippus maintained that it is lawful for a wise man to steal, to commit adultery, and sacrilege when opportunity offered. Menander taught that a lie is better than a hurtful truth. Plato taught that...

He may lie, who knows how to do it in a suitable time.

And Socrates practiced such lewdness as is not fit to be named.

So far indeed were the Greek philosophers from teaching morality that they both taught and practiced what would not be allowed in the category of common civility in our day. In short, if the Greek philosophers could be set down in the United States today and should attempt to practice here what they both taught and practiced in Greece, and counted it morality too, the whole gang of them would be in the penitentiary inside of a week, and that would be the place for them too. Because *American civilization*, to say nothing at all of morality, would not countenance it for a day.

Question 4 and 6 we omit as they are covered by:

Question 5. If the teaching of what is called morality is destructive to both the public schools and the State, and should therefore be entirely excluded from the teachers' curriculum, is not the right to teach his pupils to be kind, truthful, honest, industrious, pure, etc., by precept and example, taken from every teacher in our public schools?

Answer: Not by any means. On the contrary the way is opened for every teacher to do these very things in the way in which only it is proper to teach them, and according to the design of the

public school. The public school is designed to accomplish two principal things in the youth of the country.

First, to give them such an education as shall fit them, as citizens or members of the body politic, to take care of themselves. It therefore teaches them to read and write and apply the principles of arithmetic.

Second, to be good citizens. It *should* therefore teach the principles of citizenship. And this is but to say that they should be taught the principles of the government of which they are to be citizens. What then are the principles or elements of citizenship? Religion certainly is not one of them. The supreme law of the land declares that...

The Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion.

If religion be an element of citizenship, it is but a logical step to a religious test as a qualification for office. But again, the supreme law declares that...

No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government.

If religion be an element of citizenship, it is only a logical and proper step that the Government should define and regulate it. But still the supreme law declares,

Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Therefore as religion is not in any sense a requisite to citizenship, it can have no place in a course of instruction which is designed to teach the principles and elements of citizenship. And as morality is inseparable from religion, it falls in the same category.

Yet more than this, ethics is the science of right and wrong, but the State does not, and cannot, know any such thing as moral right or wrong, but only civil *rights* and *wrongs*. When a man

steals, the State does not punish him because he sinned, but because he disregarded and invaded the *rights* of his fellow citizen, and did him a civil wrong. Now as the Government of the United States, and as also that of the several States, is founded upon the rights of men, there is an ample field open before all the teachers in the public schools for the teaching of all that pertains to good citizenship under this Government without entering the field of ethics as such, nor touching the question of religion or morality.

The Declaration of Independence, the charter of American institutions and the foundation of the United States Government, plainly declares that...

All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Here is the basis of what ought to be the teaching in all State schools, and the basis is broad enough for everything that is either necessary or proper to be taught in the public schools. It is the inalienable right of every individual in the Government to enjoy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Let all the public school teachers teach to the youth of this Nation, and diligently inculcate upon their minds, respect for the rights of every other person.

This the perfect principle of civil government, and if every person in the United States would recognize this principle and practice accordingly, this would be a perfect civil Government. The recognition of this principle and the intelligent understanding of it, ought to be made; not only the public school instruction upon citizenship, but the qualification for citizenship in the naturalization of all who make application for admission. When a person acts in anything, in such a way as to interfere with the free exercise, by any other person, of his right to life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, then he denies the principle upon which the Government itself rests, and thereby undermines his own civil safety and in effect forfeits his right to it. Because, as rights are equal,

what one has the right to do, another has an equal right to do. If one claims the right to act in such a way as to interfere with the free exercise of another's right to life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, then all have an equal right to do the same thing, and if all should do that, then all government would be gone and only anarchy reign. Therefore, as the Government is established to secure the equal inalienable rights of men no one can invade the rights of another, to any degree, without at once striking at the foundation of the Government itself.

Let these principles be taught to the youth of the country, in the public schools, and there will be much more success in the effort to secure good citizens, than there is in the plans and the teaching now employed. As it is now, these principles are neglected if not ignored, and by an attempt to inculcate what is called morals, neither morality nor good citizenship is, secured. As we have shown in the discussion of Mr. Bierbower's book, which we have since learned is used in the Chicago public schools, such teaching can never secure good citizenship. The basis of it all is selfishness only, and as we showed at the time is essentially pagan. But this is not the only instance. The same system of ethics is inculcated in other schools of the country. In the city of Greenville, Michigan, the youth are taught, just as Bierbower's book teaches, that whatever they think to be right that *is* right, and that when the Hindoo mother throws her child into the river Ganges, she does right. (This case was actually used in illustration in a class in that school.) Such teaching as that is open heathenism, and the more of it that is believed by men, the worse they will be.

Again, how can good citizenship be inculcated better, or in any other way in fact, than by teaching the principles of the government to which the citizen belongs? This is plain enough in itself. Therefore, as the principles of the United States Government are the best on earth, the faithful teaching of these principles will secure the best citizenship. Let the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States be

taught, in the public schools, and let questions and principles of morality and religion be considered and taught in and by the family and the Church.

Question 7. When the teacher punishes a pupil for fighting, lying, swearing, or stealing, does he not employ the most emphatic method of teaching morality?

Answer: Indeed he does not. Morality never can be secured by punishment. The Lord himself cannot make men moral by punishment. To bring men to morality by punishment, is the Augustinian, the inquisitorial, the papal, the purgatorial theory. Augustine's doctrine is that often it is necessary to punish men until they reach the highest stage of religious development. That is the theory and the doctrine of the Inquisition. Therefore it was always from love of men's souls and to save their souls that the Inquisition tormented men's bodies. And as a good many people died in this world before the Inquisition could get hold of them, it was necessary to find a place, and invent a scheme of punishment after they were dead, so that they might reach this highest standard of religious development; in other words that they might attain to morality, and so purgatory, with its remedies for immorality, was established, and is still run as one of the institutions of papal morality. If men could have been made moral by punishment then Christ need never have died.

Our querist is probably correct in his idea that this is the most "*emphatic*" method of teaching morality, but it is certainly not the most efficient method. Nor is it in fact any method at all properly speaking. No, as we have before shown, men have lost morality by the transgression of the law of God, and there is no power in them to attain to it. Consequently, the only power by which they can attain to it, is the power of God which is manifested to men in the gospel of Jesus Christ. Morality is the gift of God through faith in Jesus Christ, and the writing of the law of God anew upon the heart by the Spirit of God which is received by faith Christ, the shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart by the Holy

Ghost, is *the only effectual means of bringing men to morality*, and the only proper method of teaching morality. Punishment is the penalty inflicted in vindication of the majesty of violated law, but punishment neither changes the disposition, nor bestows, power. The love of God does both.

Even if it should be admitted, however, that punishment is an element of moral instruction and a means of inculcating morality, it would still remain a fact that the exercise of it is not the prerogative of man. That would pertain to God alone as being the only one who is capable of truly knowing the measure of moral guilt and the proportion of punishment. Man's assumption of authority to punish for morality, established the Inquisition, and that is the logic of every such claim wherever made.

Question 8. Does not the teacher of necessity teach morality when he gives instruction from our text books on physiology, and hygiene, which includes the dire effect of alcohol on the human system, the necessity of cleanliness; bad effects of tight lacing, etc.?

Answer: He does not. A man may study physiology and hygiene all his school days; he may never touch a drop of alcohol; he may bathe three times a day and put on clean clothes each time; he may never wear a corset; he may do all these things and yet be far from be a moral man. In fact, so far as men are concerned, tight lacing we apprehend is not a very important element in the immorality which attaches to them. Nor is it essential that women shall practice tight lacing in order to be immoral. It is true that if a person has the root and the elements of morality in him, the instruction referred to may be helpful in cultivating it; but if he has it not in him—none of these things nor all of them together, can give it to him, and a teacher is not teaching morality when he gives instruction on these points.

Question 9. Does not the teacher of necessity teach morality when he teaches the principles of justice as connected

with the republican form of Government which is framed on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States?

Answer: He does not. He teaches only civility. Because the principle of justice connected with any government on earth is only such as is comprehended by men; and is therefore only human. And this principle, as connected with the form of government which is framed on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, the teaching of the principle, and the practice of the principle never can get beyond the of civility. It is the principle of justice comprehended by God which is alone divine and which is up to the standard of morality. God's justice is in itself morality; but civil government, which rests upon the natural basis which is conducted only on man's comprehension of the principle of justice, can never get beyond the civil. Therefore civil government is all any earthly government ever can be, sold it should not attempt to be anything else. For in attempting to be more, it always, becomes less.

We know that in many instances men use the term "morality" when they mean just what we mean by the term "civility." When such is the meaning in their use of the term, we agree with all that they say about it; but we never can consent to call it morality. Morality is infinitely a deeper and a broader term than is the term civility. The field of morality is much wider and in fact is essentially distinct from that of civility. Therefore, we always insist upon the distinction which there is between them, and which should always be made and recognized between them.

We know that the term morality has become, to a considerable extent, established in usage in a sense in which it means neither morality nor civility, but a sort of sentimental theoretical something that each theorist may have framed for himself, meaning much more than civility and infinitely less than morality. But such usage is wrong. It comes down to our time from the time when the Papacy was supreme and when accordingly there was

utter confusion of all things pertaining to the Church and to the State, of the civil and the religious; when in short everything was held to be moral, according to the papal idea of morality. And everybody who has looked into the history of those times, knows full well that under the papal dominion and in the papal system there never was any such thing as either morality or civility.

Moral government is God's government. Morality is the realm of God. He is the Author and the conservator of it. Civil government is ordained of God, and its purpose is civil only. For these reasons we constantly insist upon a clear distinction in the terms morality and civility, and in so doing we occupy Protestant ground. The great confession made at Augsburg in 1530 declared as follows:

The civil administration is occupied about other matters, than is the gospel. The magistracy does not defend the souls, but the bodies, and bodily things, against manifest injuries; and coerces men by the sword and corporal punishments, that it may uphold civil justice and peace, wherefore the ecclesiastical and the civil power are not to be confounded. . . . In this way ours distinguish between the duties of each power, one from the other, and admonish all men to honor both powers, and to acknowledge both to be the gifts and blessings of God.

This is Protestant truth. It is Christian truth. It is God's truth. And as we are Protestants and Christians and worshipers of the Most High God, we insist forever upon a distinction between the religious and the secular, the moral and the civil; rendering to Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's.

13. Shall Religion be Taught in the Public Schools?

The Religious Liberty Library, No. 9, May 1893²⁷

OUR system of free public schools is now legally established in all the States, and supported by a strong public sentiment. The public school has myriads of friends, and but few avowed enemies. There is, however, a misconception on the part of some as to what it is, and for what purpose it is maintained. Some regard the public school as semi-religious, originated and maintained for the purpose of teaching, among other things, the doctrines of the Christian religion. Before attempting to show how impossible it would be, in this land of every diversity of creed, from that of the Mussulman to that of the Methodist, to teach a religion in these schools without doing violence to some tax-payer's ideas of the only true faith, let us examine the origin and intent of the public schools.

Origin and Intent of Public Schools

The civil government has created and maintained the public school for self-preservation. Ignorance may prolong the existence of a despotic form of government, but the stability of a republic, where the responsibility of government rests on all alike, depends upon the intelligent action of the mass of the people. Realizing this, each State has made provision for the maintenance of a system of free public schools, by universal taxation,—Protestants Catholics, Jews, and infidels being taxed alike for their support. The public school rests upon the foundation of political necessity. It has in view, not only the happiness and well-being of the individual, but the preservation of the State, and is therefore a purely civil institution maintained for political purposes,—neither in the interest of, nor in opposition to, religion. The public school, as a

²⁷ PP Editor's note: This article is also included in the *Religious Liberty Fragments* collection.

part of our governmental policy, comes under Lincoln's definition of government; it is...

...of the people, by the people, and for the people.

They are neither by, nor for, the Protestant, the Catholic, nor the infidel, as such, but are for the *people*, the whole people, without reference to religion.

It is an undisputed principle in political economy, that the State may appropriate money raised by taxation to purposes which are only of general necessity or of supreme utility, and which can be attained by the State only, or by the State to a degree or in a way very superior to those of private effort. It is on this principle that the State refuses to require the teaching of religion in the public school supported by general taxation. The teaching of religion is not an object to be attained by the State only, neither, can the objects of religion be attained by the State to a degree or in a way superior to those of private effort. All history proves that the State, as a teacher of religion, is a disastrous failure. In placing the common school on a purely civil basis, the State does not, in any way, antagonize religion. It is simply an acknowledgment that the teaching of religion is outside its jurisdiction; that religion is a matter not to be handled by a purely secular government.

The Duty of the State in Public Education

While this view of the public school is regarded by the majority as self-evident, there are some who, because of this attitude of our schools toward religion, declare that they are "godless." This comes from a misconception of the province of civil government, and the mission of the public school. Had God delegated to civil government the teaching of religion, a failure to do it by means of the public school might merit the above criticism. The State, in providing for the teaching of reading, writing, and mathematics, without teaching religion, is simply attending to its legitimate business, which the Church does when it attends to the teaching of religion. The term "godless" cannot be applied with any more

consistency to the common school because the Bible is not read and religion is not taught in it, than it can be to schools of phonography, telegraphy, or art, because the Bible is not taught in them, or than the term *traitor* can be applied to the Church, because it does not teach the principles of civil government, civil engineering, and military tactics.

The Difficulties of Teaching Religion in Public Schools

The fact that the State is wholly unqualified both in point of origin and object, to teach religion, should forever settle the question of religion in the public schools. But besides being wrong in theory, the teaching of religion in the public school is impossible of practice owing to the wide diversity of opinion on the subject of religion which prevails among the patrons of the public school.

While it is true that many of the people here are outwardly favorable to religion, there are some who neither practice nor favor it. These certainly would not wish their children to be taught religion in the public schools. As tax-payers and supporters of these institutions, they have a right, equal with that of all others, to the benefits of such schools; and to ignore this right is an injustice of which no good government will be guilty.

If we limit the question to those who believe in religion, the difficulty is not obviated; for the question then arises, "What religion is to be taught?" Among the numerous phases of belief which the theology of the day includes, how shall it be determined which is the proper one to be promulgated by law? The State should not favor one religion above another, and certainly could not do so without meeting the united protest of a large number of her citizens.

It may, however, be said that the design is not to teach in the public schools the peculiar tenets of any denomination or sect, but only the general principles of religious belief which all sects hold in common. Thus Senator Blair, introduced in the Fifty-first Congress a religious amendment to the Constitution which proposed to have taught in the common schools, of every State,

...the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity.

But even this apparently liberal measure would discriminate against the Jews and other denominations which are not Christian, leaving them no alternative but that of joining the ranks of its opposers.

If we confine the question wholly to Christian denominations, the difficulties of the undertaking remain as pronounced as ever; for when we come to consider these "fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity," we find in the first place that Christendom has not yet defined what the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity are. To determine these, therefore, would be the first thing necessary; and this would require the united action of all Christian denominations, through their representatives. But so widely do the denominational lines of Christendom diverge, that any agreement of view, even upon fundamental principles, is impossible. How, for example, would Protestants and Catholics be able to agree upon the fundamental principles of Christianity, when they are in dispute over the very source from which these principles are drawn? Catholics regard the Protestant Bible as a sectarian book, and *vice-versa*.

The ten commandments, constituting the foundation of all Christian morality, cannot be overlooked in considering the fundamental principles of Christianity; yet the difference between Protestants and Catholics with respect to the decalogue is irreconcilable. Nor is the difficulty lessened if we confine ourselves to Protestants alone, for the abolition of the precepts of this law is a doctrine boldly advocated by some Protestant sects, and as earnestly opposed by others. The truth is, there is not a single fundamental principle of Christian theology upon which all denominations are agreed. It must be evident, therefore, that the proceedings of any general council called for the purpose of defining the non-sectarian and fundamental principles of Christianity, would be anything but harmonious.

The result of attempting to force upon all classes of a community, through the medium of the public schools, the acceptance of certain doctrines as constituting the principles of the Christian religion, could not but be evil in the extreme, both to the public schools themselves and to all whose interests they concern. Discord and sectarian strife, from which people are never too free, would be given an uncontrollable impulse. It might indeed happen that in some communities, where exceptional conditions prevailed, the attempt would meet with no serious opposition; but in many, if not in the large majority, it would be certain to call forth demonstrations of human prejudice and passion. Divisions would arise in the schools where the beliefs and preferences of parents would be echoed in their children, resulting in the formation of caste, and unavoidable disputes and animosities. When religious teaching is once given a place in the public school curriculum, the door is open for the introduction of all manner of sectarianism, as the theological bias of teachers or school directors may determine.

Proper Relationship of Religion and State

But above all other considerations in the settlement of this question, is that of the proper relation of religion and the State; and this relation, if it can be called such, is one of total separation. The teaching of religion in the public schools would be a violation of this principle, the validity of which is recognized by the American Constitution, and established on the highest authority, both human and divine. The attempt, if successful, would result in the establishment of a State religion; for if religious instruction is to be given in the public schools, it is evident that public school teachers will have to be qualified for this work, in addition to the ordinary requirements of their position. There would be demanded of them a profession of religion, and a knowledge of what constitute the fundamental principles of Christianity,—a demand which would be in violation of that well-known principle of our government, that...

No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States,

—and a standing bid for unconverted teachers making a profession of religion without in reality espousing it, which, in other words, means hypocrisy. Christianity, as interpreted and defined by certain leading ecclesiastics, would be the established religion of this country. It matters not that no one sect or denomination would be recognized and supported by the State. There would be a union of religion with the civil power,—a union which differs only in name from a union of Church and State.

The unparalleled success achieved by our system of free public schools, is due in great part to their freedom from that disturbing element, religious controversy. Had our public schools taught a system of religion which antagonized the beliefs of the Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Universalists, Unitarians, Jews, or infidels, they would not have been supported and patronized as they are today. When the course of study in the public schools is confined to secular instruction, and the teaching of religion is left to the parent, the denominational school, and the Church, all classes can patronize them. But let religion be taught in them, and all whose views of religion are antagonized, are compelled, in self-defense, to withdraw their children from the schools which they are taxed to maintain.

In brief, the injustice of such a step, the confusion and sectarian strife which it would be certain to create, the incalculable injury to the public schools, and all the evils which naturally result from a union of Church and State, return an overwhelming negative to the question propounded by this leaflet.

General Grant spoke wisely when in a speech at Des Moines, Iowa, in September, 1875, he said:

Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the Church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contribution.
Keep the State and Church forever separate.

Dr. Tiffany, pastor of the Hennepin avenue M. E. church, of Minneapolis, also reasoned well, when, in an address at the Rochester (Minn.) High School commencement exercises, he said:

Church and State must not be united. As Americans, we deny the right of any religious or other combination to have authority in civil matters. We recognize religion as a necessity, and the Church as a form of it, but we look with suspicion upon any interference it may attempt in government...Home shall teach youth obedience, the churches religion, but the schools shall give knowledge. The State must not teach religion, for that would give it authority to decide what religion to teach. The State must educate the children to make them intelligent, not saints.²⁸

The family, the Church, and the denominational school afford a proper and ample field for the religious education of the youth. The attempt to force such instruction into the public schools is not only dangerous, but altogether needless. It is one which should awaken the vigilance, and call forth the united opposition of all true American citizens.

The Bible in the Public Schools

There are some who, while accepting, in a general way the foregoing view of the question of religion in the public schools, nevertheless, insist on a compulsory reading of a portion of the Bible as an opening exercise in the public schools. To them the Bible means only the Protestant, or *King James version*, and in urging that it be read in the common schools, they do not recognize the fact that the Catholic has a different Bible, which he regards as the only faithful translation of the Scriptures; or that the Jew accepts of the Old Testament only, regarding the New not only as false, but as cruelly charging his ancestors with the murder of the world's Messiah.

The difference between these Bibles is considered by each party as vital to the eternal welfare of the believer. Says the Protestant Bible,

²⁸ *Rochester (Minn.) Post*, July 13, 1890.

Luke 13

³ Except you *repent*, you shall all likewise perish.

Says the Catholic Bible,

“Unless you shall *do penance*, you shall all likewise perish.”

This is not an accidental difference in translation, but is a difference maintained throughout the entire Catholic Bible, based on the distinctive Catholic doctrine of penance, in opposition to the Protestant doctrine of salvation through faith, as the following quotation from the *Doctrinal Catechism* proves:

He [Luther] invented a thing which he called justifying faith, to be a sufficient substitute for all the above painful religious works, an invention which took off every responsibility from our shoulders, and laid all on the shoulders of Jesus Christ; in a word, he told men to believe in the merits of Christ as *certainly applied to them*, and live as they pleased.²⁹

There are other important differences which appear in the text, and would be made apparent by the mere reading of the passages.

The difference between the Protestant and Catholic Bibles, and the Jewish Bible, is far greater, as the Jew rejects the entire New Testament as not only a base fabrication, but as containing an unjust charge against his people.

The infidel rejects the whole, and finds his views of religion met in the writings of Rousseau, Paine, or Ingersoll.

Which of these Bibles shall be read in our common schools? To this question comes a chorus of opposing answers. Who shall decide? Is it the prerogative of the State to decide which of these Bibles contains the truth, and which error? If we so decide, we adopt the theory which gave to the Dark Ages their moral gloom.

²⁹ *Doctrinal Catechism*, p. 37.

Leaving the difference in Bibles, there is another important difference with regard to the propriety of reading any Bible without comment. The Protestant position is that...

The Bible without note or comment is the infallible rule of faith and practice.

The Catholic regards this as a dangerous doctrine, fraught with eternal ruin to the child; and to say that he is not sincere, is to sit in judgment on his conscience. And the conscience of the Catholic is as sacred in the eyes of the law as the conscience of the Protestant.

In studying this subject, we should not allow our preconceived ideas or time-honored practices to prejudice us. The time was, when men as conscientiously believed that the government should protect religion by burning heretics, as do some today that the Bible should be read in the public schools. One way of bringing this question squarely before us is to reverse the condition by placing the Catholic, the Jew, or the infidel in the majority. Would the Protestant, who believes that salvation comes alone through faith, be willing that his child be taught from the reading of the Douay Bible, that to obtain it, he must do penance? If infidels were in the majority, would the minority, Protestant and Catholic, be willing to have the exercises of the day prefaced by the reading of extracts from Thomas Paine, Robert Ingersoll, or some other exponent of infidelity? Here it is that the Golden Rule has a practical application:

Matthew 7

¹² Whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them.

Referring to the use of the Bible in the public schools, the New York *Independent*, of Oct. 1, 1891 says:

There is no question that this is making public schools sectarian, and that it is unjust and contrary to the principles of our government, which allow of no establishment of religion. The

only consistent and the only truly Christian way, is to give religion to the care of the Church and let the State take care of secular matters.

Declaration of Principles

- We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.
- We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.
- We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.
- We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.
- We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.
- We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

14. The Science of Salvation

1897 General Conference Bulletin
Friday Evening, February 12 & 14, 1897

Introduction

GCDB, February 12, 1897

EVERYBODY knows that this is a very scientific age, at least in name, in profession, and in aspiration. God wants His people always to be up with the age. More than that: He wants His people always to be ahead of the age. Particularly He wants His people always to be reformers, and for a person to be a reformer, he must be ahead of the age. Then as this is a particularly scientific age, in profession and otherwise, God's cause, His people, must be scientific to meet the demands of the age. That is the statement of the proposition to the study of which I invite you tonight. The Lord wants you and me to accept that proposition, to study it, and to build upon it, until it is demonstrated in us before the world that that proposition is scientifically correct. If you and I, if all who profess the name of Christ, do that, then that thing will be done by the Lord. The world will see it, and the world will see it whether you and I have part in it or not. Because if you and I do not have a part in it, those will have a part in it who will allow the Lord to make that demonstration by them; and if you and I will not allow Him to do it, we miss it.

“But,” you say, “salvation is the work of God's people.”

Salvation is the one cause of the Lord. This is what these other brethren have been saying. This is what we had in the lesson this afternoon, and what we have had in all the lessons in *Hebrews*. It is the lesson we have had in other places in the Scripture. And the Scripture says that we are not to know anything but...

1 Corinthians 2

² ...Jesus Christ, and Him crucified.

You say that; yes, and I say that. I say that the work of the people of God—all that the cause of God is in the world is the work of

salvation. And this exactly agrees with what we have stated already. Therefore salvation is science.

More than that: Salvation is not simply science, it is not simply a science; it is the chief, the key, the center of all sciences. It is the most scientific of all things that are dealt with by the minds of men in this world. So that when God's people take the salvation of God *as it is in God*; when His cause of salvation in the world shall stand as representing indeed His ideas of salvation, then there will be revealed to the world the science that is above all other sciences. Then God's people can stand before the very kings of science, and not be ashamed, in a scientific age.

Now, I am thoroughly committed to that truth. And I want you to see how completely it is the truth. You and I are committed to the salvation of God. And I want you to see by the Bible—the book of all truth—that salvation is science. Then you will, with me, be committed to that truth.

First, then, I want you to think soberly, and see for yourself not only that salvation is science; but that it is the highest of all sciences.

The word “science” means, literally, *knowledge*. The science of botany is the knowledge of botany. The science of astronomy is the knowledge of astronomy. So that one scientist has defined science to be “the product of thinking.” All the knowledge—the science—that the world has of astronomy, is the product of the world's thinking on the subject of astronomy.

God's Thinking

Now salvation is the knowledge of God:

John 17

³ This is life eternal, that they might know You the living and true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent.

It is therefore science. But this knowledge is not the product of *man's* thinking; it is the product of *God's* thinking. For...

1 Corinthians 2

⁹ Eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither has entered into the heart of man, the things which God has prepared for them that love Him.

¹⁰ But God has revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God.

Therefore salvation, being the product of God's thinking, is not only science, but is the highest of all sciences.

Again: That which is recognized by the world as science—the natural sciences—is the product of men's thinking. It is with the mind that men think. It is with the mind, then, that men deal with all these sciences. But salvation deals with the mind *itself*. Which, then, is the higher? Which is the higher—that which deals with all other things, or *that which deals with* that which deals with all other things? The latter, to be sure. Then as with the mind men deal with all other sciences, and salvation deals with the mind itself, it is perfectly plain, not only that salvation is science as certainly as any other science, but that it is higher science than all other sciences. It is the highest science that can be known to the mind of man.

Yet again: Salvation deals with the mind. But who is it that in salvation and by salvation deals with the mind? It is God himself. Then as it is God himself who works out, who makes known, this science; and as this science is the product of God's thinking; it follows that the science of salvation is the highest, the deepest, the broadest, science that is known, not only to the mind of man, but to the whole universe.

Let us read a few Scriptures.

Romans 12

² Be not conformed to this world: but be transformed by the renewing of your mind.

Romans 7

²⁵ So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God.

1 John 5

²⁰ We know that the Son of God is come, and has given us a mind.

1 Corinthians 2

¹⁶ We have the mind of Christ.

The only way the Lord can reach us is through the mind. He deals with us only through the mind. He governs us only through our minds. Look:

Romans 7

²⁵ With the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.

And the first of all the commandments is this:

Deuteronomy 6

⁴ Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord:

⁵ And you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with *all your mind*.

Romans 8

⁷ The carnal mind enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

The carnal mind that cannot be subject to the law of God—cannot be—must be changed, must be exchanged for another mind which always serves the law of God. That change of mind is salvation. That renewing of the mind is wrought by God in the work of his salvation, and it can be wrought by no other. Therefore it is the highest of all sciences—the highest that is known to the mind of man, the highest that is known to the universe.

Do you not begin to see why it is that the *Testimonies* speak of “*the science of salvation*”?

“Every branch of knowledge may be found by searching the word of God. And above all else it contains the science of all sciences, *the science of salvation*.”³⁰

³⁰ Ellen White, *Christ’s Object Lessons*, p. 107.

“Christ crucified for our sins, Christ risen from the dead, Christ ascended on high, is *the science of salvation* that we are to learn and to teach.”³¹

High Authority

Now I want you to see that others think so too. I want you to see that I am not alone in this. I want you to see that for this position we have authority—scientific authority—that is, the authority of persons who understand science.

If I could bring to you tonight evidence that those who understand all other sciences the best of anybody in this world, testify that they are more interested in this science than in all the other sciences put together, that they see more in it worthy of their consideration than in all the other sciences put together, would you not say then that I am safe in talking as I do—from a scientific standpoint? Well, I have just such a company—a company that understands all other sciences, and I have the evidence truly stated that they are more interested in this than in all the others put together.

In *1 Peter* the apostle is speaking of salvation, and there I read as follows:

1 Peter 1

¹⁰ Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you:

¹¹ Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.

¹² Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; *which things the ANGELS DESIRE TO LOOK INTO.*

³¹Ellen White, *Testimonies for the Church*, vol. 8, p. 287

What things do the angels desire to look into? The salvation of God when it is preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. The Greek word for “desire,” here means,

...to set one’s heart upon.

And the Greek word for “look into” means,

...to stoop to a thing in order to look at it; to look at with head bowed forwards; to look into with the body bent; to look carefully into, to inspect curiously—of one who would become acquainted with something.

Such is the attitude of the angels toward the subject of salvation.

Now, do the angels understand other sciences—biology, geology, ichthyology, astronomy—all other sciences? You know that they do. Everybody knows that the angels understand thoroughly all other sciences. Everybody knows that it is perfectly safe to say that all the angels understand all other sciences infinitely more thoroughly than any man understands, or ever understood, any one single science. But the angels are more interested in the subject of salvation than in all the other sciences. They who know the most of all others, are most interested in this one. Oh, well, you agreed with me a while ago that if I could cite such authority as that, you would say that we were safe in taking this position. Come along, then, we are safe. We are in the best of company—yes, the best of scientific company. There is authority that is conclusive on the subject, scientific authority.

Now, I am not making a play on the word science here tonight. I am using the words “science” and “scientific” with reference to salvation as an absolutely truthful word. The salvation of God is truly a scientific thing, not falsely so-called, but genuinely, supremely scientific. So do not get the idea at all that I am making a play upon the word “science” or “scientific.” I am using it truthfully, because it is correct in this connection.

What the Angels Learn

But this is not all: not only do the angels desire to look into this, as those who would become acquainted with something; but they do become acquainted with something. They do learn by looking into this and studying it. Turn to *Ephesians 3* and you will see this thought expressed:

Ephesians 3

⁸ Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ;

⁹ And to make all [I leave out the word *men*, because that is supplied] see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ;

¹⁰ To the intent...

Look, now, I am to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ in order to make all see what is the fellowship of the mystery which has been hid in God, and that is to the intent, for the purpose...

¹⁰ ...that now unto *the principalities and powers in heavenly places* might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God,

¹¹ According to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.

What is the “intent” of making men see this? In order that the principalities and powers “in heavenly places” (“in heaven” other translations give it; that is correct) may be known the manifold wisdom of God. The angels, the principalities, and powers, earnestly desire to look into this gospel of salvation when it is preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. They do look and study. And as they study, they learn new revelations of the wisdom of God—the manifold wisdom of God—according to His eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord. You know by other scriptures that this mystery of God, this eternal purpose, is revealed in the gospel. You know that the principalities and powers in heaven are not eternal in one way—they are not from eternity to eternity. They are from a certain point to

eternity, as you and I are. Gabriel is to eternity only from the point where he was created. He is not from eternity to eternity.

A Study for Eternity

But God is from eternity to eternity. Now, from eternity to eternity there was, there is, *a purpose*—His eternal purpose which is purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord. How long will it take the angels to get to the depth, to exhaust the study, of that eternal purpose? To eternity. That is plain enough. Then as that purpose is revealed in the gospel, is made known through the mystery of God, which is,

Colossians 1

²⁷ Christ in you, the hope of glory,

—it is plain enough that the angels are studying it. And as they look into it, they see there revealed the manifold wisdom of God, according to His eternal purpose. They desire to look into it. They do so, and thus learn.

Well, then, as they understand all other sciences more than any man understands any one, when they are more interested in this than in all the others, and learn from this; is not that a fact upon which you and I can with safety trust ourselves? Then is not this, too, a subject more worthy of our thought, our highest thinking, than all others put together? And cannot we set our hearts upon this, and give our whole soul to it without being unscientific? O, we can, we can! Let us do it.

Now, do not misunderstand me. I am not making an attack on other sciences. I am not saying that all other sciences should be ignored, and counted as Will-o'-the-wisps, and unworthy of any attention. No; I am saying that this is greater than all of them; and that whatever we study in them must be studied in subjection to this which is greater than they. I am saying only that all others must take a secondary place, at least, to this one, if we would be scientific.

Think of it! Take our own natural minds with which we deal with other sciences. Would I, would any man, be strictly scientific to put his best and highest thinking on a science, when he had the highest possible authority that there was a higher one at his hand? Would that be scientific? No. Well, then, we see so far that this is a science; that it is the highest science. Then any man who does not put his highest thinking, his best thinking, and all his powers, upon this science first of all, and have it lead all other sciences, in the nature of things he is not scientific.

And he is not wise either. For what is this science? Salvation, Very good. And it is eternal life. Suppose I put all my life, all my powers, on other sciences, to the neglect of this, or holding this as inferior, do I get it? No. How long shall I have then, to study the other sciences? At the most only a few years. Then my work upon these sciences will be done forever, and I shall never have a chance to study them any more.

But if I take this one first of all, and let the others take the inferior place until I get this one secure, then shall I have a chance to study the others? Yes. How long? To eternity. Ah, is not that the wise way then? Is not that the only wise course? And is not that the only scientific and sensible course? Certainly it is. Come, then, let us be scientific, strictly so, supremely so.

Now let us look a little further. In that first passage that we looked at about the angels, it began with the prophets, thus:

1 Peter 1

¹⁰ Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, and prophesied of the grace that should come unto you,

—when they testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.

Now, by the prophets was brought forth in writing, as we have it here, this science of salvation, this product of God's thinking on the subject of salvation. This book of science, this science of sal-

vation, came by the prophets. Did they know anything about the other sciences? Yes.

We can find this in a number of places—more than we would have time to notice tonight. But we will look at two or three points, that we may get before our minds the fact that they did have a knowledge of these.

An Astronomical Statement

In the 15th chapter of *1 Corinthians* there is a scientific statement that was made about seventeen hundred years before it was discovered by science. It was there all these ages, but the scientists in whose field it was did not know it by the process of their thinking. It is the statement of a truth in astronomy. Whoever believed the statement in the Bible knew it all the time, of course, even though he never heard the word astronomy; but the science of man did not know it, and discovered it only after so long a time.

Another thought: When that Bible writer made that scientific statement which seventeen hundred years afterward scientists found to be scientifically correct, was it not just as truly a scientific statement all the time as it was after the discovery of it? Assuredly. Then was it not that when the writer wrote it? Certainly. The passage is:

1 Corinthians 15

⁴¹ There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differs from another star in glory.

That was not known one hundred years ago, because about that long ago a man who considered himself considerable of an astronomer, and was so considered among his fellows, criticized that statement as being incorrect, and as being an evidence of the ignorance of Bible writers; because he thought (that is, the Bible writer thought) that one star differs from another star in glory, in brightness, *instead of in distance*. That is the statement of this

critic about it. His idea was, and he spoke for the science of astronomy, that the only reason why one star is to us brighter and more beautiful than another, is that one is nearer to us than another, so that we get more of its light. But today in all the realms of science it is known to be the truth that there is as much difference in the stars, in their grandeur and beauty and tints, as in the flowers upon the earth. So that if we could see all the flowers on the earth set before us in a grand field, with all their glory, and variety of tints, and then could see the stars of the heavens as plainly as we see these, we should see one just as variegated and beautiful as the other. This is known now, but it was not known when that passage was written to the Corinthians.

Now, I ask, was not that a scientific statement, was it not the statement of a truth in science, the day that Paul wrote it and sent it to Corinth, just as certainly as it is now? The discovery that science made that it was the truth did not make it the truth, nor did it add a particle to its weight as the truth. Their discovery simply showed that they had found out something that was true, but which they did not know before, because they did not believe the Bible. If they had only read that in the Bible, and believed it and accepted it, that point in science they would have known long before any scientists had discovered it.

Gravitation and the Bible

There is another science: Sir Isaac Newton one day was sitting under an apple tree. An apple fell from a branch near him. Many times apples had fallen from trees before. He had seen apples fall from trees before. But that day he was in a meditative mood, and he began to think. Why did that apple fall? It must be because the earth had some influence on it to draw it to itself. The earth being larger than the apple, would draw it to itself when it came loose from the tree. He said, If I take that apple, and throw it as high as I can, it falls again to the earth. Then if it was the influence of the earth that brought it this little distance, when I throw it as high as I can and it comes back again, that is proof that the influence of

the earth reaches that far away from the earth, and holds to that thing and brings it back. If I could throw it a mile high, and it should come back, then it would be plain that that influence reached a mile away to bring that thing back. Then, he said, If that is the truth, that influence ought to reach to the moon. I wonder if it does reach to the moon? I will go and see. He went to his house and sat down there, took the astronomical calculations upon the orbit of the moon in its place, and worked a long series of figures. But they didn't fit. He tried it over and over again, but they didn't fit; he couldn't get that influence to reach to the moon.

He laid the thing aside for about ten years, if I remember correctly, before he took it up again. One day there was published a new calculation of the orbit of the moon, correcting some inaccuracies in former figures. When that was published, Newton said, I wonder whether that will supply what I want. He got the figures, went to work, and worked a long series of figures that you and I would be astonished at, of course. But he came down at last within two or three figures of the end, and he saw that it was going to fit. He was so overwhelmed with the wonderful fact that he could not finish his figures. The pen dropped from his hand, and he had to ask a friend to carry it out for him. The friend did so, and Sir Isaac Newton had demonstrated a scientific fact, or rather, a new science. It is called gravitation. And he has been immortalized ever since.

That was indeed a great thing. Yet that was in the Bible twenty-five hundred years before Sir Isaac Newton discovered it in nature. Gravitation is simply the balancing of the universe. It is that principle, that law, as scientists would say, by which the balance of the universe is maintained. That is, each body in the universe influences every other body, and is balanced with it. Not only each body, but each particle of matter in the universe, attracts and influences every other particle of matter in the universe.

In the physical world that is simply the corresponding fact to what we had in the Bible class this afternoon, in the matter of life. We found that you could not touch anybody or anything without its being known throughout the universe. A sparrow does not fall without your Father, and that sparrow does not fall without its fall being felt throughout the universe. This is simply a corresponding fact with that.

There is a spiritual fact there also corresponding to these two.

Psalm 139

⁷ Whither shall I go from your spirit? or whither shall I flee from your presence?

⁸ If I ascend up into heaven, You are there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, You are there.

⁹ If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;

¹⁰ Even there shall your hand lead me, and your right hand shall hold me.

When you and I think a right thought, is it discerned anywhere else? We think a wrong thought. What is a wrong thought? Sin. Where does the sin begin, then? In the thought. Is my sin discerned any place else in the universe besides myself? Who discerns it? God, by His Spirit. O, then, is there a spiritual fact in our universe that is not discerned? is not felt? or a thought for good or ill that is not felt? Do you not see gravitation as a science then? Sir Isaac Newton discovered a truth in the universe which corresponds to other truths of the universe.

The law which Newton discovered is, as I have said, that by which the balance of the universe is maintained. Now I will read the scripture that shows that this was known twenty-five hundred years before Newton discovered it.

Isaiah 40

¹² Who has measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in balance?

When the mountains and the hills were set, they were balanced one with another. Did God fix the thing so that their balance would be maintained? What is the scientific name of the law by which the balance of things is maintained? Gravitation. Of what, then, did Isaiah speak? Of gravitation. Certainly he did.

A scientist illustrates that fact by the little flower called the snowdrop. Think of two kinds of flowers that reproduce themselves from the seed. One is a standing flower, the other is a drooping flower. You have noticed in flowers little spindles standing around a central one. Now, in a standing flower that reproduces from the seed, the central spindle is always shorter than the surrounding ones. If it is a drooping flower, the central spindle is longer than the surrounding ones. The reason of that is that the flower-dust—pollen—that is upon the surrounding ones must fall upon the central one, or there can be no reproduction of the flower.

Now, in a standing flower that breeds from the seed, this central spindle must be shorter than the others, so that the pollen of the others can fall upon it. If it were longer, you see the dust would fall below, and miss it, and so no seed could form. If it is a drooping flower, and this spindle is shorter than the others, the dust will fall away and again no seed can form. So then, in every standing flower that is reproduced from the seed, the central spindle is shorter than those surrounding. In every drooping flower that reproduces from the seed, the central one is longer.

The snowdrop reproduces itself from the seed. And though it is a standing flower, yet the central spindle is *longer* than the surrounding ones. How can this be? I will state it again so that you may get the point more clearly: The snowdrop is a standing flower, properly, and reproduces itself from the seed. The central spindle, then, should be shorter than the others. But it is longer. How, then, can it reproduce itself from the seed? The Lord has provided for that. He has fixed it so that though it be a standing flower, yet it shall bend and droop. Therefore the central spindle

is made longer than the others, in this, a standing flower. It grows up and stands straight until it blooms and is ripe and ready for reproduction. Just then it droops its head, and when the pollen has fallen to its place, the little flower rises again and stands.

Now, that is beautiful in itself; but here is where the illustration of the law of gravitation comes in. This scientist tells me that what causes the flower to droop, to bow its head, is the attraction of the earth. That is correct. What makes an apple fall? Weight. But weight is simply gravitation—from the Latin *gravus*, signifying weight. What makes that standing flower droop its head? The weight of the earth. But why does not the weight of the earth make that flower droop its head before? Ah, when God made that little flower, He balanced the earth, yea, He balanced the universe, to its needs. When God made that modest little snowdrop, He held the universe in a balance, and fitted it to the need of that tiny flower! And if God take thought of that tiny flower, shall He not much more take thought for you, O you of little faith?³²

Now this scientist tells me that if the earth—and of course the universe—had been made a single pound, or a single ounce heavier than it is, it would have made the snowdrop droop before the right time; because, being heavier, it would have had more influence upon it. And in that case, the first snowdrop would have been the last. But that that little snowdrop might live and cheer mankind to the end of the world, God fixed the universe just exactly to the needs of that flower, so that when the exact time of its need comes, the weight is exactly sufficient to draw it over. Then as it hangs that reproduction may take place, other strength is coming in from the roots, and the stock becomes a little more stiff, and the flower overcomes gravitation, and stands as before.

Isaiah 40

¹² Who has measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of

³² *Matthew* 6:28-30.

the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales,
and the hills in a balance?

Who set the balance of the universe? God. Isaiah stated it nearly twenty-five hundred years before Sir Isaac Newton discovered it. Was it not a scientific fact when Isaiah wrote it? Yes. Was it not on record all those ages? Yes. Was it not a scientific truth all the time? It was. Was it any more a scientific truth when Newton discovered it? No; scientists learned something that they did not know before, but there it had stood in the Bible all the time.

Think on these things. God wants us to. He wants you and me to see that the salvation, the Word that He has given us, and to which He calls our highest thinking, is not some little narrow side issue; but the greatest thing the world can ever know. It is the greatest thing the science of the world can ever know. It is the chiefest science that the world can ever know.

Yet we are not to study it *to be scientific*. We are to study it to be saved; and to be saved is scientific.

The Chief Science

GCDB, February 14, 1897

Another word or two of explanation before we begin the study tonight: No doubt a great many may have been querying somewhat whether all that was said will bear the test. It will. I was not talking at random. It is true I did not follow everything out in detail, but if you will think of what I was saying when you get it in print, you will see that it is true. When I said that the snow-drop was balanced to the earth, and the earth balanced to the snow-drop, then if a meteor several tons in weight falls upon the earth, is not the gravity greater than before? and would not that destroy the balancing of the flower to the earth? No; because it is not the earth only that is balanced to that flower, but the universe. Do you remember that, in studying the law of gravity, the scientific statement is,

Every particle of matter in the universe is attracted by every other particle, so that not only the earth, but the universe, is bal-

anced to the needs of the flowers; so the falling of the meteorite would not increase the gravitation of the universe.

Just a few words of explanation in beginning: If I had been talking upon the subject of "Science in the Bible," or "Science and the Bible," I would have discussed more fully what gravity is, and what it is not, according to the scientific idea of the word. But I was not talking about that; all I intended to do the other night was to state the fact of the discovery of the law of gravitation, and the theory of it as a law. There are changes of view since Newton's time, in regard to the theory of that law; but that doesn't affect the law.

In strict truth, gravitation is not a law at all, but simply the power of God. There are really no "laws of nature." The laws of nature are only the habits of God. All that the law of gravitation is, is a habit of God; the manifestation of the power of God. But as I was not discussing what it really is, I used the terms in the commonly accepted sense, and only to state it as that by which the balance of the universe is maintained.

I will read this evening another definition of science. This, too, is taken from one of the leading recognized scientists of the world:

Science is the most exact knowledge which we possess of any subject.

The word "science" literally means knowledge. The definition we had the other night is correct. It is the product of thinking. Also it is well enough to define it as the most exact knowledge we have on the subject.

Now recurring to the two points we had in the previous lesson. Where was to be found the most exact knowledge as to the difference in brightness of the stars, for seventeen hundred years before science discovered it? In the Bible. Then where was the true science of that subject to be found? In the Bible. Where was the most exact knowledge of the balancing of the universe to be

found for twenty-five hundred years before it was discovered? In the Bible. Then what was the most scientific book in the world, on the subject of that science? The Bible. Bear in mind still, that I am not talking upon science and the Bible. I am talking upon the science of salvation. And though other sciences may be referred to, it is only in inseparable connection with this chief science. It is that you and I shall know by all the evidences that we can bring together in these two hours of study, that salvation is science, that it is the highest science in the universe, that it is the most worthy of our study, and that we are acting scientifically when we are giving our chief and whole-souled study to it.

Now, the Bible is not a treatise upon any science except the science of salvation. It is a set treatise upon that subject. The Bible *refers* to other sciences; but there are no treatises in the Bible on any other science. Other sciences are referred to, as the ones that we have noticed in *Corinthians* and in *Isaiah*; why are they referred to in these places—to state a scientific point? No; but to be used to illustrate better to our understanding the science of salvation. Why is that astronomical truth brought into *1 Corinthians* 15:41? What is the purpose of saying,

1 Corinthians 15

⁴¹ One star differs from another star in glory?

It goes right on to say,

⁴² So also is the resurrection of the dead...

⁴³ It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power.

Just as one star differs from another in glory, so also is the resurrection. Thus you see that the purpose of calling in that scientific point, is to illustrate a point in the science of salvation, to help us the better to see a truth in the science of salvation.

Why did Isaiah draw into his discourse that statement of the fact of gravitation? Let us look a little further into the chapter,

and we shall see. I will read that verse and then another at the end of the thought that he is following.

Isaiah 40

¹² Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand?

²⁵ To whom then will you liken me, or shall I be equal? says the Holy One.

²⁶ Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who has created these things, that brings out their host by number: He calls them all by names by the greatness of His might, for that He is strong in power; not one fails.

Not one escapes his notice, and they are all balanced to the needs of every little flower that grows in the field. But why does He call our attention to that, and bring it into his discourse in this place? Not to state the scientific fact; but to call the attention of all people to the science of salvation. What does He make of it? We are to consider all this, and to consider what it is that has done all this. And then I read farther,

²⁷ Why do you speak, O Jacob, and speak O Israel, My way is hid from the Lord, and my judgment is passed over from my God?

When God has so much care over the flower that grows at our feet, it is not hid nor forgotten; how then can you say that you are hidden from the Lord, and that your judgment is passed away, and He has no care for you any more? Thus you see that in every instance, the scientific truth is brought in altogether to illustrate to you and me the science of salvation.

Another thought: When these writers caught this, it was by revelation. Of course they did not get these things from any scientific study that this world had. The Lord was revealing His chief science, the science of salvation; and He called upon the other sciences to illustrate that. Then which of all the sciences is most important to the Lord? Salvation, assuredly. When the Lord used the other sciences only to illustrate this, it is perfectly plain that He considers this science more important than the others.

A Great Scientist

Yet this is not all. One man named in the Bible was thoroughly versed in universal science—all the natural sciences of this world. I want you to see that there was a man thoroughly versed in the sciences that are now made so much of in the world. And I want you to see what he says in view of it all. Here is the scripture:

1 Kings 4

²⁹ And God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the sea shore.

³⁰ And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt.

³¹ For he was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol; and his fame was in all nations round about.

³² And he spoke three thousand proverbs: and his songs were a thousand and five.

³³ And he spoke of trees from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springs out of the wall: he spoke also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes.

“He spoke of trees from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon to the hyssop that springs out of the wall.”

What is that called in science? Botany. He understood botany better than anyone else in the world.

“He spoke also of beasts.”

What would be the scientific word if it were put there today? Zoology. Solomon understood zoology better than any man who lives in the world today. He taught it; for it says he spoke of all these things. He taught these sciences.

“And of fowl.”

What is that science? Ornithology. Then Solomon taught in the sciences of botany, zoology, ornithology.

What next?

“And of creeping things.”

What science is that? Entomology.

“And of fishes.”

What science is that? Ichthyology.

People who read this passage of Scripture, do not usually think of Solomon as a universal scientist. But if it had been said that Solomon spoke of botany, zoology, ornithology, entomology, and ichthyology, they would be ready to say,

“What a wonderful man Solomon was!”

But it would not then be a particle more wonderful than it is; for it does say all that.

I read this that you might see that Solomon knew something of science, not only *something* of science, but more of all these sciences than any other man has ever known of any one of them.

Yet though he so thoroughly understood all these sciences, and having taught in them all, here is what he says:

Ecclesiastes 12

¹³ Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter;...

–the sum of all that has been said, is:

¹³ ...Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.

¹⁴ For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil.

In his estimation, what took precedence of all other sciences put together? The salvation of God.

The angels understand all the sciences, yet they consider salvation more worthy of their study than all of the other sciences put together. The prophets also considered it more worthy; and employed the others as a means to better understand salvation. And here is a man that understood the other sciences, and he says that

the science of salvation transcends them all. Now I want you to see that God himself on His own part, separated from all these, considers it just so.

See here: We just read that Solomon taught all these sciences. How much of those teachings have we written out for our study? Not one. God did not bring to us any record or report of Solomon's teaching in botany. He did not bring to us, or put on record, a single lesson that Solomon ever taught in zoology, or any other one of these sciences. But He did, over and over, bring us lessons from Solomon, as well as all the rest, on the science of salvation. Then, counting the angels as giving only an angel's opinion; counting the prophets as giving only a prophet's opinion, and Solomon as giving only a universal scientist's opinion; what is God's opinion? It is that salvation is worth more to you and me, and is more worthy of our study, than all these other sciences, this knowledge of which He himself gave.

This science that Solomon understood and taught was not such science as that of Huxley, Darwin, and the other scientists of this age. With the natural mind man can delve into natural sciences, and make many discoveries. And though they are not always correct, yet they can discover some points that are true. But that was not Solomon's way. God gave to Solomon wisdom, so that he saw into all this by the light of God. He spoke of all this by the wisdom of God. Thus the science which Solomon taught was God's science. The botany that he taught was genuine, divine botany. The zoology that he taught was divine zoology. It was God's views, God's truth, God's science in all these things. It was not science falsely so-called.

The World's Need

Well there, that being God's science, and it being divine in itself, why didn't the Lord give it all to us? Why didn't He give to the world Solomon's treatise on botany, and on all these other subjects? There is a reason for it; and it is that that is not what the world needs first of all.

A man might have all that, he might understand all that, as did Solomon. Yet what good would it do him, if he did not have the science of salvation first of all? Solomon had it all; yet when he turned his heart from God, from the science of salvation, and from the study of that with all his heart, what good did his knowledge of the other sciences do him? How much was it able to hold him back from sin? How much power was there in it to keep him back from his natural self, and from the devilry and corruption that was in him?

You know that when he turned his heart from God's science, from the science of salvation, though he had all the others, he was just as bad, just as wicked, swallowed up as thoroughly in idolatry and every profane thing, as though he did not know the A B C of anything.

Thus we can see why it is that the Lord did not preserve to man all there is of science. Suppose they had it all, as Solomon did, and could teach it as Solomon taught it. With the heart not surrendered to God, with the soul not saved, what good would science do them? It could not restrain them from any kind of wickedness and corruption that is in the human heart.

These sciences are not what the world needs today, first of all. The heart needs to be purified, the soul needs to be saved, the whole character rebuilt, the mind transformed into the very image and glory of God, so that the life shall reflect His righteousness, to make manifest the knowledge of God alone to all the world. Though we have all that all the sciences can give, it will profit nothing without salvation; for it will be but a little while till we shall have none of it at all. This is worth thinking about for ourselves today, in all our studies, readings, and researches.

There is another thing: God wants you and me, all men, to think right on every subject that He has anything to do with. There are men today thinking on all these scientific subjects, but they do not think right. They get so far along that they find no place for God at all. And the man without God, without the guid-

ance of the thought, the mind of God, is not able to think right on these other subjects. But the mind is not right until it is renewed in the image of Him who created it. The mind is to be transformed, renewed. We are to have another mind altogether. Every thought is to be brought into obedience, in subjection, to Christ.

That is the work of salvation. It is to restore the image of God in the soul; to bring the mind where it will be but the reflection, the outshining, of the righteousness, the thought, of the living God. When that is done, and the work of God is finished in this world, in making known the knowledge of God to all the other people, then the Lord will open the universe and eternity to us. Then all these other subjects will be open for our study, and the Lord can say to us,

“Go where you will, I can trust you. The wide universe is open to you. There is nothing kept back from you. It is all your own. It belongs to you. Go where you please, stay where you please, do what you please; I can trust you. Think on whatever subject you please, delve into it as deeply as you please, you will do it rightly.”

Now, I am not saying that men are utterly to ignore all other sciences till we reach the other world. I am simply saying that the science of salvation is to lead in the study of all of them. Has not the Lord set us an example as to what attention we should pay to these things, and what use we are to make of them? What is the purpose of reading and studying these other textbooks? That these may help us better to understand and to teach the things of the science of salvation, than if we do not have that knowledge. That is the use made of them in the Bible. He sends us to preach that gospel with which these others had to do, and by example He has shown us how to use it. By this the Lord shows us that the science of salvation must take the lead of all the other sciences known in the universe.

It must take the lead of all others in this world, and when we get into that other world it will still take the lead. When eternity

is open before us, and when we go anywhere we please, and think upon any subject we please, shall we turn our backs upon salvation then, and say, I have graduated in that? No. We know it is written that...

“The cross of Christ will be the *science* and the song of the redeemed throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity.”³³

Then, when we have finished our course here, when we have graduated, and the time comes for a grand commencement, and we enter upon an eternity of study, we shall then be more able to understand this greatest of all sciences than when we were in this world.

We stated in the other lesson that it is not a misuse of the words “science” and “scientific,” to apply them to salvation. Salvation is science, it is scientific. The working of the Spirit of God upon the mind, transforming the mind and all the life into the image of Jesus Christ, from sin unto righteousness—that is a scientific thing. Therefore when you study it, bear in mind that we are not in the least unscientific when we make that the chief and the all in all of every subject, all the time. These would-be scientists are unscientific in neglecting this, the chief of all sciences.

There is another thing that has been demonstrated; and it has been demonstrated in the three nations that are the examples in the learning of the world. The record of the Bible people, the Jewish people, God’s people as in the Bible, is professedly the example and source of study for all who propose to serve God. Greece and Rome, with their philosophy, their literature, and their laws, are the examples of many of those who profess to follow the Bible, and of all others.

³³ PP Editor’s note: This is a combination of two passages from the writings of Ellen G. White: “The theme of redemption is one that the angels desire to look into; it will be the science and the song of the redeemed throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity.” (*Steps to Christ*, p. 89-90) “...the unfallen beings will find in the cross of Christ their science and their song.” (*The Desire of Ages*, p. 20).

Now we have seen that among God's people there was a man who was a universal proverbialist, as well as a universal poet, and a universal scientist. His songs were a thousand and five, and his proverbs three thousand. There you see a master mind; and yet the one who had such an understanding, such wisdom, in all these things, demonstrated in his life that all such knowledge as that is absolutely impotent for any good in a man or to a man, without the science of salvation being there to control, and hold in righteousness the balance over all.

I called your attention awhile ago to the fact that God did not bring to us any of that scientific teaching. Now I call your attention to the fact that He *did* bring to us a record of that man's life when he turned away from God. He did bring to us a record of the enormous failure that that man made in spite of all this knowledge, when he forgot the science of salvation. Why, then, did God consider it more important for you and me to record all that man's life after he turned from God, than to bring to us a record of all the scientific instruction that He gave? In the minds of men, which is the more valuable to mankind? The record of the failure, the enormous failure, made by Solomon is of more value to mankind than would have been all of the scientific teaching that Solomon ever spoke put in a book for mankind today; because in that failure it was demonstrated to all the world how altogether vain and less than nothing, is all knowledge of all things without the knowledge of the salvation of God.

The Foolishness of Man's Wisdom

Another great example is seen in the Greeks. The natural mind never can attain to a higher, closer, and more perfect thinking than the Greek mind did. In that is portrayed the perfection of human thinking without God.

But what did it do for them? That is the question. What did their literature do for them? What did their philosophy do for them? What did their art do for them? What did their religion do for them? Philosophy, *philo sophia*—the love of wisdom. What

was that wisdom? It was absolute foolishness. God says so. What was their religion? It was mythology only. What was their art? God says it was idolatry. Do you remember the record?

The Word of God does not say that as Paul walked among those statues and saw their art, he admired their art. No, it says his spirit was stirred within him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry:

The Acts of the Apostles, p. 234:

As Paul looked upon the beauty and grandeur surrounding him, and saw the city wholly given to idolatry, his spirit was stirred with jealousy for God, whom he saw dishonored on every side, and his heart was drawn out in pity for the people of Athens, who, notwithstanding their intellectual culture, were ignorant of the true God.

Then what was it? Idolatry.

Yet even today men, women, and children take the remains of that which was only idolatry, and worship it, and call it art, and copy it. Their minds dwell upon it, they prepare books on it, and they teach and study it in the schools of the country. But what can come from all this? What came of it among the Greeks themselves? You know what it did for them. I need not repeat—literature, art, law, philosophy, all these things. Rome copied her philosophy from Greece more than it originated from herself, but the literature is there. And what did it do for the Romans? Some things it did for the others, only, if possible, it made them worse than the others were. In all Greece, so far as my observation went, I saw everywhere that the Greeks had respect enough for woman to drape properly every figure of her they carved. A man, of course, is always naked; but when we get to Italy that respect is gone, and all are without any drapery whatever. In most cases the drapery is all gone; and by the way, the perfection of art today that is worshiped by those who go to Rome, and study there in art, is only the undraped female figures, and that is not art anyhow when it is done; and yet it is come to the perfection of art,

and is copied everywhere, and its imperfections are copied every time.

I want to ask a question. Who of you have ever seen a human pair of legs from the knees down? As I stand here, the weight of my body is on my left foot. That balances altogether the weight of my body. The right foot rests with the toes on the floor. Will the muscles of my right leg be conformed exactly to those of the left? No. But that is the wonderful piece of art. There is just that difference. The two legs are exactly alike, and we cannot discover a hair's breadth of difference. And so we see it is not art anyhow. There is much to say about that, but I am not giving a lecture on art tonight. I am talking about what is the value of salvation, and what is the good of all things without it. What good did Rome have without it? Her iniquities sunk her. What good did Greece have without it? Her iniquities sunk her.

So, then, when the fact stands thus demonstrated in threefold measure before the world, of the absolute impotence of every effort of the human mind in its perfection to attain to any good when the heart is turned from God, what can the Lord do for the world if these three world-lessons will not teach the people? What can He do for men if they will follow in that way, in spite of these three examples of solemn warning? God has recorded these three instances to teach us the impotence of the highest effort of the mind in all branches of science, art, and literature, to do men any good, to keep them back from sin, to lead them toward any good of any kind whatever, when they forget the salvation of God and the science of salvation, which He has given to the hearts of men.

I ask therefore: Are we to copy the foolishness of Greek and Roman? Are we to be charmed by their idolatry, and to think it is art? Are we to be interested in their religion, when it is altogether idolatry? It is not enough to say it is mythology; it is idolatry.

But someone will say,

“Is not their literature invaluable?”

Let us see what God thought it was worth. At the time when through the Greek language He was introducing the science of salvation throughout the world, the Lord had the whole world of Greek literature before Him, and the Roman, too, for that matter. Yet He found only three short sentences in the whole realm that were worth picking up and putting in this treatise on the science of salvation. I will give you them. One of them is in the 17th chapter of *Acts*. It is quoted from a Greek writer by the name of Aratus, and is this. I read from the twenty-eighth verse. Paul is speaking, and says:

Acts 17

²⁸ Certain also of your own poets have said, *For we are also His offspring.*

A Greek writer said that man is the offspring of God. The Lord picked that up, and said, “That is true.”

Another one is in the 15th chapter of *1 Corinthians* and the thirty-third verse. The first part of the verse is,

1 Corinthians 15

³³ Be not deceived...

These are the Lord’s words. The rest of the verse is quoted from a Greek writer named Menander:

³³ ...evil communications corrupt good manners.

The other one is in *Titus*, the 1st chapter and the twelfth verse, and is from Epimenides, as follows:

Titus 1

¹² The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.

Those three passages were all that the Lord was able to find in the whole realm of Greek literature that were worth taking up and putting His endorsement upon.

Well, then, I do not say that this is all that anybody can use to profit. There are historical facts in the Greek language that are of value. But God is teaching the things that are most valuable to all mankind; He is teaching the principles of right and truth, not simply bringing before the world an array of facts. And all that He could find in the whole field of Greek literature that could be used in the interests of truth or righteousness as principles to guide man, was just these three statements:

“We are also His offspring;”

“Evil communications corrupt good manners;”

–and...

“The Cretians are always liars.”

Who else can find any more than that, that will do him any good in the way of righteousness and truth, purity and integrity?

Now do not forget. The Greeks and Romans were not low down, degraded, ragged, ignorant heathen; they were aristocratic, cultivated, and most highly educated. How could it be otherwise when the things which they knew and taught are the pinnacle to which teachers of today aspire? Julius Caesar was one of the most accomplished men that ever lived—in courtliness, etiquette, aesthetics, and manners generally. But what was his character? The most guarded description of it, to be anywise full or fair, would be unfit to print.

When the Lord has shown how absolutely vain is all science, all learning of all kinds without His salvation, then I say again, What can He do for men if these things which He has set before the world will not instruct them that that is not the way to take? If men will not be instructed by these things to take the right way, to allow that God’s science is the chief, and that what He knows is the best, then how can mankind hope to escape the evil that has come upon all these that have gone before?

Salvation Is the First Science

The science of God's salvation is the one thing for men to know, first of all; and to have that lead us, guide us, balance us, to hold us everywhere in all things, and against all things evil. And it will do all this. That is the blessed truth. I read last night, and read again:

Ephesians 3

⁸ Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ;

⁹ And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ.

What is that mystery of God?

Colossians 1

²⁷ Christ in you, the hope of glory.

1 Corinthians 1

²⁴ Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God,

Romans 1

¹⁶ ...the gospel,...the power of God unto salvation,

—that is the mystery of God; that is the science of salvation. That is the scientific truth, around which all other sciences center. That power of God unto salvation every man must have to hold him back from the evil that is in him. The evil that is born in every man will carry him to perdition, in spite of all science, all literature, all art, all religion, everything the world can furnish, or that it ever could furnish, unless he lays hold upon the power of God unto salvation, which comes to a man by faith of Jesus Christ.

Without that power in the heart, even the science which God taught—to say nothing of the literature, the art, the religion, and all that the heathen taught—is impotent to hold back man from sinning. Without that, every vestige of evil that is in a man will

show itself, in spite of all these other things. That is why it is the power of God unto salvation: it saves man against every evil.

The mystery of God,

Colossians 1

²⁷ ...which is Christ in you, the hope of glory;

1 Corinthians 1

²⁴ Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God;

1 Corinthians 2

² ...Christ, and Him crucified;

—that alone, that all in all, that over all, in all, through all, now and through eternity,—that is the science of salvation, the chief of all sciences; that which leads all sciences, takes precedence of all, and guides in the study of all. Let it be so with all forever.

Then let the Lord by His Spirit so draw us to himself; let the heart be so opened to that power, to the fellowship of that mystery, to the Spirit of God, that He may implant there Jesus Christ, His grace and His virtue. And as we hold our hearts open to Him always, and to none but Him, as a flower to the sun, we obtain in all its fullness, His righteousness, His power, His salvation, His mercy, His truth, His joy, His gladness, His peace—O, and His eternal life!

15. The Teacher and the Textbook

Christian Educator, July 1897

GOD has revealed himself to the world as a teacher.

2 Corinthians 5

¹⁹ God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself;

–and in Him, He says,

Matthew 11

²⁹ Take my yoke upon you and learn of me.

When He thus calls us to take the place of *learners*, in that very call He himself occupies the place of *teacher*.

Again He says,

John 6

⁴⁵ They shall be all taught of God.

In this also He reveals himself as occupying the place of the teacher of men.

Isaiah 48

¹⁷ I am the Lord your God, which teaches you to profit.

And it is written that...

Job 36

²² Who teaches like Him?

How could any teach like Him? Is He not God? And as certainly as He is God, so certainly is He the greatest and best teacher there can possibly be. He is truly the Teacher of all true teachers.

How could any teach us better than He who is...

⁴ ...perfect in knowledge?

And again it is written:

Matthew 28

²⁰ Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.

Hebrews 13

⁵ I will never leave you, nor forsake you.

Job 36

⁴ He that is perfect in knowledge is with you.

He is with you to teach, He is with you evermore. Nothing but unbelief, then, can ever hinder anybody from being taught always in the perfection of knowledge.

God teaches by His Spirit. Therefore it is written,

John 14

²⁶ The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things.

He teaches by His Spirit through His word.

John 16

¹³ The Spirit of truth...will guide you into all truth. For He shall not speak of himself; but what He shall hear that shall He speak.

¹⁴ He shall take of mine and show it unto you.

¹⁵ All things that the Father has are mine: therefore I said, He shall take of mine and show it unto you.

God teaching, in Jesus Christ, by His Holy Spirit through His word—this is Christianity, this is true education, this is Christian education.

The Bible is the book of Christianity. It is the book of wisdom and knowledge of God, by which men are to be restored and made that which man was made to be. It is the book of revelation of Jesus Christ,

Colossians 2

³ In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge;

—and in whom alone men can ever be complete.

As in Christ are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and as the Bible is the revelation of Christ, it is perfectly plain that in the Bible are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

In Christian education, then, the eternal Spirit is the great teacher; and the Bible is the great text-book.

Who that believes at all in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, can ever choose any other teacher in anything? Who that believes the Bible to be His word, can ever allow it to be second to any other book in any line of study?

How can any education, how can any school, be recognized as Christian, in which the Spirit of God as the one great Teacher is not courted and deferred to by a living faith in Jesus Christ, and in which the Bible is not given the leading place in every subject and line of study?

16. The Bible Is Science

American Sentinel, August 5, 1897

OF ALL the mistakes that men have made with reference to the Bible, one of the greatest is in thinking that it is not scientific.

The truth is that the Bible is the most scientific book in the world: the foundation of, and the guide to, all correct science that is known, or that can be known, in the world.

Our word science, is from the Latin word *scientia*, which signifies *knowledge*. The Latin *scientia* corresponds to the Greek word *gnosis*, which signifies *knowledge*. Accordingly *science* is simply knowledge.

But is not the Bible knowledge? The Bible comes to the world from God: everywhere its claim is “Thus says the Lord;” “God spoke;” “the word of the Lord,” etc.

2 Timothy 3

¹⁶ All Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

And does not God know? He does. Is not that knowledge which comes from God for the instruction of men? It is. Then as science is only knowledge; and as the Bible is knowledge, it certainly follows that the Bible is science.

It is true that science signifies knowledge of more than a common order. The Latin *scientia* signifies “being skilled in knowledge,” knowledge of a high order; and the Greek *gnosis* signifies “higher knowledge,” “deeper wisdom.” But is not God’s knowledge of a high order? Is not He skilled in knowledge? Is not His wisdom deep? There can be no higher knowledge than that of God. There can be no deeper wisdom than His. Therefore as science is higher knowledge: and as there can be no higher knowl-

edge than that of God, it is certain that the knowledge of God is science, and that it is science of the highest kind. And as in the Bible the knowledge of God is revealed: and as the knowledge of God is highest science, it is certainly true that in the Bible is the highest science.

It is written:

Job 36

⁴ He that is perfect in knowledge is with you.

Science is knowledge. Perfect knowledge is perfect science. The knowledge of God being perfect, is perfect science. This knowledge of God is revealed in the Bible. It is therefore perfectly certain that *in* the Bible, and the Bible itself, is perfect science.

Another definition of science is given as:

Accumulated and established knowledge, which has been systematized and formulated with reference to the discovery of general truths, or the operation of general laws.

The Bible meets this definition more fully and exactly than any other book in the world. The Bible is the knowledge of God. This, being perfect knowledge, is established knowledge; for...

Hebrews 13

⁸ [He is] the same yesterday, and today, and forever,

—and with Him...

James 1

¹⁷ ...is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.

In the Bible this knowledge is accumulated,

Isaiah 28

¹⁰ ...line upon line, and precept upon precept; line upon line and precept upon precept.

In the Bible this perfect knowledge has been, and is, systematized and formulated with reference to the discovery of general truths, or the operation of general laws—in other words, *of princi-*

ples. According to this definition therefore, the Bible is strictly science.

Yet another statement, by a scientific writer, is that...

All sciences are the products of the mind.

Very good. But shall it be said that the Bible is not the product of mind? Of course it will not be claimed that *whatsoever* is the produce of mind is science. But shall it be claimed that the Bible is not sufficiently the product of mind to be worthy of recognition as science? or shall it be said that it is not the product of a mind that may be recognized as scientific? All of this must be said, all of it *is* said, when it is said that the Bible is not science, or is not scientific.

The Bible is the word of God. Words express thoughts. The word of God, then, is the expression of the thought of God. It is therefore inevitably the product of the divine mind. And how can it possibly be said that the product of the divine mind is not science? How can it be thought that the divine mind is of such a low order that it cannot properly be considered scientific? With any recognition of God at all, no such thing can be said or thought. As certainly as God shall be recognized at all, He must be recognized *as God*. And He who created the mind, shall not He think? He who created minds whose product is expected to be accepted as science—shall not the product of His mind be accepted as science?

Science, then, being the product of mind; and the Bible being the product of the divine mind, it is certainly true that the Bible is not only science, but it is divine science. And when the Bible meets fully and fairly each definition of science, it is not scientific for any scientist or anybody else to say that the Bible is not science.

By all these considerations, and many more that can be given, therefore, it is perfectly plain that the phrase "Science and the Bible," that is so much used nowadays, is altogether invalid. It is unsound from the beginning and has not a particle of merit. It is

one of those boastful, self-assertive, things that are set forth with great show of knowledge, but which, having no merit of their own, are obliged to beg their way. This one begins at begging everything. It is expected that by the sheer weight of its appearance of superior knowledge, every being will at once fall prostrate and humbly pray it to accept all that it is forced to beg. Instead of this, however, the brazen thing should have its mask plucked off, and be made to stand upon merit only. It must not be allowed to receive anything to which it cannot present strictly just and valid claim.

Now, this phrase, "Science and the Bible," asserts in itself, that the Bible is not science. To admit the correctness of the phrase, as it is asserted, is to allow that the Bible is not science. But why should the phrase be admitted? There is not a single definition of science that is not fully met by the Bible as science. Strictly and truly, yea *supremely*, the Bible is science. Why then, upon what principle of reason or propriety, should the phrase be admitted as valid when on its very face it denies that the Bible is science?

If anyone wants to deny that the Bible is science, let him do it. But let him do it by presenting what seem to him considerations that show that it is not science, instead of flaunting a phrase that begs all that it is bound to show. This however cannot be done: the very word "science," itself is against it. Every accepted definition of the word is against it. The root idea of the word, the very nature of the word itself, will have to be obliterated, before it can be shown, or even fairly claimed, that the Bible is not science.

There is therefore no place for any such expression "Science and the Bible" or "The Bible and Science" because the Bible *is* science. As the Bible is science, what such expressions really say is, "Science and Science." This indeed might be well enough, if that were meant, but when the only thing intended is the begging suggestion that the Bible is not science, there can be no place for it in the world.

No; the Bible, being strictly and truly science, the only way in which there can ever be any contrast or “conflict” between science and the Bible, is between God and science and man’s science, between divine science and human science, between perfect science and imperfect science.

Between God’s science and man’s science, there may very easily be a contrast; but with anyone who has any respect for God at all, can there ever be any question as to which justly belongs the preference or which shall have precedence?

Between divine science and human science there may indeed arise a “conflict;” but in the mind of anyone who recognizes God at all and has any respect for Him, can there ever be for a moment any question as to which shall surrender or give way? And when such a conflict does arise, and the human refuses to surrender, or give way, to the divine, but continues the conflict, what is that but to argue that the human is greater than the divine, and that therefore the divine must surrender and give way to the human?

But for the human to continue a conflict with the divine, and thus to argue that the human is greater than the divine, is simply for the human to supplant the divine, and itself set up claim for recognition as such, or else to claim that there is no divinity.

And this is the essential defect of the phrase “Science and the Bible”: it argues that the Bible is not science, and in that it argues that the Bible is not the knowledge of God, that it is not the product of the divine mind—in short, it argues that the Bible is not of God. The phrase “Science and the Bible” is therefore infidel on its very face.

But the Bible is the knowledge of God. The Bible is a product of the divine mind. It is accumulated and established knowledge which has been systematized and formulated with reference to principles. It is therefore easily and emphatically science in every true sense of the word.

Matthew 28

²⁰ Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.

Hebrews 13

⁵ I will never leave you, nor forsake you.

Job 36

⁴ He that is perfect in knowledge—[science]—is with you.

Proverbs 1

⁷ The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge [science].

Proverbs 2

³ If you cry after knowledge [science], and lift up your voice for understanding;

⁴ If you seek her as silver, and search for her as for hid treasures;

⁵ Then shall you understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge [science] of God.

Colossians 2

² ...[In] God,...the Father, and [in] Christ,

³ ...are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,

—all the treasures of philosophy and science. That is the everlasting truth. And let all the people say, Amen.

17. Salvation Is Science

American Sentinel, August 12, 1897

THE one subject of the whole Bible, is *Salvation*. Whatever other subject may be touched upon or dealt with in the Bible, it is always subordinate to the great subject of salvation.

This fact does not stand in any way against the great truth that the Bible is science. Instead of this fact arguing for a moment that the Bible is *not* science, it argues forever that Salvation *is* science.

Instead of standing thus: The Bible treats solely of the subject of Salvation, therefore the Bible is not science; the true argument runs thus: The Bible is science; the Bible treats solely of Salvation; therefore Salvation is science.

Salvation is truly a science. It is more than *a* science, it is the chief of all sciences, the one most worthy of investigation. It is the science of sciences.

That Salvation is truly a science is plain from this consideration: With the *mind*, man explores the realm, and delves into the secrets, of all other sciences. Indeed "Physical Science" is defined by a scientist as "a product of *our thinking* as to external things." But while it is with the mind that man deals with all other sciences. Salvation deals with the mind itself.

The first word in the call to Salvation is, "Repent," which is literally "change your mind." The first of all the commandments is this,

Matthew 22

³⁷ You shall love the Lord your God with all...your mind.

And it is written,

Romans 12

² Be transformed by the renewing of your mind.

Romans 7

²⁵ So then, with *the mind*, I myself serve the law of God.

As it is with the mind that man investigates all other sciences, while Salvation has to do with the mind itself, it is certain that Salvation is a science as truly as is any other. Shall the product of that which deals with all other things be science, and the product of *that which deals* with that which deals with all other things, be *not* science? That will never do. Assuredly there can be no other right way than that. While the product of that which investigates all other things is science, much more the product of *that which investigates* that which investigates all other things is science.

This just conclusion demonstrates not only that Salvation is science, but that it is greater than all other sciences. Because since it is with the mind that all other sciences are dealt with while Salvation deals with the mind itself, in the nature of things it follows that the science of salvation is greater than the others. Beyond all question that which deals only with the thing that deals with all other things, is greater than those other things.

That Salvation is science is further suggested by the fact that those who are well acquainted with all other sciences, are deeply interested in this.³⁴ And that it is the greatest of all sciences is further shown by the fact that those who most thoroughly understand all other sciences, are more deeply interested in this than in all the others; and while they thoroughly understand all the others, they are so deeply interested in this *that they may* understand it.

The ones here referred to as thoroughly understanding all other sciences, are *the angels of God*. Surely no man who admits the existence of such intelligences, can fairly question that the angels do, more thoroughly than all other created persons, understand the recognized sciences. Those who traverse the stellar spaces as familiarly as the florist his flower paths—shall it be said that they do not understand astronomy? Those who gladly joined in the joyful anthem of all the sons of God when the morning stars sang together at the laying of the foundations of the earth—shall it be

³⁴ 1 Peter 1:12; Ephesians 3:10.

suggested that they do not understand Geology? Those bright minds which *saw* the origin of every other form of living creature—shall it be intimated that they do not understand Biology?

No, no! They thoroughly understand all these things. Each one of them understands *all* these sciences infinitely better than all men together ever understood any one science. Yet with this thorough knowledge of all the recognized sciences, the angels “*desire to look into*” the subject of Salvation. For unto the prophets...

1 Peter 1

¹² ...it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, that are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; *which things* THE ANGELS DESIRE TO LOOK INTO.

The Greek word here rendered “desire” means “to set one’s heart upon.” And the Greek word here rendered “look into” means...

...to stoop to a thing in earnest, to look at it; to look at, with head bowed forward, and to look into with body bent; to look carefully into, to respect curiously—of one who would become acquainted with something.

It is the word used to tell them the disciple...

John 20

¹¹ ...was stooped down and looking into the sepulcher.

Such is the attitude of the angels of God toward the subject of Salvation. They desire to look into the subject of Salvation to become acquainted with it, that they may understand it and learn by it. For again it is written,

Ephesians 3

⁸ Unto me who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ;

⁹ And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:

¹⁰ *To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers IN HEAVENLY PLACES MIGHT BE KNOWN by the church the manifold wisdom of God,*

¹¹ According to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Now if the men who are acknowledged to be the best of all men acquainted with certain sciences, should keep their whole attention intently to the investigation of another subject and should continue that to the exclusion of everything else, that subject, even though it had never before been thought much of, would be instantly raised to the dignity of a science: and not only to the dignity of a science, but to the dignity of *the leading* science. The very fact that such eminent scientists should give such attention to a subject, would of itself be the best possible evidence that they considered that subject more worthy of their attention than the other sciences; and would be sufficient evidence that they considered that a greater science than the others. And if any should treat lightly, or scoff at, such work of such men they would be looked upon as persons of inferior caliber and sadly lacking in the “scientific spirit.”

Very well; here are the angels of God, who are thoroughly acquainted with all others sciences, yet turn their whole attention intently upon the subject of Salvation and have continued to do so age after age. This is evidence enough that they consider salvation a greater science than all the others put together: the one science most worthy of their thought. This being so with the angels, is not this ample evidence that all who slight or scoff at Salvation, or who count it second to any or all other sciences, are greatly lacking in the *true* scientific spirit?

Yet further: All sciences are the products of mind. Salvation is of God. It is God himself who reveals, and works out, Salvation. It

is the product of God's thinking. It is therefore divine science, the science of God himself.

From this and the other considerations here presented, it follows that Salvation is not only science, but that the science of salvation is the highest, the deepest, and broadest science that is known not only in this world but throughout the whole universe.

18. God the Teacher In the Sciences

American Sentinel, August 19, 1897

THE mistake that men make in thinking that the other sciences are not to be found in the Bible, is second only to the mistake that they make in thinking that the Bible itself is not scientific, and that Salvation is not science.

God is the Author of all true science, and to all who will have God for their teacher He will give knowledge of the other sciences as well as of the science of Salvation. He has done this before, and the fact is recorded that all may know that He will do it always for all who will have Him for their teacher.

Solomon was but a youth—about eighteen—when he became king of Israel. Yet with God for his teacher, in a short time he became the greatest scientist that ever lived either in ancient or in modern times.

He knew thoroughly the whole range of Botany...

1 Kings 4

³³ ...from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon to your hyssop that springs out of the wall.

He knew just as thoroughly, zoology and ornithology and entomology and ichthyology. For he spoke not only of trees from the mighty cedar of Lebanon to the tiny hyssop, but...

³³ ...also of beasts, and birds, and creeping things, and of fishes.

Solomon was better acquainted with all these sciences together than any other man has ever been acquainted with any one of them. Yet this was not the complete range of his scientific attainments: for he was just as well acquainted with meteorology and others as with any of the ones named. Nor did he hold this knowledge in any exclusive spirit. He taught it freely to the people: and to all people, too, for they came to him from all nations to hear his instruction in science and philosophy. Thus a thousand years before Christ, hundreds of years before the so-called

and boasted wise men of Greece had ever breathed, there was in Israel an understanding of science that has never been attained in any nation since.

Nor did this knowledge pass away with Solomon. Four hundred years afterward, when the first captives were taken from Jerusalem to Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar had a selection made of certain youth from among the Jews to be taught in the learning of the Chaldeans. These youth were selected upon both their mental and physical standing. They were chosen by a strict examination. The requirements, in the examination which they must pass, were that they should have...

Daniel 1

⁴ ...no blemish [but should be] well favored, and skillful in all wisdom and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them.

It is well known that at that time Babylon itself stood high in scientific attainment; and was qualified to conduct an examination in science. And it is a fact that there were found even among the youth of the Jews those who were able successfully to pass such an examination. The fact that the Jewish youth understood these things, demonstrates that the sciences were understood and taught in Israel: and shows that the scientific instruction established by Solomon had remained among the people of Israel and was still taught in their families and in their schools.

Among these Jewish youth selected to be taught in the Chaldean learning, were Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. Daniel was about eighteen. At Babylon they were put under the Chaldean instructors to be taught. They remained in the Chaldean school three years. At the end of that time there was an examination held. The result was that of all who were in school, none were found as learned as these four youth.

Nor was it only the other students in the school that were surpassed in knowledge by these four. They outstripped all the men in the empire. For...

Daniel 1

²⁰ ...in all matters of wisdom and understanding that the king inquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm.

No man can teach what he does not know. No man can teach ten times more than he knows. This testimony therefore shows that Daniel and his three brethren knew ten times more than did the men who were over them as instructors. It must be borne in mind that Babylon is held even at this day, to have been then well versed in a number of the recognized sciences. All these things were certainly taught in that school where were these four young Jews. Yet when examination came these four were found to be ten times better versed in all these things than were all the professed wise men in all the realm, and that is certainly ten times better than were their own Chaldean teachers.

Well then, since no man can teach ten times more than he knows or understands, the question is, How did these youth learn what the examination demonstrated that they knew? Whence came to them this knowledge that was so far beyond that of all the wise ones of Babylon, including their own teachers? Here is the answer:

¹⁷ As for these four children, *God gave them knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom.*

God was their teacher. This is why they learned so much more than all the teachers knew who were placed over them as instructors. God was Solomon's teacher, and this is why he too had understanding in philosophy and science beyond all that the rest of the world knew or that it has ever known since. These examples are sufficient to make it plain that God is a capable instructor in the recognized sciences as well as in religion. Yea, more than this: these examples make it perfectly plain that God is a better teacher in all true philosophy and in all true science, than is any man or all men together. This idea that true science can be taught without

God, or that heathen infidels and atheists are better able to discover it than God is to teach it, is a most pernicious error.

These examples are given in Holy Writ to teach all men that God is as ready and willing to be their teacher in all these things as He was to be the teacher of Solomon and the four brethren in Babylon. God will teach people today as truly and as fully as He did those in that day. All that is needed is the faith and devotion in people today, such as was in those of that time. There is no respect of persons with God. God favored Solomon and Daniel and his brethren, no more than He is ready to favor every soul every day. Let men, youth and children, today choose God for their teacher in all things, as did Solomon and the four in Babylon, and they will find Him to be today the all-efficient teacher that He was then in all philosophy and all science—we say *not* “as well as in religion,” because the religion, the Salvation of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, is both philosophy and science.

But people do not believe, even many professed Christians do not believe, that the religion of Christ is philosophy; they do not believe that the Salvation of God is science. They do not believe that even the recognized sciences are known to the Lord or that, if known to Him, He cares to teach anything concerning them. They do not believe that the Bible is science, nor do they believe that the Bible knows anything of the recognized sciences. They do not believe that God will teach these things to men. Therefore they go to the heathen, to infidels and atheists, to learn all that and think that such men are wondrous wise, and that they themselves are wise, in following the “science” of such teachers, that is without God, that leads away from God and from faith in His word, His wisdom and His power.

A good illustration of this is found in the fact that Harper’s *Haydn’s Dictionary of Dates*, the standard work on the dates of important events, says that the sun dial was invented by Anaximander, who lived about 530 BC, when there stands in the Bible that is in everybody’s house the plain circumstantial mention of

“the sun dial of Ahaz”³⁵ which shows that the sun dial was in use in Jerusalem two hundred years before Anaximander ever breathed. Thus it is expected that the people shall give to Anaximander credit for the invention of a thing that the Bible shows was in daily use two hundred years before he lived. If that was indeed a thing so new in Greece that Anaximander could claim it as an original invention, then the belated science of the Greeks may sincerely be deplored. But as for us we must be pardoned for not believing that Anaximander was the original inventor of a thing that we know was in use two hundred years before he was born. There are in the Bible more interesting facts and truths than many people think.

Oh that those who profess to believe the Lord would believe Him indeed! Oh that they would believe that He is what He is! Oh that with a whole heart they would choose Him, for all that He is to the children of men, that they might find Him to be the great, wise, and blessed teacher that He is to all who will choose Him for their teacher in all things.

Job 36

²² Behold, God exalts by His power: who teaches like Him?

³⁵ *Isaiah* 38:8; *2 Kings* 20:11.

19. Science With and Without the Bible

American Sentinel, September 2, 1897

Original title: Science With the Bible, and Without the Bible

SALVATION is the one great subject of the Bible.

Other things are referred to, and to some extent discussed in the Bible; but always in subordination to the one great and only *subject*, which is Salvation.

Salvation itself is science, and while this is treated in the Bible as the one great science—the science of sciences—yet other sciences are not ignored, but are often referred to.

It is true that in the Bible no science is considered without God; yet this is nothing against its being science. The idea of science without God is a vain and fallacious thing, infinitely more incongruous than the drama of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. It is a palpable contradiction, for how can there be true knowledge where the very Source of knowledge is ignored?

In all science without God,

Fundamentals of Christian Education, p. 407:

There is a painful uncertainty, a constant searching and reaching for assurances that can be found only in God.

In all the discussions of such science there is betrayed a conscious inability, sometimes acknowledged, to trace things back to the first great principle, to that which is fixed and final, and where the mind can rest in assured certainty.

In the Bible, however, that is, in science with God, there is none of this uncertainty. In that there is no feeling about for a standing place; there are no proffers of “a working hypothesis;” but everything is placed at once upon God as the origin and ultimate of every phenomenon, the sure resting-place of the mind after every “last analysis.”

In science without the Bible, that by which things are held together is Cohesion. But when it is asked,

“What is Cohesion?”

–the only answer is:

“That by which things are held together.”

In science without the Bible, that by which all things are held up or held in place, is Gravitation. But when it is asked,

“What is Gravitation?”

–the only answer is,

“That by which all things are held up or held in place.”

But such answers as these are not answers at all: they are simply the saying of the same thing in another way.

Yet it is a fact that such is just the instruction that is given in the books, and such is the teaching that is given to students. But by it the mind of the student is caused to travel in a circle, and is left wandering there, ever inquiring and finding no certain or satisfactory answer. It is proper for a student to ask,

“What holds, in their places, the worlds and all things?”

And it is proper enough that the answer should be,

“Gravitation.”

It is then proper for him to ask,

“What is Gravitation?”

But it is not in any sense proper to answer that,

“Gravitation is that by which all things are held in their places.”

It is proper for the student to ask,

“What is it that holds things together?”

And it is proper enough that the answer should be,

“Cohesion.”

It is then proper that he should ask,

“What is Cohesion?”

But it is not in any sense proper, nor is it at all sensible, to answer this question by saying that...

“Cohesion is what holds things together.”

Yet that and such as that throughout the curriculum, is what is offered as science. It is science without God, science without the Bible; but it is not genuine science. By it, all that any person can ever know is merely something *about* things; he cannot know the reality of the things themselves.

In science with the Bible, it is altogether different. In that, when a child or a student asks,

“What holds all things in their places?”

–he can be told that it is Gravitation. And when he asks,

“What is Gravitation?”

–he can be answered,

Hebrews 1

¹ God...

² ...made the worlds by His Son,

³ Who, being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and *upholding all things by the word of His power.*

Thus, gravitation is the power of God manifested in His word through Jesus Christ. When it is asked,

“What holds all things together?”

–and it is answered,

“Cohesion;”

–and when it is asked,

“What is Cohesion?”

–the true answer is,

Colossians 1

¹³ [God] has translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son:

¹⁶ By whom all things were created,...visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers, all things were made by Him and for Him;

¹⁷ And He is before all things and by Him *all things consist* [hold together].

Thus Cohesion is the power of God manifested through Jesus Christ our Lord. All things came neither by evolution, nor by the “nebular hypothesis,” but by the word of God. For...

Psalm 33

⁶ By the word of the Lord were the heavens made and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.

⁷ For He spoke, and it was.

Hebrews 11

³ [And] through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things that are seen were not made of things which do appear.

- Gravitation was taught in the Bible more than twenty-three hundred years before it was discovered by Newton.
- That the air has weight and that dew is formed by distillation, was taught in the Bible more than twenty-five hundred years before science without the Bible had “discovered” it.
- That there is a difference in the radiance of the stars, and not simply a difference in their distance, was declared in the Bible more than fifteen hundred years before modern science had learned it.

- That there is healing in the sunshine was taught in the Bible twenty-three hundred years ago, and medical science has only lately “discovered” it.
- The science of meteorology—the sources of the wind and the rain, the circulation of the waters and of the atmosphere—was revealed in the Bible more than twenty-five hundred years before science without the Bible had become at all acquainted with it.

The world of science and philosophy today is going farther and farther astray, “in wandering mazes lost,” because of its persistent ignoring of God in the Bible. By such pretended knowledge and wisdom the world is just coming to the point where again it does not know God. And through the glamour of this so-called science and philosophy, even the professed Church of Christ is fast forgetting God.

He who believes the Bible and thus becomes so acquainted with God and the power of His word, that He knows and rests with perfect confidence in the knowledge that God possesses and has revealed in the Bible a philosophy and a science that is as far beyond any that this world ever knew, as heaven is higher than the earth, is counted as fairly beyond the pale of respectability. But all that makes no difference with the truth. And it is the everlasting truth that in the Bible there is more and better science, truer and more profound philosophy, than this world ever knew or ever can know without this book.

God is. He is the former of all things. He is the only true teacher. He is ever ready and is waiting to be the teacher of all. He will willingly teach all who will be taught by Him. And to all such He will teach all knowledge and all wisdom, all science and all philosophy. For in Him are hid all the treasures of philosophy and science, and...

Colossians 2

¹⁰ You are complete in Him, who is the head of all principality and power.

20. The Science of Salvation – I

American Sentinel, September 9, 1897

Note: This study is a condensed version of the first half of the second 1897 GC Bulletin study by the same name.³⁶

THE angels of God are acquainted with all the natural sciences, yet they are more interested in the science of Salvation than in all the other sciences.

This testifies that in the estimation of the angels, the science of salvation transcends all other sciences, and is more worthy of their attention than are all the other sciences together.

The prophets were acquainted with natural science, yet the only use they ever made of this knowledge was to employ references to it as a means of making clearer to men the science of Salvation. This testifies that in their estimation the science of Salvation transcends all other sciences.

Solomon was a universal scientist. He knew more of all the sciences than any other scientist knew of any one of them. For twenty years he taught the sciences to the people. Yet, after all, he sums up all in the words,

Ecclesiastes 12

¹³ Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: [the sum of all that has been said is,] Fear God and keep His commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.

¹⁴ For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil.

This, being the candid conclusion of the greatest scientist that ever lived, is worthy of respect as valid testimony to the fact that the science of Salvation is more important than all other sciences together.

It must be borne in mind that the science that Solomon knew, was divine science; it was science learned under the teaching of

³⁶ See Article 14 *The Science of Salvation*, starting with section: “The World’s Need.”

the Lord himself. It must be borne in mind too that the prophets and all the other writers in the Bible, wrote only under the inspiration of God, they wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; then the fact that the Lord himself in writing for the instruction of men that which is most for their good and the best for them to know, put all the stress upon the subject of Salvation. Other sciences are glanced at, yet only for the purpose of making plainer to the understanding the subject of Salvation. This testifies that in the estimation of the Lord the science of Salvation is more important than all the other sciences; and all who believe in God can only acknowledge that it is so.

Why is this so? How is it that God gave to Solomon and to Daniel such deep knowledge in the sciences, and yet has not preserved for men any treatise of science? There is a reason for this, and the reason is that Salvation is the one thing that men need first of all, and more than anything else, or than all other things together.

Solomon indeed had understanding of the sciences more than any other man who ever lived: yet a man might have all that, he might understand all that, as Solomon did, and what good would it do him, if he did not have the science of Salvation first of all? Solomon had it all; yet when he turned his heart from God, from the science of Salvation, what good to him was his knowledge of the other sciences? How much power was in the sciences to hold him back from sin? How much power was there in his great scientific knowledge to keep him back from his natural self, and from the devilry and corruption that was in him.

Everybody knows that when he turned his heart from God's science, from the science of Salvation, though he had all the others, he was just as bad, he was just as wicked, he was as thoroughly swallowed up in idolatry and every profane practice, as though he had not known the A B C of anything.

Here we see a master mind; and yet the one who had such an understanding, such wisdom, in all the sciences, demonstrated in

his life that all such knowledge is absolutely impotent for any good in a man or to a man, without the science of Salvation being there to control, and hold in righteousness the balance over all.

Mention was made a moment ago, of the fact that God did not bring to us any of Solomon's treatises on science. Now we call attention to the fact that He *did* bring to us a record of Solomon's life after he turned away from God. He did bring to us a record of the enormous failure which that man made in spite of all this knowledge, when he forgot the science of Salvation. Why, then, did God consider it more important for you and me to record all that man's life after he turned from God, than to bring to us a record of the scientific instruction that he gave? The record of the failure, the enormous failure, made by Solomon is of more value to mankind than would have been all the scientific teaching that Solomon ever spoke put in a book for mankind today. Because in that failure it was demonstrated to all the world how altogether vain and less than nothing, is a knowledge of all things without the knowledge of the salvation of God.

Another great example is seen in the Greeks. The natural mind never can attain to a higher, closer and more perfect thinking than the Greek mind did. In this is portrayed the perfection of human thinking without God.

But what did it do for them? That is the question. What did their literature do for them? What did their philosophy do for them? What did their art do for them? What did their religion do for them? It sunk them into such wickedness as is unfit to mention.

Rome learned from Greece and followed her example and came to the same end.

It must be borne in mind that the Greeks and Romans were not low, degraded, ragged, ignorant heathen; they were aristocratic, cultivated, and most highly educated heathen. The things which they knew and taught are the pinnacle to which teachers of today aspire. Thus Caesar was one of the most accomplished men that

had lived—in courtliness, etiquette, aesthetics, and manners generally. But what was his character? The most guarded description of it, to be anywise full or fair, would be unfit to print.

Therefore, when the fact stands thus demonstrated in threefold measure before the world, of the absolute impotence of every effort of the human mind in its perfection to attain to any good when the heart is turned from God, what can the Lord do for the world if these three world-lessons will not teach the people? What can He do for men if they will follow in that way, in spite of these examples of solemn warning? In all this history, men are taught the impotence of the highest effort of the mind in all branches of science, art, and literature, to do men any good, to keep them back from sin, to lead them toward any good of any kind whatever, when they forget the science and literature of Salvation, which God has given to purify the hearts of men.

21. The Science of Salvation – II

American Sentinel, September 16, 1897

Note: This study is a condensed version of the latter half of the second 1897

GC Bulletin study by the same name.³⁷

FROM the history of Solomon, and of Greece and Rome, which we have reviewed, we can see why it is that the Lord did not preserve to man any of the treatises that even He himself gave upon science. Suppose that men had it all, as had Solomon, and could teach it as Solomon taught it. With the heart not surrendered to God, with the soul not saved, what good would science do them? It could not restrain them from any kind of wickedness or corruption that is in the human heart.

The sciences are not what the world needs today, first of all. More than all else, the heart needs to be purified, the soul needs to be saved, the whole character rebuilt, the mind transformed into the very image and glory of God, so that the life shall reflect His righteousness, to make manifest the knowledge of God alone to all the world. Though men have all that all the sciences can give, it will profit nothing without salvation; for it will be but a little while till they will have none of it at all.

There is another thing: God wants all men to think right on every subject. There are men today thinking on scientific subjects, but they do not think right. They get so far along that they find no place for God at all. The man without God, without the guidance of the thought, the mind, of God, is not able to think right on these subjects. And the mind is not right until it is renewed in the image of Him who created it. The mind is to be transformed, renewed. We are to have another mind altogether. Every thought is to be brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

That is the work of salvation. It is to restore the image of God in the soul; to bring the mind where it will be but the reflection, of the living God. When that is done, and the work of God is fin-

³⁷ See Article 14 *The Science of Salvation*, starting with section: “The World’s Need.”

ished in this world, in making known the knowledge of God to all people, then the Lord will open to men the whole universe for all eternity. Then all these other subjects will be open for our study, and the Lord can say to us,

“Go where you will, I can trust you. The wide universe is open to you. There is nothing kept back from you. It is all your own. It belongs to you. Go where you please, stay where you please, do what you please, *think on whatever subject you please*, delve into it as deeply as you please, you will do it rightly.”

This is not at all to say that men are utterly to ignore all other sciences till we reach the other world. It is simply to say that the science of salvation is to lead in the study of all others. Has not the Lord set us an example as to what attention we should pay to these things, and what use we are to make of them? What is the purpose of reading and studying upon the other sciences? That these may help us better to understand and to teach the things of the science of salvation, than we could do without that knowledge. That is the use made of them in the Bible. By this the Lord shows us that the science of salvation must take the lead of all the other sciences known in the universe.

It must take the lead of all others in this world, and when we get into that other world it will still take the lead even there. For...

“The cross of Christ will be the *science* and the song of the redeemed throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity.”³⁸

When the Lord has shown how absolutely vain is all science, all learning of all kinds *without His salvation*, then we say again, What can He do for men if these things which He has set before the world will not instruct them that that is not the way to take? If men will not be instructed by these things to take the right

³⁸ PP Editor's note: This is a combination of two passages from the writings of Ellen G. White: “The theme of redemption is one that the angels desire to look into; it will be the science and the song of the redeemed throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity.” (*Steps to Christ*, p. 89-90) “...the unfallen beings will find in the cross of Christ their science and their song.” (*The Desire of Ages*, p. 20).

way, to allow that God's science is the chief, and that what He knows is the best, then how can mankind hope to escape the evil that has come upon all these that have gone before?

The science of God's salvation is the one thing for men to know, first of all: that it may lead us, guide us, balance us, and hold us everywhere in all things, and against all things evil. And it will do all this. That is the blessed truth:

Ephesians 3

⁸ Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ;

⁹ And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ.

What is that mystery of God?

Colossians 1

²⁷ Christ in you, the hope of glory.

1 Corinthians 1

²⁴ Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God,

Romans 1

¹⁶ ...the gospel,...the power of God unto salvation,

—that is the mystery of God; that is the science of salvation. That is the scientific truth, around which all other sciences center. That power of God unto salvation every man must have to hold him back from the evil that is in him. The evil that is born in every man will carry him to perdition, in spite of all science, all literature, all art, all religion, everything the world can furnish, or that it ever could furnish, unless he lays hold upon the power of God unto salvation, which comes to a man by faith of Jesus Christ.

Without that power in the heart, even the science which God taught—to say nothing of the literature, the art, the religion, and all that the heathen taught—is impotent to hold back man from

sinning. Without that, every vestige of evil that is in a man will show itself, in spite of all the science that he can ever know.

The mystery of God,

Colossians 1

²⁷ ...which is Christ in you, the hope of glory;

1 Corinthians 1

²⁴ Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God;

1 Corinthians 2

² ...Christ, and Him crucified;

—that alone, that all in all, that over all, in all, through all, now and through eternity,—that is the science of salvation, the chief of all sciences. That is the science which leads all other sciences, which rightly takes precedence of all, and which must guide in the study of all. Let it be so with all forever.

Then let the Lord by His Spirit so draw us to himself, let the heart be so opened to that power, to the fellowship of that mystery, to the Spirit of God, that He may implant there Jesus Christ, His grace and His virtue. And as we hold our hearts open to Him always, and to none but Him, as a flower to the sun, we shall obtain in all its fullness, His righteousness, His power, His salvation, His mercy, His truth, His joy, His gladness, His peace—O, and, His eternal life!

22. The Bible the Leading Educational Book

Advent Review, July 5, 1898

FOR anybody to profess to believe the Bible for what it is,—the word of God,—and at the same time not to allow that the Bible must be the leading book in all education, are two things that will not hold together at all.

The Bible claims for itself that it is the word of God. It comes to men as the word of God. If it is not accepted and held as the word of God, it is no more than any other peculiarly national book. To believe the Bible, is to accept it as the word of God; for that is the only claim that the Bible makes for itself. Not to except the Bible as the word of God, is not to believe *the Bible* at all.

The Bible, then, being the word of God, is supreme knowledge and supreme authority upon every subject that is true. There can not be any truer knowledge than that of God: there can not be any higher authority than that of the word of God. As certainly, therefore, as the Bible is an educational book at all, so certainly is it the supreme educational book.

Is the Bible, then, an educational book? Is it given to instruct, to educate? For what other purpose could it possibly have been given, since it is given in written language? The Author of it says,

Matthew 11

²⁹ Learn of me.

Isaiah 48

¹⁷ I am the Lord thy God which teaches you to profit.

And,

Job 36

²² Who teaches like Him?

The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father sends,

John 14

²⁶ ...shall teach you *all things*,

–not all things good, bad, and indifferent; not all things speculative, conjectural, and false, but all things that are *true*; not false science, but true science; not false philosophy, but true philosophy. For He is the Spirit only of *truth*. He is a guide only into *truth*. And in this...

John 16

¹³ He will guide you into *all truth*.

He, being God and being a teacher, is the supreme Teacher. His words are supreme instruction. Instruction is the only means to education; and His instruction, being supreme, the education accomplished through this instruction is likewise supreme. And that which is supreme is, in the very nature of the case, of the very first consideration. To the Bible, therefore, being the word of God and being instruction from the Lord, belongs, *by divine right*, the place of first consideration in all education.

Therefore it is perfectly plain that any teacher in any Christian school who would lead any student into any study before the study of the Bible, does not really hold the Bible to be the word of God, and, therefore, supreme. And it is just as plain that any teacher in any Christian school, who, in any study, uses any other book before the Bible, or in preference to the Bible, does not really hold the Bible to be the word of God; he does not count it supreme knowledge; he does not acknowledge it to be the supreme authority. He may *profess* to hold the Bible as the word of God; but such action shows that it is not really that to him; some other book is more to him than is the Bible.

It may be, indeed, that he thinks he holds the Bible to be the word of God, but uses some other book in preference to the Bible, because he is better acquainted with that book than he is with the Bible. But this does not relieve him; because if he is better acquainted with this other book than he is with the Bible, it is simply because he has studied that book more than he has the Bible:

and the very fact of his studying that book more than he has studied the Bible, is proof positive that that book is more to him than is the Bible. And that being so, the Bible is not really the word of God to him: for the Bible is not the word of God to a man when, to that man, another book stands ahead of the Bible.

More than this, the teacher to whom any other book is more than the Bible, or is preferred to the Bible, is not prepared to teach in any Christian school; for he will certainly, even though not consciously, put the word of man before the word of God. And that is not Christian teaching.

This is not in any sense to say that no book but the Bible can be used in teaching. Other books can be used,—yes, in a number of studies other books *must* be used,—but they will always be used only *with* the Bible. And when these books are used with the Bible, they will always be used in subordination to the Bible; in each particular study the Bible will *lead*, and the other book will follow. No other book can ever lead, and the Bible follow, in any Christian school, nor with any teacher in a Christian school.

We have much more to say in illustration of this great and vital principle. But all that we shall say more just now is that *no person is qualified as a teacher in any Christian school until he is so acquainted with the Bible that in anything which he undertakes to teach, he can make the Bible the leading book.*

But let not this truth discourage any one. If you are not so acquainted with the Bible *now*, go to *work*, and become so acquainted with it. And this is simply asking you to become acquainted with God, with His wisdom, and with His power.

23. The Bible First

Advent Review, July 12, 1898

THE principle in the Bible's being the leading book in all education, is the simple one that "first impressions are most lasting."

As first impressions *are* most lasting, it is all-important that the first impressions shall be the best that can possibly be made. And as it is impossible that better impressions can be made than those which are made by the word of God, it follows inevitably that the first impressions made upon the mind, both in the very beginning of the child's thinking, and at the beginning of every subject that comes before the student, should be those made by the word of God.

Is it not a familiar fact that very aged people remember clearly the times of their childhood, and yet cannot remember ten minutes what you tell them today? Why is this? Simply because the first impressions are most lasting.

Sometimes it is said of very aged persons that they have their second childhood. If people were only considerate, they would know that in a beautiful sense this is true: they have, indeed, their second childhood; because their minds have failed for the things of today, and they live once more only amid the scenes of their childhood. And they live amid the scenes of their childhood because those scenes, having been the first impressed upon their minds, are the last to fade. What a blessed and beautiful thing it is when such minds can dwell amid scenes of the word of God, as the consequence of that word's having been the means of instruction in their childhood!

Now, every person, whatever may be his age, is practically only a child when he enters a new field of study. On that particular subject he has everything to learn, every thought must be acquired. It is, therefore, all-important that his first thoughts, the first impressions upon his mind, shall be the best and the truest.

Therefore, the very fundamental principle of the education demands that the word of God shall be given the first place in every study.

24. The Bible First in Language

Advent Review, July 19, 1898

IN LEARNING a new language, the only proper way is, first of all, to learn from the Bible in that language.

As to a strange language, the mind is absolutely a blank; and the first impressions made upon it, the first thoughts that enter it, will irresistibly color all associate thoughts or impressions that ever come afterward.

It is therefore infinitely better that the thoughts of God in the new language shall be the first that enter the mind, and so throw their pure light upon all other thoughts that enter the mind, than to begin with fairy tales, trifling stories, pagan notions, or records of war, and so have these to cast their dark shadow upon the thoughts of God when His word is read.

To illustrate: suppose you would learn the German language, and that the first words you ever learn are these: "*Im anfang war das Wort.*" Then the first *thought* which ever enters your mind in the German language is, "In the beginning was the Word." Then, having *learned* this, whatever after that, as long as you live, you meet the word *anfang*, that word will unfailingly recall the expression, "*Im anfang war das Wort,*" and the *thought*, "In the beginning was the Word."

Or suppose the Greek, and the first words that you ever learn in it are, "*En arch en ho Logos;*" and therefore the first thought in a Greek that ever enters your mind is, "In the beginning was the Word." Then, having *learned* this, wherever you meet either the word *arche* or *Logos*, instantly occurs the thought first lodged in your mind with the passage, "In the beginning was the Word."

But suppose you unfortunately fall into the hands of a teacher with whom the Bible is not supreme, and therefore is not the first and most important book in every line of study; suppose the first words and language that he gives you are from some fairy story, some fable, some novel, some play, or from *any* other source than

the Bible. When you learn those words, you receive the *thought* expressed by the words. It having learned *that*, then afterward, when you meet those same words in the Bible, instantly and irresistibly your mind will refer to the first thought in those words, and the clear rays of light and truth and the words of the Bible will be clouded and confused by being mixed up with that fairy scene, or whatever it was that was first associated in your mind with those words. Then your very study of the Bible will be hindered, and you will be crippled, by such a bad beginning in the new language. On the other hand, when you begin right, with the words of the Bible and the thoughts of God first, then if, for any purpose, you should find it necessary to read those other books, you will find the precious light and wisdom and strength of the thoughts of God constantly recurring and abiding with you, guiding you in the way of truth, and guarding you against that which is false.

It is so, also, in the study of Greek or Latin or any language whatever.

What a lasting injury, then, it is to students, and especially the young,—what an imposition upon them, and what an abomination altogether,—when they are kept a year, two years, or even more, in the wild, foolish, false, and wicked mouthings of pagan poets, philosophers or actors, or even the writings of historians before they are qualified to read New Testament Greek or Bible Latin.

- Is a mind whose whole warp and woof in Greek is pagan the better qualified to understand and appreciate Christian Greek?
- Is a mind that has grown from one to three years all over Gaul, amid the barbarities of Caesar and the Gauls, or that has dwelt all its Latin life in the pagan miasma of Virgil,—is such a mind the better prepared to read in Latin, to Christian profit, the Gospel of John or the epistles of Paul?

- Are paganism and barbarism an essential basis for Christianity?
- Are pagan thoughts and heathen conceptions an essential antecedent to Christian thoughts and divine conceptions?

If not, why do teachers who consider themselves, and expect others to consider them, *Christians*, cause their students of Greek, or Latin, or any other language, to build up their minds in that language wholly of pagan material, and that from one to three years, before they are expected, or given any chance, to form their minds of the Lord's thoughts—the perfectly good, the perfectly pure, the perfectly true?

For all practical purposes, the mind is composed of thoughts. The object of study is to obtain thoughts—knowledge. The object of study is to build up the mind; the mind is built of thoughts, and thoughts are obtained by study. What, then, is the object of professed Christian teachers in having students study pagan Greek and pagan Latin first of all? What *can* be their object, other than to build up the minds of the students in paganism and of paganism? In plain words, What can be their object other than to make pagans of the youth who are under their instruction? For what the mind is, the man is. And if the mind is pagan, the man is pagan; and if the mind is mostly, or even partly, pagan, the man is mostly or partly pagan.

But is it the God-given task, or responsibility, of Seventh-day Adventist teachers to cause students to become even partly, nay, even in any degree whatever, pagan? The only possible answer is, No. Then what Christian—Seventh-day Adventist—teacher can ever put any pagan book into the hands of any student as a textbook, or as a book for study at all? What Christian teacher can put *any book* but *the Bible first* of all, into the hands of any student; and other books only when the thoughts of God from the Bible have formed and fashioned the mind, and made it capable of testing the value of what may be found in the human book?

And if, by any mishap, there should be found in any Seventh-day Adventist school, or anywhere else among Seventh-day Adventists, a teacher who cannot teach from the Bible the language which he proposes to teach, but must teach it from pagan authors,—Caesar, Virgil, Homer, or who not,—then the students who are so unfortunate as to fall to that teacher for instruction should refuse to take a single lesson from him in that language; that is, in short, they should refuse to submit themselves to that teacher, to be made pagans of to any extent whatever.

This is not to say that no other book but the Bible can ever be read or studied in a foreign language; but it is to say that no other book should ever be read or studied in a foreign language until that language has been *learned* from the Bible, and until the Bible can readily be read at sight in that language. With this has been, and can be, done by a person, then that person can read with perfect safety, and to profit, any other book in that language which he may find it necessary to consult.

The Bible must be first, and the original text-book, in every line of language study.

25. Our Schools

Advent Review, October 4, 1898

THE most of our colleges, academies, and schools have opened their doors and begun work again. Will they now be conducted as the strictly Christian schools that they profess to be?

- Will the directions of the Lord be followed?
- Will all the books containing pagan and infidel sentiments, and worldly wisdom, and human science, be put away?
- Will the Bible be given, without question or criticism, the place that God has assigned it in every school, and in every line of study in every school?
- Will God be recognized as the teacher, in all things? and this not only mediately, but also *immediately*?

The sciences—mental, moral, and physical, all—must be taught there: will these be taught there: will these be taught from the divine source, or from human sources? from the divine writings, or from human writings? In other words, will true science be taught there? or will it be science falsely so-called?³⁹

"Science" is *knowledge*: and knowledge is something known. A guess is not knowledge. Conjecture is not knowledge.

In order to teach science, there must be taught that which is *known*: not what is guessed at, not what is supposed, not what is derived from a "working hypothesis."

To teach for science what is not *known*, what is supposed, what is derived from hypotheses, is only to teach science falsely so-called. It is to teach as knowledge that which is not known, and therefore is a contradiction in terms.

³⁹ 1 Timothy 6:20.

And this is precisely the attitude of the accepted science of our time. A leading scientist has laid down as strictly scientific this proposition:

All our knowledge must ultimately repose on propositions which are unproved and unprovable.

Such “knowledge” is not knowledge. It is simply assumption and speculation. And being not knowledge, it is not science; for science is knowledge. It is only science false so-called.

The teaching of true science is the teaching of that which is known: it is the teaching of the certainty of knowledge. And the certainty of knowledge is found only in God, and is expressed only in the word of God. He *knows*. And only such knowledge is true science.

Therefore, anything taught for science, which has not the word of God for its foundation, is only science falsely so-called.

God alone is the author of true science; and His word is the only certain foundation of it for man. Will the true science *only*, be taught in our schools?

26. What Will Our Schools Teach?

Advent Review, October 11, 1898

ALL our schools are to teach science, which is knowledge. Being Christian schools, they are to teach divine science, divine knowledge—not human science. For Jesus, who is the great Teacher in every truly Christian school,

Fundamentals of Christian Education, p. 408:

...brought into His teaching none of the science of men...His majesty could not mingle with human science, which will disconnect from the great Source of all wisdom in a day. The topic of human science never escaped His hallowed lips.

In every field of thought or instruction there is a divine science, and there is a human science. And these are contrary the one to the other, because the constant tendency of human science is to separate from the Source of true wisdom. Indeed, the very nature of human science—which, bear in mind, is but human knowledge—is enmity against God.

There are three great root-sciences,—mental science, moral science, and physical science. All conceivable phases of science are but branches of these. And these three are so closely related that neither is, nor can be, complete without the others.

The first of all the sciences, in importance, and indeed in nature, is mental science. First, therefore, in every system of teaching comes naturally the teaching of mental science.

Mental science, or psychology, if any would rather deal with it as an “ology,” is the science of the *mind*. And as it is the *mind* with which every conscious or intelligent thing is done, in the nature of things the knowledge and training of the mind lie first in all teaching.

Again: the only true object of education “is to restore the image of God in the soul.” And it is with the mind that we serve the law of God. No greater gift can possibly be bestowed upon any soul

than the service of the law of God. No higher nor more honorable position can ever be attained by any creature than to serve the law of God; that is, to be, in his whole being, so completely in harmony with God that every thought, every motive, and every action will be the perfect reflection of the will of God. And “with the mind”⁴⁰ this service is accomplished. The mind is the root from which all else in the individual springs; the mind is the pivot, upon which all else turns. This being so, it is certain that, in the very nature of things in the existence of the individual, in all education the knowledge of the mind is first in importance.

As “mental” is mind, mental science is *mind* science, or science of the mind. And as “science” is knowledge, *science* of the mind is *knowledge* of the mind.

Knowledge is to know. A guess is not knowledge; supposition is not knowledge. A hypothesis is not knowledge. To *think* that we know is not knowledge. Knowledge is to *know*; and he who truly knows, *knows* that he knows.

Where, then, shall we find certain knowledge? Answer:

Psalm 94

¹⁰ He that teaches man knowledge, shall not He know?

With God is the certainty of knowledge. He *knows*. Whoever would find the certain knowledge, the true science, of the mind, let him ask of Him who knows. When we find what God has said of the mind, in that we find the true knowledge of the mind. And the true knowledge of the mind is the true science of the mind.

What, then, has He said on the subject of the mind? Read this:

Romans 8

⁷ The carnal mind [that is, the mind of the flesh, the natural mind, the human mind] is enmity against God.

Therefore, the human science of the mind, human psychology, is only enmity against God. The study of the human science of

⁴⁰ *Romans* 7:25.

the mind, the study of human psychology, is but the study of enmity against God.

But what profit is there in studying enmity against God? When this mind, which is enmity against God, has been studied and analyzed, and all its phenomena marked, what has the student at last? Only enmity against God. What does he know? Only enmity against God. And even this he does not *know*; he *thinks* it is something else. If he really knew that it was enmity against God, surely he would not study it at all.

Surely, then, in no Seventh-day Adventist school will any human science of the mind, nor any science of the human mind, be studied. To know what that is, to know that it is enmity against God, is surely enough to know, without wasting time in any detailed study of it.

No; there is an infinitely better science of the mind than that, to study in our schools.

1 John 5 [paraphrase]

²⁰ The Son of God is come, and has given us a mind.

Philippians 2

⁵ Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.

1 Corinthians 2

¹⁶ We have the mind of Christ.

Here is a mind-science worthy of study. Here is a mind, the knowledge of which is only an inspiration and an eternal blessing. This is the divine mind. The knowledge of this mind is also divine. And as knowledge is science, the divine knowledge is divine science. There is, therefore, a divine science of the mind,—a divine psychology, open to all the teachers and students in all our schools. Shall not, then, this divine mental science be studied in all our schools?

Romans 12

² Be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

This transformation of life and character, of body, soul, and spirit, through the *renewing of the mind* by faith in Jesus Christ,—this is a mental science, this is a psychology, that is a true science, and worthy of the most industrious and intense application of the powers of teachers and students. Shall not *this* divine science be taught in all our schools?

27. Our Schools, Teachers, and Students

Advent Review, October 18, 1898

AS CERTAINLY as Seventh-day Adventists are Christians, so certainly must every Seventh-day Adventist school be a Christian school.

For these to be Christian schools, Christian principles must be the only principles, Christian teaching the only teaching, and Christian teachers the only teachers, found therein.

And in order that only Christian principles and Christian teaching shall be found therein, the word of Christ, the word of God, the Bible, must be the source and substance of every line of instruction.

The Bible is spiritual. The words of Christ are spirit. The teaching, therefore, must all be spiritual: the things there taught must be the things of God. And the things taught and studied, being the things of God, can be properly taught and understood only by the Spirit of God.

Now,

1 Corinthians 2

¹⁴ The natural man receives not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.

Romans 8

⁷ The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

Then with such a mind, what is the use of anybody's attempting to take up the studies in these schools? That would be trying to do things with means which those things cannot possibly be done. It would be trying to know things with a mind that cannot know such things.

What more slavish work could possibly be engaged in, what more futile effort could possibly be made, by any student, than

must be in the endeavor to understand things with a mind that cannot possibly understand those things? And what would possibly be more of a beating the air on the part of a teacher than the endeavor to cause a person to understand his teaching while that person has only a mind that could neither receive nor know his teaching?

Yet such is exactly the attitude of both teachers and students in every case where students attempt, with the carnal mind,—the natural mind, with which they were born into the world,—to follow the studies in any genuine Seventh-day Adventist school. The carnal cannot understand the spiritual. The natural mind cannot know the things of the Spirit of God.

All this conclusively demonstrates that of all the studies in our schools, mental science—the knowledge of the mind—is first in order and in importance. Without the knowledge, the *science*, of the change of mind from the natural to the spiritual; from the mind which came with the birth of the flesh to the mind that comes with the birth of the Spirit; from the mind that came by being born once to the mind that comes by being born again,—without a knowledge and an understanding of this science, effort will be vain, and time and money will be misspent, in any genuine Seventh-day Adventist school.

But with this science grasped and understood on the part of both students and teachers, every task is a pleasure; every lesson, whether studied or recited, is a clear and distinct gain; improvement is positive and rapid; and the field of knowledge, the height of intellectual attainment, and the realm of opportunity and usefulness, are seen to be infinite.

This is not to say that every person who desires to enter one of our schools must be a complete, all-round Christian in all respects. Not at all.

2 Corinthians 8

¹² If there be *first a willing mind*, it is accepted according to that a man has, and not according to that he has not.

He that has a willing mind can easily learn the true science of the mind. Whosoever, therefore, has a willingness to accept the system, and conform to the principles, of education held in our schools, is welcome to enter and remain; and the results can be nothing else than supremely satisfactory. For if any man wills to do His will, he shall *know* of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether we speak of ourselves.⁴¹

In education it is true today that...

1 Corinthians 2

⁹ ...Eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God has prepared for them that love Him.

But He has revealed, and will reveal, them unto us by His Spirit;

¹⁰ ...for the Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God.

¹² Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

And...

John 14

²⁶ He shall teach you all things.

1 John 5

²⁰ We know that the Son of God is come, and has given us a mind.

Philippians 2

⁵ Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.

1 Corinthians 2

¹⁶ We have the mind of Christ.

Job 36

⁴ He that is perfect in knowledge is with you;

²² ...[and] who teaches like Him?

⁴¹ *John* 7:17.

28. True Moral Science

Advent Review, November 15, 1898

IN THE realm of morals, which is character, since men have forgotten the true morality, and have become altogether immoral; since...

Romans 3

¹² They have all gone out of the way, [and have] together become unprofitable;

¹¹ ...[since] there is none that seeks after God,

—unless God should abandon them utterly, it is essential that there should be set before men the true standard of character in such a way that they shall be drawn to the contemplation of it.

Yet though man had become altogether immoral, God could not abandon him; because He is...

Exodus 34

⁶ ...The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth,

⁷ Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin.

Therefore He formulated for man a transcript of His own character in such a form as to be particularly adapted to the condition and needs of man altogether as he is.

This transcript of the character of God, this true standard of character, is formulated in the law of God, the ten commandments. And while...

...the God of nature has written His *existence* in all *His works*,

—He has also...

...written *His law* in the *heart of man*.⁴²

And here are the ten commandments:

⁴²Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. 50, p. 14.

Exodus 20

1

³ You shall have no other gods before me.

2

⁴ You shall not make unto yourself any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth:

⁵ You shall not bow down yourself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me;

⁶ And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

3

⁷ You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that takes His name in vain.

4

⁸ Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.

⁹ Six days shall you labor, and do all your work:

¹⁰ But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God: in it you shall not do any work, you, nor your son, nor your daughter, your manservant, nor your maidservant, nor your cattle, nor your stranger that is within your gates:

¹¹ For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

5

¹² Honor your father and your mother: that your days may be long upon the land which the Lord your God gives you.

6

¹³ You shall not kill.

7

¹⁴ You shall not commit adultery.

8

¹⁵ You shall not steal.

9

¹⁶ You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor.

10

¹⁷ You shall not covet thy neighbor's house, you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is your neighbor's.

It was necessary for the Lord to present His law, the transcript of His character, *in this form*, just *because* of the essential immorality of mankind. For...

1 Timothy 1

⁹ The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers,

¹⁰ For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for men-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.

As this is a description of man just as he is naturally, in the world, it is easy to see how perfectly adapted to his condition, how perfectly calculated to awaken him and draw him away from himself, is that law saying to him:

“You shall have no other gods before me;”

“You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain;”

“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy;”

“Honor your father and thy mother;”

“You shall not kill;”

“You shall not steal;” and

“You shall not bear false witness.”

This would reveal to man the knowledge of himself, would show him that he is altogether wrong, and would awaken him to

the desire for something better and the longing to get away from himself. Then, to satisfy this desire,

Haggai 2

⁷ ...the Desire of all nations [would] come,

–and present himself to him; and, when accepted by him, would deliver him from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.⁴³

So...

Romans 5

²⁰ The law entered, that the offense might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:

²¹ THAT as sin has reigned unto death, EVEN so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

And...

Romans 3

¹⁹ What things soever the law says, it says to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.

²⁰ Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified [made moral] in is sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.

²¹ But now the righteousness [the morality, the character] of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets;

²² Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference:

²³ For all have sinned [have become immoral], and have come short of the glory [the character, the morality] of God.

²⁴ Being justified [made moral] freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus:

²⁵ Whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;

⁴³ Romans 8:21.

²⁶ To declare, I say, at this time His righteousness [His morality]; that He might be just [moral], and the justifier [the one who make moral] of him which believes in Jesus.

This transformation of men from immorality to morality by the faith of Jesus Christ is the only true moral science: it is the only true science of character.

This is divine science, and it is the only moral science that is worthy to be studied in any Christian school, in any Seventh-day Adventist school.

29. Some Good Principles in Education

Advent Review, November 15, 1898

IN ANSWER to the question as to what are the characteristics which adapt a boy to become a naval officer, Mr. Park Benjamin publishes an article in the *Independent* of October 5, in which are found valuable hints to any boy who would succeed anywhere in life.

First, he must have “sound health and a good constitution.” Then, having these, he must have “quick intelligence and a *capacity for study*.” And while to be a naval officer he “has got to be a navigator, a seaman, an astronomer, a gunner, a lawyer,—versed in both international and military law,—an electrician, a surveyor, a torpedoist, a chemist, a diplomatist, a metallurgist, and a steam engineer,” he must really be competent in all these things, and “must avoid being a ‘Jack of all trades and master of none.’” And “the only solution” of this problem “lies in *study capacity*,—the power to recognize and grasp *principles*, rather than to memorize tasks.”

And there is a world of valuable suggestion in this statement:

The prize scholar, who declaims Burke’s orations at school exhibitions, or writes thoughtful essays on his understanding of Robert Browning’s poems, is *less promising*, on the whole, than the youth who has a bulldog grip on the multiplication table; and who, in these days of Keely motors and gold-from-sea-water delusions, cannot be led by any mathematical or mechanical jugglery into a doubt that the product of two and two is ever anything but exactly four.

There is also instruction for schools and teachers everywhere in the statement that...

...the Naval Academy does not cram its students, nor attempt to do so; but it requires from them this *capacity for study*, and then teaches them how to use it; and as a consequence there is a sort of versatility...which enables them effectively to grapple with

widely separated branches of knowledge. The boy, therefore, who shows no talent except such as depends on the power of memory will be handicapped in the navy race. . . . The navy is no place for dreamers, nor for people who merely know *why*, without knowing *how*.

These are sound principles, and are worth thinking of by all, in these days when thousands in the world are longing for something better in education than is commonly given; and when God is longing to show to the world the very best principles and system of education.

30. Science Falsely So-called

Advent Review, August 1, 1899

SCIENCE falsely so-called has decided that man has “progressed” from the animals, through barbarism, to his present state. All the discoveries in Chaldea and Egypt, the most anciently inhabited lands, instead of revealing barbarism, show always “a high state of civilization”—that even...

...poetry and literary art had reached a high proficiency in days which were credited with a liberal amount of barbarism.

Thus the *evidence* proves that man began his career as *a man* of fully developed faculties, instead of as an animal, or even as a barbarian. The truth of God tells the same thing. But instead of the professed scholarship of the day believing the truth of God, and accepting the evidence from the most ancient inhabited lands, it sets aside all of this, at the mere dictate of “science,” and holds so tenaciously to the theory that man began only a half step or a step from the apes, that it will push back thousands of years the time of his appearance upon the earth, in order gratuitously to blot it all out before the existence of this high state of culture and civilization in the oldest inhabited lands.

That this is all done at the mere dictate of “science” is clearly shown in the following confession of Lyman Abbott, D. D., who is a representative of the mass of evolutionists:

It is true that I am an evolutionist, and inclined to be a radical evolutionist. Perhaps my correspondents have a right to know why; and, in so far as it is possible, I am quite willing to tell them why,—to give an account to others of a change which has taken place gradually and almost unconsciously.

In the first place, all biologists are evolutionists—probably without a single exception. They are not all Darwinians; that is, they do not all regard “struggle for existence and survival of the fittest” as an adequate statement of the process of evolution. Indeed, it may be said that this is no longer by any regarded as a

complete summary of the process, even if it were so regarded by Darwin himself, which is doubtful. I am not an expert biologist; few ministers are. *We are not competent to pass any independent judgment of value on the question.* What is the process of life in its earlier forms? *We have not the scientific habit of mind which enables us to sift the evidence and reach a conclusion.* How many of those who read this article could pass a creditable examination on the question at issue between the Ptolemaic and the Copernican theories of astronomy, or the atomic and undulatory theories of light? Probably but few. *We accept the testimony of the experts when they have reached a conclusion.*

This is my first reason for being an evolutionist. Practically all scientists, I believe absolutely all biologists, are evolutionists. They have proved themselves careful, painstaking, assiduous students of life. I assume the correctness of their conclusion. I have, indeed, studied somewhat the writings of Darwin, Huxley, Haeckel, Tyndall, and the later epitomes of LeConte, Drummond, and Tyler, and have read something of the criticisms on the other side,—enough to see that the hypothesis of evolution has a groundwork of fact and reason. But *I accept evolution*, as a statement of the process of physical life, *not from a personal scientific investigation, which I have not the training to conduct, BUT upon the substantially unanimous testimony of those who have such training.*⁴⁴

Thus it is plain that the word—the “conclusions”—of men is accepted instead of the word of God. Human conclusions are received rather than divine truth and positive and direct evidence. And that it is altogether the word of men that is taken, and that instead of the word of God, is demonstrated by the fact that the scientists—“the experts”—who formulated the theory of evolution, and whose conclusion it is that is accepted,—Darwin, Haeckel, and Tyndall,—were (or *are*, as Wallace is still living) all, without exception, infidels, men who had no faith at all in any revelation of God, nor even in any God.

⁴⁴ *The Outlook*, Feb. 6, 1897.

What can the ministers think that either they or the world can gain by accepting the word of men instead of the word of God? Where can be the gain to any soul, in accepting the conclusions of men, which he acknowledges he does not know, and which he cannot know to be the truth, instead of the word of God, which he can know to be the truth?

Luke 18

⁸ When the Son of man comes, shall He find faith on the earth?

For...

Romans 10

¹⁷ Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

31. Christian Education – I

Advent Review, October 3, 10, 17, 24, 1899⁴⁵

Part 1

Advent Review, October 3, 1899

THIS is the last Sabbath in the period of the summer school for teachers, of Battle Creek College, and it has been arranged that there should be a subject discussed today, in connection with education, and that I should be the one to discuss it. I will therefore speak to you on *Christian* education. I beseech you to hear me patiently, and to consider sincerely the principles to which I shall call your attention.

To introduce the subject, I will read to you two texts expressing the world's hunger, the world's demand, in the matter of education. These two texts are taken, one each, from two of the most influential papers in the United States, and are but fair samples of many that I could bring. One of them appeared in the *Outlook*. It is not by the editor of the paper, but by a contributor. It reads:

There must be in this country a better system of education, a system that is in closer touch with life, and that fits rather than unfits for life. There must be something in our common schools that will make for self-respect, and for that respect for others that is a part of true self-respect; something that will develop faithfulness and intelligence and pride in work; something that will link head and hands by indissoluble bonds. Domestic science and manual training in schools will gradually give a greater respect for manual labor; and with this respect should go a greater diffusion of manual labor; for the lack in our present system is quite as much on the side of employers as of employed.

An intelligent and many-sided woman recently remarked to me that Queen Victoria would be a better woman if she made her own bed daily. While it may not be practicable for queens to make their own beds, or for the president of the United States to

⁴⁵ A Sermon delivered in the Tabernacle, Battle Creek, Mich., Sabbath, September 2, 1899, and stenographically reported.

chop his own wood, there never will be faithfulness, respect, and intelligence on the side of the workers unless the same attitude toward work is found in the employers.

That expresses one phase of the world's longing, the world's hunger, the world's demand, in the matter of education. Here is another, originally published in the Chicago *Inter-Ocean*, by a master of theology in the Chicago University. He says:

There is nothing more disappointing to evangelical religion than its great schools. The fearful stress which has fallen on the...denominations during the last ten years has proceeded largely from the great schools fostered by these denominations. . . . The very foundations of religious teaching are being undermined by teachers in our great schools, just as they have been in a large sense in the German universities. What is known as "higher criticism" is simply working havoc with the rising minority in the three-named denominations.

Now, listen to this:

There is no school on the American continent where a young man can go and learn the Bible as a whole under the direction of deeply pious and thoroughly learned teachers. There are schools where a young man fitting for the ministry can go and spend three years, and have himself stuffed with speculative philosophy under the name of theology, and with infidelity under the name of "higher criticism." This is a positive and a burning shame. The writer cherishes the hope that some pious man or woman of means will found a school in this country where men can be trained who will not only know the Bible from first to last, but preach it from first to last. That would be something new under the sun.

Those two texts set before you the true need in all education, and show to you what the world is calling for in the education of this day. Now, I do not cite Battle Creek College as a *complete exception* to the statement that I read last:

There is no school on the American continent where a young man can go and learn the Bible as a whole under the direction of deeply pious and thoroughly learned teachers.

I say, I would not set Battle Creek College before that writer as the one school that he is calling for; but I am sure that the management of Battle Creek College is doing its utmost, and has made considerable progress in it, to make Battle Creek College exactly what is demanded *there*, and what has been demanded *by the Lord* for years.

Seventh-day Adventists, professing to have light for the world, will be apostate, will utterly fail to fulfill their mission in the world, if they do not present to the world exactly what the world is longing for and calling for, in the matter of education. Battle Creek College has no place in the world at all if it shall not be such an institution as that which is here called for,—if it shall not be an institution where men can be trained who...

...will not only know the Bible from first to last, but preach it from first to last,

—an institution which will put forth the utmost endeavor to give to every one who enters its doors to take a training there, just as fast as time and opportunity will allow, such a knowledge of the Bible from beginning to end, from first to last, that where-soever he goes, he will be able to use the Bible.

It is not enough that this should appear only in preaching from the pulpit, but also in handiwork. The Bible is the book of Christianity. Jesus Christ is Christianity; and as our Saviour, as the Redeemer, as an example of Christianity, He spent nearly six times as much time in *working at a trade*, the carpenter's trade, as He did in preaching in His official ministry, as He went about from place to place, preaching and teaching the people. And as Jesus Christ is Christianity, and a considerable portion of His life was spent in working with His hands, and in bringing God into His daily labor, and in making daily labor the service of God just as

certainly as in making praying the service of God,—as that was the course of Christ, that must be forever the true course of Christianity.

In our day, God has begun a movement which is to “establish Christianity”—the Christianity of Christ—“on an eternal basis” in the world, which is simply the basis of Christ himself. And as certainly as that movement of God succeeds, so certainly will this Christianity of Jesus Christ dignify labor in our day, as in His own day—common, every-day labor of the hands. It will lift that up, and make it the honor of every one in this world: an essential part of Christianity. *This* Christianity being received and being inculcated by those who become Christians upon this true basis, those who become preachers, evangelists, as was Christ, and as also was Paul, will not shun to join manual labor with their preaching, and will consider one equally as dignifying as the other, and as taking both to make complete Christians.

That is what the Lord will do in this movement in this day, which He has begun, and which finally establishes Christianity upon an eternal basis in the world. Therefore, I say again, As Seventh-day Adventists who profess, none too loudly provided the material is there to justify the profession, that we are those by whom the Lord will establish Christianity upon an eternal basis in this world, and by whom the Lord will give this light to the world, we cannot afford to slight any one of these things: because, to do so is to slight the very Christianity which is our profession; it is to miss our calling in the world.

I say again, The Bible is the word, the book, of Christianity; and for Christian education to be given its place in the world, and to be made all that it must be in the world, it must come from the Bible: the Bible must be the beginning and the end, the all in all of such education. Such will be the work and the study of all those who will be such Christians, who will have the Christianity of Jesus Christ; for such was His preparation, such was His education. He did not attend the schools of the day. Yet, when He came

preaching, and teaching the people, and drawing them to Him by the power, the truth, the simplicity, of His preaching, the rabbis, the scribes, and the great ones, seeing what He knew, and the power of it, exclaimed:

John 7

¹⁵ How does this man know letters, having never learned?

That itself shows that, though He had not been attending their schools, He knew more than they who were at the head of those schools. Yet His study, His whole preparation, was the word of God—the Bible, as it was then, and as it is now in the Old Testament.

With *both* the Old and the New Testament, we have an advantage that He did not have. Christians today have an advantage in this world that Jesus Christ did not have, in having the New Testament all drawn out for us—the life of Christ, showing what was wrought in Him; and also the epistles, showing the workings of it all in the world, and spreading the whole truth more fully before us.

I will say that again; for it is important to be believed: In having both the Old and the New Testaments, Christians in the world today have an advantage that Christ did not have, who had only the Old Testament.

I know the defense that will be made:

“But Christ was divine, and that in that He had an advantage that we do not have; that He could take these things from the Bible and easily understand them, because He came down from heaven, and we did not.”

To make such an argument as that is not Christianity at all: it is the utter denial of Christianity. Because Jesus Christ, though He came down from heaven, “emptied himself,”⁴⁶ and never used, in this world, in the flesh, any of His own individual, personal divin-

⁴⁶ *Philippians* 2:7 RV.

ity that He had before He came to this world. He became flesh: He became human, as human as any one in this world is today; as weak, as helpless, as anyone in this world is today *in himself*. And He plainly says,

John 5

³⁰ I can of my own self do nothing.

That is just what He said about *us*:

John 15

⁵ Without me *you* can do nothing.

These two scriptures show that He placed himself exactly upon a level with us. And when He put himself there in human flesh, and upon the level of human flesh in this world, where He was unable to do anything of himself, *He put His trust in God*; and, by His faith in God, He drew from the Source of all power, of all knowledge, and of all good, into His life in human flesh, that which gave Him all that He had, and made Him all that He was, in the world, and all that He is today in heaven. And BY THIS He made it possible for *every human being* to become what *He was then in the world*, and what He is today in heaven.

Otherwise, where shall we find Christianity? Otherwise, how shall people be saved? Otherwise, what did He come for? If His coming to the world was a make-believe; if He came here with a power in himself that you and I can never, never, have; and used means that you and I can never use, and that can never be within our reach, then how much has He done for you and me? How near has He come to us, and how near can we ever come to Christianity—to salvation? Christ in the flesh was God manifest in human flesh⁴⁷—just such flesh as yours and mine. And Jesus Christ came into the world in the flesh to show to all mankind how God will be manifest in human flesh in *every one who will believe on Him*, who will trust in Him, as Jesus Christ in human flesh trusted in Him; so that, though Christ was the Son of God,

⁴⁷ 1 Timothy 3:16.

and though He came down from heaven, having sat on the throne of God; yet, when He did come down, “He emptied himself,” and became as ourselves. And by that divine thing He brought God to us, and brings us to God, and connects us with God, the source of all power and of all good. And in that He showed to the world what man can become—what every soul in human flesh can become—by putting his trust in God, and depending upon God.

And *Christ became educated*: He understood things. He understood the sciences. He understood the application of the sciences, in the things of daily life. He understood philosophy. And in His teaching, those who were the learned ones of the law discovered that He had learning which they admitted was beyond them, and which astonished them. And yet He had never learned it in their schools. Now those schools of theirs were the schools of the Hebrews. They were the schools of the professed church of God in that day. He did not even attend these; must less did He attend the schools of the Greeks or the Romans, those which were entirely outside, separate from, all that is of God, or that is connected with Him, and which were pagan entirely.

Then, that tells to everybody in this world that there is such a thing as distinctively *Christian* education. It shows that a Christian education is not derived from the schools of the world; and that it is separate from, and cannot be derived even from, church schools that are mixed up with the world by a church that is worldly. Then, that tells to every one in the world that Christian education is separate from paganism, which is utter worldliness; and is also separate from a professed Christianity that is connected with the world and is worldly.

Part 2

Advent Review, October 10, 1899

There is another defect in that view that puts Christ away from men; that separates Him entirely from humanity; and that opens to Him means of grace that are not open to men in general in the flesh. And that is that when that view is held, those who profess

to be Christians do not receive as a truth, and hold it as a principle, that God is indeed able himself to teach a person in this world. But that it is possible for God to teach a person himself alone, through His word, is demonstrated in the life, in the education, in the Christianity, of Jesus Christ. Therefore it is Christianity to believe that God is able to do this for a person in this world. That is the beginning. It does not follow that God will always teach each person directly, without any other person being connected with the teaching. It was not so even in the case of Jesus; for Mary was His first teacher; and He grew in wisdom as well as in stature. God may use other persons as means of teaching. Yet even then God is the teacher; as it is written:

Isaiah 54

¹³ Your children shall be taught of the Lord;

—and,

Job 36

²² Who teaches like Him?

Jesus Christ calls all to Him:

Matthew 11

²⁸ Come unto me, all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

²⁹ Take my yoke upon you, and *learn of me*.

He is a teacher, a teacher sent from God. Now God has demonstrated that He himself is able to teach a person in this world. Christ, in His life and education, has demonstrated that any person in this world is able to learn of God. And now, having demonstrated that in human flesh, these two united, the Father and the Son, still come to mankind in this world, and call them to the Christianity of Jesus Christ, in which God and Christ are united in teaching human beings who believe Christ, and who wish to be Christians, and desire Christian education.

The world's system of education of ancient times, the wholly human system, culminated in the crucifixion of Christ. The

world's system of education in ancient times culminated on the one side—the side of the world—in paganism, which was utterly without the knowledge of God. On the other side—on the side of the professed church of God—it culminated in a church so altogether of the world that it could not recognize God when He came and spoke to them in person. And these two—paganism that did not know God, and a church that had forgotten God because of the world—joined themselves together and crucified Him out of the world, when He came to give them the true knowledge of God, when He came to show the true education. Therefore I say that the world's system of education of ancient times culminated in the rejection of God and the crucifixion of Christ. That is the measure of its failure.

On the other hand, through all that period, from the time of Abraham down to the time of Jesus Christ, God's system of education was maintained in the world, and IT culminated in Jesus Christ himself, the glory of God and of man, and the Saviour of the world. And that is the measure of its value, and its success.

The Lord was crucified, and ascended to heaven. He poured out the Holy Spirit, and so returned to abide with His disciples forever, and to be their Teacher and Guide. Then they went out into the world, preaching Christ, conveying Jesus Christ to mankind.

The world at that time is described to us in the first chapter of *1 Corinthians*, verse 18 to the end of the chapter. The world was wise. The world was educated, so perfectly educated, so supremely learned, that today professed Christian schools—the ones referred to by that master of theology in the Chicago University—these schools count that the greatest thing a student can study is the literature that was produced by the men of whom I read in this chapter. Beginning with verse 21:

1 Corinthians 1

²¹ For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

There are two propositions in that verse. The first is that “the world by wisdom knew not God.” How was it, by *what* was it, that the world knew not God? “By wisdom,” by education. And, bear in mind, that wisdom is the very wisdom that is the pride of professed Christian schools, universities, and colleges, as well as of the worldly schools, in the United States today. It is found in the classical literature—the Greek and Roman literature. It is the classical phase of education.

Now what did that wisdom, that education, do for those who had it in its “perfection”? What did it do for those who created it? It led them to where they did not know God. What, then, can it do for a people who did *not* create it, who are mere copyists in it?

The second proposition of the verse is that when the world by this means had been brought to where it did not know God, it pleased God to save people. It pleased God to present to the world His views; and He did it in *the preaching of the gospel*.

1 Corinthians 1

²¹ ...it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

And preaching is only teaching.

Now, mark the situation. Here was the world’s education. The world’s education had brought the world to where it did not know God. God comes to reach the world by preaching, which is simply teaching; and He sends out His apostles, those whom He had taught, to teach the world. Now, what did they use in their teaching? What did God employ from which to teach the world, when the world by wisdom had reached the point where it did not know God? *His word*, the Bible. Every one who is sent forth to preach under His commission is charged by the Lord himself:

2 Timothy 4

² Preach the Word.

They are not to diminish aught from it: “Preach the Word.”

Then: preaching is teaching; the world by its wisdom had reached the point where it did not know God; God comes now to teach the world, to give it the true education; and to do this, He takes His word and presents that to the world. And when that is done, it is counted foolishness, by the world. The Spirit of the Lord, when writing of it, recognizes the fact that it was called foolishness:

1 Corinthians 1

²¹ It pleased God by *the foolishness of preaching* to save them that believe.

It pleased Him to do in that way—by the *foolishness* of preaching the gospel—by the foolishness of *teaching the word of God*—what the *wisdom* of the *teaching of the world* and of the schools of the world had not been able to do.

And that is not the last time in which that idea has been called foolishness. You yourselves have heard it in Battle Creek. And not only has it been heard in Battle Creek, but also in almost every place where it has been proposed to have the Bible as the textbook and the basis of all education.

Now, let us read the Lord's estimate of that view of things.

¹⁸ For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness.

Now, note: To whom is the preaching of the word of God, and of the word of God only, foolishness? The preaching of the cross, that preaching that God sent into the world,—*that* is foolishness “*to them that perish.*” Then beware of this fearful danger—it must be pointed out: Whenever any person expresses the thought, or entertains the view, that the use of the Bible as the only source of Christian education, is foolishness, he thereby gives notice to the world that he is one of “them that perish.” Do you see?

1 Corinthians 1

¹⁸ For the preaching of the cross [this foolishness of preaching] is to *them that perish* foolishness.

It is foolishness only to them that perish. Then, to whomsoever that is foolishness, whoever holds it to be foolishness,—it is settled that he is advertising himself as a candidate for perishing.

“But unto us which are saved,” the use of the Bible as the basis of all education—that education which is *Christian* education—that education which comes from God—he who will receive that as Christianity, to him “it is *the power of God*.”

1 Corinthians 1

¹⁸ But unto us which are saved it [the preaching of the cross] is the power of God.

[Voices]: Amen.

Not only is it the power of God; but it is:

²⁴ ...the power of God, *and the wisdom of God*.

[Voices]: Amen.

Thus went forth the gospel, Christian education, in that day when Jesus sent forth His disciples preaching the Word. Presently, there were those who, in their professed Christianity and half-hearted Christian experience, thought that Christian education, Bible teaching—the teaching of the word of God—was too narrow. It was not sufficiently deep, nor sufficiently broad, not sufficiently balanced, to give Christianity the proper standing before the world. To give it its proper place, Christian education must be blended with the world’s education. Therefore they took the world’s philosophy and the world’s literature, and made them the real basis of education, and made the Bible and Christian education conform to them. That was the great apostasy, which finally seized upon the power of the Roman government; and of which the result was “the beast” of the book of *Revelation*.

When that result of the abandonment of true Christian education had manifested itself in the world, God again sent a message to the world in the great Reformation. In that again He exalted the Bible as truly educative, as that which has in it Christian edu-

cation, root and branch. And *that* made Protestantism. But instead of Protestantism holding fast to that principle, it, too, gradually became cold and half-hearted, adopted the world's wisdom and the world's literature, and imitated the world in its work of education. And so much is this so that, as you know, Protestantism is now making the very image of the beast.

Now, what shall be the end of all this? You know that the end of all things is at hand in this world. And you know that this world will utterly reject that which is Christian; and will receive as Jesus Christ the opposite of Christ, which is Satan. You know, likewise, that at that time—at the time when this world ends—when this world shall have rejected Jesus Christ—there will be one hundred and forty-four thousand persons in this world who will be just like Jesus Christ was when He was in the world. They will reflect His perfect image. They will stand in the world precisely as He stood. Upon them God can look, and see no fault at all; for it is written:

Revelation 14

⁵ They are without fault before the throne of God.

This whole company will stand before the world and before God without spot or wrinkle or any such thing; they will be holy, and without blemish. And as such, Jesus Christ will present this people to himself when He comes in the clouds of heaven.

Thus it is the truth that at Jesus Christ's second coming, *the world* will have reached precisely the point at which it stood at His first coming, and *by the same means too*. *God's work* in the world when Christ comes the second time, will also have reached precisely the point at which it stood at the time of Christ's first coming; for it will have culminated in the one hundred and forty-four thousand in whom the mystery of God is finished, which is...

Colossians 1

²⁷ Christ in you, the hope of glory.

And now, it is a question today, a testing question to the professed church of Christ, as to whether this church will eat of the tree of life, or whether she will turn to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; whether she will have Christian education, or a mixture of professedly Christian education with worldly education, after the living likeness of the great apostasy which made the beast mentioned in the book of *Revelation*, and which has wrought so much mischief in the world. That is the philosophy of Christian education as against an education that is utterly worldly; and as against an education that is a mixture of professed godliness and actual worldliness.

The tree of the knowledge of good *and evil* is no better today than it was the day when Eve and Adam partook of it. Refuse the evil, choose the good, and the good alone; for good *and evil* is only evil alone.

Part 3

Advent Review, October 17, 1899

Now, a little as to the *practice* of Christian education. I know that there are thousands of persons who are surprised, and so express themselves, whenever it is said that the Bible must be the basis of all true education; that the Bible must be the text-book in every line of study. The reason of that surprise is evident; the only reason that there can be for it is that to those persons the Bible is so small a thing, so utterly narrow and confined, that, in their estimation, to undertake to make the Bible the basis of all education, and the text-book in all studies, is like teaching nothing at all. But how much Christianity, how much confidence in the Bible, has a person to whom the Bible is so small as that? That is the question—the important question. So, one who is astonished that the Bible should be the basis of all education in Christian schools, one who is surprised that the Bible should be the text-book in every study in a Christian school, by that simply certifies to his own narrow view of the Bible: he simply tells how small the Bible is to him, and what a small place the Bible has in his life.

Now a few illustrations as to what really is the use of the Bible as the only text-book. First of all, bear in mind that the Bible as the *text*-book in every study does not mean the Bible as the only *study*-book in education. When the Bible is mentioned as a text-book, persons get the idea—and the only idea that they do get of it is—that the Bible is to be the only *study*-book. There is a material difference.

To illustrate: I took two texts this morning. You will remember that I read them from these papers. I took the two *texts* from these papers; but in the study I have led you into a considerable field which, in itself, is not expressed in words in those two texts. Those two passages are the *texts*; but I have used all the world's history as a field of *study*, in this hour. Those two passages are the two *texts*, and all the history to which I have called your attention is the *study*-book. Do you see the difference then between a *text*-book and a *study*-book?

This mistake of thinking that a *text*-book and a *study*-book are the same thing, came about by the fact that in the schools of the day all study-books are called text-books. To the *teachers* these books are supposed to be *text*-books; while to the students they are expected to be *study*-books. But instead of the *study*-books of the students being *text*-books to the teachers, nine times out of ten the *text*-books are *study*-books to the teachers; and the teacher does not get out of the *text*-book, and the students hardly ever get into it.

To use the Bible as a *text*-book is literally to take the Bible as a book from which to take the *text* of all lessons to be given, in Christian education. Take a statement of the Bible as a *text*; and then use all the realm of history, literature, science, nature, and human experience as your *study*-book. And that is not a narrow field of study.

How shall that be then? Perhaps I had better illustrate that: Botany must be a study in Christian schools everywhere; and the Bible will be the *text*-book. One of the *texts* will be this:

Matthew 6

²⁸ Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow.

And then, the *lily itself*, and how it grows—what causes it to grow—all the history, the literature, and the science of the lily—will be the *study-book*. That will be the field of study on that *text*. And for what purpose? Why does Jesus tell you and me to “consider the lilies of the field, how they grow”? “Consider;” that is, to *study* the lily. And why? For the reason stated in that place where it is written:

Hosea 14

⁵ Israel...shall grow as the lily.

You and I,—the Christian,—the students themselves, are to grow, under God, as the lily grows. Jesus tells every student to study the lily, to see and know how it grows, so that he may know how he himself is to grow. He is to find in the lily the life and the power of God by which it grows,—the means which God employs in the sunshine, the soil, the dew, and the rain, to cause it to grow,—and the science and philosophy of the growing itself, so that he may know how God will cause him *himself* to “grow as the lily.” Then, every student studying botany that way, only so far as the lily is concerned, will, whenever he sees a lily, get from that lily a lesson direct from God, telling him what God is doing in *his* life, and what God will put into his life by his believing on Him.

Another *text*:

Hosea 14

⁷ He shall revive as the corn and grow as the vine.

That is the *text*; and the study-book will be the *corn* and the *vine* themselves, in all the science, the philosophy, the literature, and the Scripture that can be found relating to the nature of the corn and the vine.

John 12

²⁴ Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abides alone: but if it die, it brings forth much fruit.

John 15

¹ I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman.

⁵ ...you are the branches.

Thus the corn and the vine will be the *study-book* for the student who has in the Bible the text, Israel “shall revive as the corn, and grow as the vine.” Then whenever he sees either corn or vine anywhere, it will speak to him lessons of experience, in the language of God.

Astronomy will be a study in Christian schools everywhere, and one of the texts used will be:

Job 38

³¹ Can you bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?

With that as a *text*, all the astronomy of the Pleiades will be the *study-book*. And when the student has covered the field of the Pleiades, and knows what *are* the sweet influences of the Pleiades, he will know, in his own life, the sweet influences of the Spirit of Him who gave sweet influences to the Pleiades; and this will make him in *his place* in the order of God what the Pleiades are in their place in the order of God.

More than this, it is written, in *Psalms* 147:3-4:

Psalms 147

³ He tells the number of the stars; He calls them all by their names.

⁴ He heals the broken in heart, and binds up their wounds.

When one has taken for his *text*, “Can you bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?” and has studied thoroughly the book of the Pleiades, and knows *Him* who *can* bind their sweet influences, he will know the sweet influences of Him who binds up the broken heart and heals the wounded spirit.

Now read *Isaiah* 40, the last three verses. First the 26th verse:

Isaiah 40

²⁶ Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who has created these things, that brings out their host by number: He calls them all by names by the greatness of His might, for that He is strong in power; not one fails.

Not one of them escapes His notice. And then the next verse:

²⁷ Why do you say, O Jacob, and speak, O Israel, My way is hid from the Lord, and my judgment is passed over from my God?

When the student, with this as his *text*, looks into that *study-book*, and knows something of the infinite number of the starry host, and knows that God calls these *all* by their *names*, he can easily understand that the Lord will never forget *his* name, nor shall he ever escape the Lord's notice. This is the Bible as a text-book.

Meteorology will be a study in all Christian schools; that is the study of the winds and the waves, the atmosphere, the rain, the dew, the ocean tides, the ocean itself. And one of the *texts* may be:

Ecclesiastes 1

⁶ The wind goes toward the south, and turns about unto the north; it whirls about continually, and the wind returns again according to his circuits.

With that as the text, the teacher will lead the students into the *study-book* of the course of the winds as they come out of the north, as they go to the south, as they whirl about continually, and as they return again according to their circuits. He will lead the students into the books that give the science of the winds, and so will conduct the students along the whole course of the circuit of the winds. Then the students will know that the wind has a circuit as certainly as the sun a course, and that the gentlest breeze that fans the cheek on a summer's day is wafted by the hand of the Lord, who...

Psalm 147

¹⁸ ...causes His wind to blow.

And *that* will be no small study-book.

Another text will be:

Ecclesiastes 1

⁷ 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.

The teacher will take that *text*, and will have his class get it well in mind. Then he will lead the class through the whole course of the philosophy, and the science, as it is given in the literature of the true science, of the return of the rivers from where they flow into the sea, to the place whence they came in the first place.

Another text on that same subject will be:

Amos 5

⁸ [God] calls for the waters of the sea, and pours them out upon the face of the earth.

That will be the *text*; the *study-book* will be all the literature that can be had that contains the science and the philosophy that will give to the student and the philosophy that will give to the student the actual facts, the procedure, and the means by which God picks up the water from the sea, and transports it over the earth, and pours it out upon the earth—two hundred and fifty-two cubic *miles* of water every twenty-four hours.

And, by the way, by the time that the student has gone through that, he will be no tyro [beginner] in arithmetic. And this recalls to my mind a query that is made by man,

“How in the world are you going to teach arithmetic from the Bible?”

That is about the way it is put. Now, that a person does not know how to do it, is no proof that it cannot be done. You can see, from what I have cited, how arithmetic will come in, not as an abstract thing, but as an actual experience in the daily life of

the student as he studies the taking up of the waters from the sea, the transporting of them through the air, the pouring out of them in the form of the rain or the snow. As the student actually practices arithmetical calculations as a material part of his studies, arithmetic will be found a most practical thing, and will be far more beneficial than when it is studied abstractly and merely for practice.

But the greatest benefit is that in all the study and work the student is *living with God*, and is studying the works of God. And it will be found that such study will have such a hold upon the student, such a charm indeed, that there will be no need of urging, driving, threatening, etc., to have the students get their lessons. They will be so wrapped up in it that they will be studying their lessons, and will have them well learned because they are interested at every step, and wish to know.

“Well,” one may say, “that will do very well after a person has *learned* arithmetic; but how are you going to use the Bible in teaching the children—the beginners—that two times two are four?”

As to two and two are four, or eight times nine are seventy-two,—the simple calculations in addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division,—so far as the actual fact is concerned, the process is the same whether it be the Bible as the basis, or something else, such as stock exchange. There is no difference in the material thing involved as to the use of the nine digits and the cipher; but there is a most important difference in the *association of the ideas* that come to the student’s mind, and become a part of his very self as he uses the nine digits and the cipher in his lessons. The question is which will be the better way? which will have the better influence on the child’s life? which will have more influence,—not simply more, but the BETTER influence, upon his character (and character is the great object in all education)?

- Which is better,—to take the problem from the Bible, or from the stock exchange?

- Which will be better for the child,—to have his mind drawn to things outside of the Bible every time his mind is called to those figures, or to have the mind drawn to the things in the Bible?
- Which is better,—to have his mind filled with the stock exchange, with the idea of getting the advantage over others, and of making all he can in a worldly way; or to take problems from the Bible, which will teach him something better?

And the way that you answer these questions, will tell you whether your heart is more with the Bible than with the world, or more with the world than with the Bible.

I am perfectly free to say that I believe this thoroughly: that the child who, in his first steps in figures, has all his problems in the use of figures drawn from the Bible, has far better influences surrounding him, and meets something of far more benefit to his character and character development, than if all his problems are concerned with hogs, and horses, and “percent,” and “How much did he make?” “How much did he lose?” “Did he gain or lose?”—all taken from the world, and in the world’s own way; simply teaching him selfishness—how to make money. The associations that fix themselves in the child’s mind, and inevitably mold his character,—*that* is the philosophy of the Bible in the beginning of number work, with little children; and it is all expressed in that saying that “First impressions are most lasting.” The first impressions upon the mind of a man or a child are always most lasting; and these will associate with his thoughts in spite of himself with everything that ever comes to him. The only question is as to whether it is preferable to have these first impressions from the word of God, or from the things of this world. And surely nobody whose heart is with God can have any difficulty in answering the question.

I will not take your time longer; but this that I have presented for your consideration is something which I hope will help you to

understand what the truth of Christian education is; what the philosophy of it is; and what the principle is, in making the Bible first in all, the beginning and the end in everything, in Christian education. And these teachers, these church-school teachers, who go out from here before another Sabbath comes, may nothing draw them away from the closest possible allegiance to that one thing—that one principle—that the Bible is the beginning and the end; the all in all; the basis of all true education, and the text-book in every line of study that is taken up in Christian education. Make the study of this one Book the study of your life; study it until it becomes your very life. Is not that the very best preparation that a teacher can make? And then, when it is your very life, it will be your *text-book*, while all true learning, all true science, all sound literature, and all nature,—all this will be your *study-book*. *Then*, wherever you go, you will have such success in teaching as no other kind of teachers in the world can have. Then these educators who are calling for just such things as these, will find that for which they are longing.

God wishes to give to the world just such an education as this. And thus God can manifest to the world that which He has longed since Christ's day to manifest in the world, but which He has not had the opportunity to do since Christ was in the world.

God will redeem a people from the world,—a people that will be separate from every untoward thing,—a people that will stand in this world as did Christ Jesus, amid the wickedness and perverseness of this world; and He will do it by His word and Spirit, by the foolishness of preaching that blessed Word, the Bible.

This is Christian education; and you will find it in Jesus Christ. And that is what He has put you into the world for. Jesus Christ has put it into the Bible for all people; and...

Job 36

⁴ He that is perfect in knowledge is with you;

—and...

Job 36

²² Who teaches like Him?

Part 4

Advent Review, October 24, 1899

Said Jesus:

Matthew 11

²⁸ Come unto me, all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

²⁹ Take my yoke upon you, and LEARN OF ME; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and you shall find rest unto your souls.

All that is true. Jesus calls no one to Him to receive anything without giving in perfect fullness that thing.

One of the things, the chief and particular thing in this calling here, is *rest*. He gives rest to every one who will receive it. He *has given* it, indeed. He has prepared it for all the world. It is for every heaven laden soul, and is free to every soul. Hundreds of you know that this is true—that He gives rest to all who come to Him. You have received that rest unto your souls.

You worked a long time to *get* rest yourself; but nobody can ever find rest by *working*; he has to stop working before he *can* find rest. That is true in your everyday experience, whether you are washing or plowing, or whatsoever your work may be; and the only way any one can ever obtain rest in Jesus Christ, is to stop working. And the only way that anyone can stop working his own works is by finding the works of God, which satisfy to perfection. Having obtained the works of God that are in Jesus Christ, which is the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ; having perfection of conduct, which every soul is longing for, and cannot rest without having obtained in Christ,—then you can rest. Therefore it is written that...

Hebrews 4

¹⁰ [Every one who] has entered into His rest...has ceased from his own works, as God did from His.

I thus cite, at the beginning, your experience, as a groundwork for something further, which you must admit, and which you must know, if you do not yet know it. I ask your special attention to the clause, “*Learn of me.*” *In this* you shall find rest to your souls. I wish you to see and acknowledge that to *learn of Christ* will give you rest, just as well as to come to Him and receive the *gift* of rest.

He does call us to Him to learn of Him: “Learn of me.” Anyone who calls another to him so that that person may learn, *in that act* says that he has something to teach. Jesus Christ, then, has something to teach to all whom He calls. And He calls *everybody*. Therefore to every one who comes to Him, Jesus Christ has something to teach. He expects to become the teacher to that person.

But I have learned that many of those who come to Christ for rest, and professedly to learn of Him, will not allow Him to be their teacher. Therefore let us inquire whether Christ is, in himself, and properly, a sufficient teacher,—such a teacher as will justify a person who comes to Him in taking Him as his teacher.—his true, supreme, and only teacher.

It is said of Christ, and you know it, that in Him...

Colossians 2

³ ...are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

Do you admit that? Will you hold to it? For that is your test nowadays, and will be, until you get out of this world. Therefore is it a settled thing with you—do you believe it?—that in Jesus Christ...

³ ...are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge?

And that THERE is the only true place to obtain wisdom and knowledge?

In other words, are ALL the treasures of WISDOM and KNOWLEDGE sufficient for you? That is the question. Is that storehouse, that fountain of wisdom and knowledge, of all wis-

dom and all knowledge, sufficient to satisfy you? Can you drink at that fountain and be filled? Or must you go to some other source for additional knowledge? These are fair questions: they are not vain questions; they are not questions at random; they are not questions asked into the air; they are asked directly to you.

In another place it is spoken by the Lord Jesus to every believer:

Matthew 28

¹⁸ All power [all authority] is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

¹⁹ Go therefore, and teach all nations,...and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.

Therefore it is written in yet another place:

Job 36

⁴ He that is perfect in knowledge is with you,

—and,

²² Who teaches like Him?

Is Jesus Christ with you? What do you say? Is He?

[Voice]: Amen. Yes, sir.

In that then you acknowledge that He who is perfect in knowledge is with you. And He is with you to teach you? Then, is He really your teacher? Is He who is perfect in knowledge, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,—is He a sufficient teacher for you? Has He sufficient wisdom to satisfy all your needs?

[Voice]: Yes.

Does He know enough to supply all that you need to know?

[Voice]: Yes, sir.

It is written in another place, appealing to us all, thus:

Psalm 94

⁹ He that formed the eye, shall He not see?

Whoever made the eye knows what it is to see. Before He made your eye, before He made any eye at all, He knew what it is to see. And knowing that, He was able to make that wonderful thing, the eye. Again:

⁹ He that made the ear shall He not hear?

Before He made the ear, He knew what it is to hear; and, knowing that, He made the ear. Finally:

¹⁰ He that *teaches man knowledge*, shall He not know?

As He who made the eye knew, before the eye was made, what it is to see; as He who made the ear knew, before the ear was made, what it is to hear; so He who teaches man knowledge knew, before man was made, what it is to know. Thus He is revealed as the source of knowing; He is the fountain of knowledge. What is it then for any one to go elsewhere for knowledge? What is that but to forsake the fountain of knowledge?

Where would be the wisdom of the man, who, knowing, and having approached unto, a fountain of living water, would leave that and go down to drink of the slow-moving waters of the valley? Would that be even common, every-day, human discretion? At the fountain is the pure, clear, ever-flowing waters, which have gathered impurities as they have flowed along, and which have lost their cooling, refreshing, vivifying spirit. What then is it, compared with that water which flows from the fount, at the fountainhead? Mark, it is not a question of merely *drinking* of the slow-moving, murky waters of the valley: that water might do for those who know not of the fountain, and have never drunk there. The question is, What of the man who *knows* of the fountain, and has drunk its refreshing water, yet who leaves this and drinks of the slow-moving, murky waters of the valley?

What is it then for persons who profess to know God, who profess to be Christians, who profess to believe in Jesus Christ, and

who profess to have Christ, and God in Christ, dwelling with them,—what is it for these persons to leave God in Jesus Christ, *the fountain of knowledge*, the perfect teacher, and go to some other place to drink in wisdom and knowledge? What is it for Christians to leave the fountain of knowledge and go to worldly sources, perhaps absolutely pagan sources, for wisdom and knowledge—philosophy and learning? Such knowledge as that may do for those who do not know the fountain of knowledge; but what can be the taste of those who, *knowing the fountain of knowledge*, leave this blessed fountain, and are satisfied with that which is found in the swamps and bogs of worldly science and pagan philosophy?

Education of Christians must be Christian education. If it is not Christian education, then what kind of education have those Christians, and whence can come Christian education? Can Christianization come from paganism? Are Christianity and paganism one? Can Christian education come from infidelity and atheism? Are Christianity, infidelity, and paganism all so nearly one that in learning from authors that are infidel, atheist, or pagan,—adopting their ideas, accepting their views, imbibing their thoughts,—we shall learn Christianity? Are Christianity and the world the same thing? Are Christian education and the education that is of the world the same thing?

He said *to* His disciples, whom *you* are:

John 15

¹⁹ You are not of the world.

He said *of* His disciples, to His Father:

John 17

¹⁴ They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.

To His disciples He said,

John 15

¹⁹ I have chosen you out of the world.

And you know it is written, to you and me:

1 John 2

¹⁵ Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.

¹⁶ For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.

There is a separation between Christians and the world. There is a separation between Christianity and worldliness. There is a separation between Christian things and worldly things. There is a separation between Christian education and worldly education. *And the separation between Christian education and worldly education is as wide as that between Christ and this world.* That is as certain as that there is a separation at all between Jesus Christ and the world; for Christ is Christianity: without Him, there is no Christianity; and there is no Christianity in anything that is outside of Him.

Therefore, Jesus Christ himself is Christianity; all that is of Christ being Christianity, and that *only* being Christianity, as certainly as Christ has education for the people; as certainly as He is an educator; as certainly as He has that which the people must learn; as certainly as He is a teacher: so certainly He is a *Christian* teacher; and so certainly that which He has for the people to learn is Christian learning and Christian education. And outside of that, there is no Christian education.

Any education that is not Christian is not fit for a Christian to have. For when we enter through the wide-open door of the kingdom of God, at the coming of Christ, for which coming we are looking,—in that day I can take nothing with me through those gates that is not Christian.

Whatever education I may have received that is not Christian, will have to be left outside in that day; it cannot go in. Then, as I am preparing to enter, alive, through those wide-open gates, at His coming; and as you are preparing, and profess to be looking,

for that day in which you and I shall enter, alive, though those gates of the city; you and I must now, in this time, be sure that we have nothing in us, about us, or of us that is not Christian, even to the material of our education.

Now, have I said too much?

[Voices]: No.

Why are we *professing* Christians unless we intend to be nothing but Christians? What is my profession of Christianity worth to me, or to the world, unless I am through and through, up and down, entirely Christian? Unless my whole heart is set unto that one thing, and is welcoming any of the searching of the Spirit of God, by whatever means He may employ to search me through and through, to find in me what is not of Christ, and separate it from me—why do I profess to be Christ's, unless I stand in that place?

32. Christian Education – II

Advent Review, October 31 & November 7, 1899⁴⁸

Part 1

Advent Review, October 31, 1899

SINCE the apostles' days, immediately after the ascension of Jesus Christ, there has been no Christian education in this world, excepting in a very small measure, on the little theater, though infinitely large in itself, occupied by the Waldenses, and by the Reformers in the earliest days of the Reformation. But, to take that which has been accepted as Christianity—Christianity as it stands in the world—since the days of the apostles ended and the apostasy began, there has not been any properly Christian education in this world.

But we are in the time when this world will see—when it *must* see—that which is truly Christian education.

I have said that, since the apostasy began to enter, this has not been; because the apostasy began to enter and made its grand entree at the last, *upon this very issue*—that of a mixture of pagan, worldly education with professed Christianity. And there was a contest then between Christians indeed and those who were mere formal professors of Christianity, as to what is true Christian education. And the apostasy gained the day. But the time has come when there is to be in the world a complete separation from the apostasy, and a complete union with true Christian education, on the part of Christians. And the apostasy will end exactly where it began—*upon this very issue*—the issue between Christian education in its sincerity and purity, and a worldly, pagan mixture, passed off by formal professed Christians for Christianity.

CHRISTIANITY CORRUPTED WITH PHILOSOPHY

Now, I will read to you a few paragraphs of the history that was made at the beginning of the apostasy, that you may see exactly

⁴⁸ Sermon preached at Ionia, Michigan camp-meeting, August 22, 1899, and stenographically reported.

how matters were then, and just what was the issue upon which the apostasy entered. The first century is from 1 to 100 AD. The apostle John died about 98 to 99 AD. The second century is from 101 to 200 AD. The end of the second century would be from one hundred and fifty to two hundred years this side of Christ. That, you see, is only about fifty years and onward after the death of the last of the apostles.

In this latter part of the second century there was a school of worldly philosophy called the Eclectic, because the idea of the school was that in all phases of philosophy there was truth; and, according to this school, he was the true philosopher who gathered from all sources into one, the truth of all the philosophy that could be found. I now read:

This philosophy was adopted by such of the learned at Alexandria as wished to be accounted Christians, and yet retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers. In particular, all those who in this century presided in the schools of *the Christians* at Alexandria—Athenagoras, Pantenus, and Clemens Alexandrinus—are said to have approved of it.⁴⁹

That is, these all approved of that scheme of adopting this pagan philosophy while still retaining the name of Christians. Continuing, I read:

These men were persuaded that true philosophy, the great and most salutary gift of God, lay in scattered fragments among all the sects of philosophers; and therefore that it was the duty of every wise man, and especially of a Christian teacher, to collect these fragments from all quarters, and to use them for the defense of religion and the confutation of impiety. Yet this selection of opinions did not prevent them from regarding Plato as wiser than all the rest.⁵⁰

And Plato got his wisdom from Egypt too. Do not forget that it is written, even unto this day:

⁴⁹ Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, chap. i, par. 6, Murdock's translation.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

Matthew 2

¹⁵ Out of Egypt have I called my son;

—and,

1 John 3

¹ Behold, what manner of love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God.

That is, that we should be called out of Egypt. They regarded Plato...

...as wiser than all the rest, and as especially remarkable for treating the Deity, *the soul*, and *things remote from sense* [that is correct enough] so as to suit the Christian scheme.

That is, of all the people in the world of ancient times, Plato was held by these philosopher Christians to have been the most fully Christian.

Presently, there appeared in Alexandria, in Egypt, one of these mixed philosophers,—badly mixed,—named Ammonius Saccas, who was so thoroughly pagan that all the pagans knew he was a pagan, and yet made so artful a profession of Christianity that all these mixed Christians acknowledged him to be a Christian. He established a school, or rather drew off from all these, and formed a school, which took precedence of the other. The key of his philosophical system was that when the truth was known, all sects had the very same truth; that the difficulties were caused by the different ways in which that truth was stated; and that the climax of all philosophy was to find such a means of stating the truth that all should be able to perceive and understand it, and so all be one. Ammonius had two disciples who were especially promising. One was Plotinus, who took the pagan side of Ammonius's philosophy, and ran it in the channel of sheer paganism; the other was Origen, who became the very chief of the "fathers of the church," who took the professed Christian side of Ammonius's philosophy, and ran it in the course of that mere formal

profession of Christianity which ended in the full apostasy and the complete development of the papacy in the world.

Now, I read again:

The grand object of Ammonius, to bring all sects and religions into harmony, required him to do much violence to the sentiments and opinions of all parties,—philosophers, priests, and Christians,—and particularly by allegorical interpretations to remove all impediments out of his way. . . . To make the arduous task more easy, he assumed that philosophy was first produced and nurtured among the people of the East; that it was inculcated among *the Egyptians by Hermes*, and *thence passed to the Greeks*; that it was a little obscured and deformed by the disputatious Greeks; but still that *by Plato, the best interpreter of the principles of Hermes* and of the ancient Oriental sages, *it was preserved for the most part entire and unsullied.*⁵¹

To these assumptions he added the common doctrines of *the Egyptians* (among whom he was born and educated) concerning the universe and the Deity, as constituting *one great whole* (Pantheism); concerning the eternity of the world, the nature of the soul, providence, and the government of this world by demons, and other received doctrines; all of which he considered as true and not to be called in question.

And for anyone to call it in question was disrespect to him and to education in general. Continuing, I read:

For it is most evident that the ancient philosophy of *the Egyptians*, which they pretended to have learned from Hermes, was the *basis* of the New Platonic, or *Ammonian*; and the book of Jamblichus, *De Mysteriis Aegyptiorum*, in particular, shows this to be the case.

To this Aegyptiaco-Platonic philosophy, this ingenious man and fanatic joined a system of moral discipline, apparently of high sanctity and austerity. . . . And these precepts *Ammonius*, *like one born and educated among Christians*, was accustomed to

⁵¹ *Idem*, chap. iii, par. 5.

embellish and express by *forms of expression borrowed from the sacred Scriptures*, which has caused such language to occur abundantly in the writings of his followers.⁵²

One of the earliest to espouse this philosophy from among those who professed to be Christians was Clement of Alexandria (all these were of Egypt; and in Egypt, do not forget), who became the head of that kind of school at Alexandria. These philosophers...

...believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings,—the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import of the words; the other recondite, and concealed under the words, like a nut by the shell. The former they neglected, as of little value, their study chiefly being to extract the latter: in other words, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the Sacred Writings by the fictions of their own imaginations than on searching out their true meanings. Some also, and this is stated especially of Clement, accommodated the divine oracles to the precepts of philosophy.⁵³

Clement died about 220 AD, and was succeeded in the headship of that school, by Origen, who had been taught by both Clement and Ammonius. Now, a word further: These two disciples of Ammonius—Clement and Origen—caused the Christian school to take a strong position. Many were gathered to it. Their success was such as to push all other Christian education into the background. Among the pagans, the school of Ammonius, and of his successor Plotinus, also caused his school to be so successful that it...

...gradually cast all others into the background. From Egypt it spread in a short time over the whole Roman Empire, and drew after it almost all persons who took any interest in things remote from sense.

On the other hand:

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*

The estimation in which *human learning* should be held was a question on which *the Christians were about equally divided*. Many recommended the study of *philosophy*, and an *acquaintance with the Greek and the Roman literature*; while others maintained that these were *pernicious to the interests of genuine Christianity and the progress of true piety*. The cause of letters and philosophy triumphed, however, by degrees; and those who wished well to them continued to gain ground till at length the superiority was manifestly decided in their favor. *This victory was principally due to the influence of Origen*, who, having been early instructed in the new kind of Platonism already mentioned, blended it, though unhappily, with the purer and more sublime tenets of a celestial doctrine, and recommended it in the warmest manner to the youth who attended his public lessons. The Christians; and in proportion to his rising credit, his method of proposing and explaining the doctrines of Christianity gained authority till it became *almost universal*.

The principles of these two schools were so evenly balanced that:

Some of the disciples of Plotinus embraced Christianity *on condition* that they should be allowed to retain such of the opinions of their master as they thought of superior excellence and merit. This must also have contributed, in some measure, to turn the balance in favor of *the sciences*. These *Christian philosophers*, preserving still a *fervent zeal for the doctrines of their heathen chief*, would naturally embrace every opportunity of spreading them abroad, and instilling them into the minds of the ignorant and the unwary.

That is enough to show the beginning of the apostasy. And you see that it began in the adoption of worldly education instead of Christian education; the use of Greek and Roman literature instead of the Christian literature; pagan text-books instead of the Book of Christianity, which in itself is the text-book of all that is Christian.

This is also enough to show you the origin of that beast of the book of *Revelation*. Now, you and I are in the time of the making

of an image to that beast, and you know it. Is it strange, then, that in this time there should be involved that same controversy between Christian education and worldly education that was involved when the beast was made?

THE PLACE FOR THE BIBLE

Is not the image of this beast to be formed in our day?

[Voices]: Yes.

Do you then, Seventh-day Adventists particularly, begin to see some of the importance of the subject of Christian education? Do you begin to understand something of the propriety of abandoning the worldly education, worldly literature, and worldly schools, and of confining yourselves to Christian education, Christian literature, and Christian schools?

[Voice]: Amen.

I know that a great many have not seen this subject that way yet, and that is why I am telling this to you now. It is high time that every Christian, whether Seventh-day Adventist or not, should find out what is Christian education.

Part 2

Advent Review, November 7, 1899

The other day a gentleman asked me why it is that the Mohammedan religion has a stronger hold upon Mohammedans as a people, than the Christian religion has upon Christians as a people. The answer is, Because the Mohammedans have a Mohammedan education.

[Voices]: Amen; that is right.

The book of Mohammedanism is the Koran; and all children are instructed in the Koran alone until they reach—I don't know what age—the age of manhood, anyhow. That is what makes them Mohammedans. If Christians would use the Bible as the Mohammedans use the Koran, Christianity would be to those Chris-

tians as real, as all-absorbing, and would hold them as certainly and as firmly, as Mohammedanism holds the Mohammedans. Yet it is not enough to say that it would hold them, AS certainly, AS firmly, comparatively: but it would hold them AS MUCH MORE SO as Christianity is stronger, broader, higher, and purer than is Mohammedanism, and as the Bible is above the Koran: so much as the Bible is more than the Koran, so much more would Christianity have a hold upon Christians than Mohammedanism has upon Mohammedans.

It has been remarked by many, and many times, that Catholics, as a people, are more firmly established in their religion than Protestants, as a people, in theirs; and here the same reasoning holds. Let Protestants use the Protestant book of religion as the Catholics use the Catholic books, and Protestantism will have a hold upon Protestants as much stronger than Catholicism has upon Catholics as the Protestant book, the Bible, is above Catholic books. Everybody knows that Catholics, as a people, teach their children, from the beginning, as long as possible, the Catholic religion, from Catholic books; while Protestants do not do that from the Protestant book, the Bible.

This brings us to the consideration of the literature—the Book of Christianity,—as the basis of Christian education—as the Text-book in Christian schools. That book we profess to believe, we profess to hold, as the word of God,—as the word, the instruction, the teaching, of Him who is the fountain of knowledge,—as the teaching of Him who is perfect in knowledge, and like unto whom no man, no one, can teach. We profess that; why not then, stick strictly to your profession?

[Voice]: Amen.

Why not give that book, the word of God, that instruction, that knowledge, which comes from the Fountain of knowledge, which is given by Him who is perfect in knowledge—why not give all this the place that belongs to it in the profession we make concerning it?

PAGAN LITERATURE

Pagan literature is still extant in the schools, not simply in the schools of the world, but also in the denominational schools of the Protestant churches of the world. Pagan literature, infidel philosophy, atheistic ideas, are in the text-books and the books of study not only in the schools of the world, but also in the denominational schools of the churches of professed Christians in the United States.

Now, let me ask you this question: How long must a person study pagan literature before he shall become a Christian by that? How long will he have to study it in order to become a Christian? How much is there in it that will help him become a Christian?

[Voices]: Nothing.

Is pagan literature the channel to Christianity?

[Voices]: No, no.

How long, then, must persons who desire to be Christians study text-books through which the only thread, from beginning to end, is infidel, atheistic, or pagan, before, by such study, they shall become Christians? Are such books, is such instruction, such education, the channel to Christianity?

But it is said that...

These studies are not primarily to teach paganism: the idea is not that the student shall gather the philosophy, or the instruction, that is in this literature; but it is used primarily *as the best means of developing the mind*, of creating mental vigor, of increasing intellectual power.

Let us look at that: that is some philosophy on the opposite side of that question. Suppose that I, a student, enter a school where those kinds of books are used for the purpose of developing capacity and intellectual power. Suppose I take the course unto completion. I have an immense capacity developed; but *what is in it?* It is not expected that I shall gather from the literature what is

in it, because that is intensely, basely, immoral. Everybody knows that, who knows anything of paganism.

[Voices]: Amen.

Greece and Rome sank into irretrievable ruin through the corruptions that they gathered from this identical literature, and from the men who made the literature, which forms the study books in the schools both of the churches and of the world today: Homer, Plato, Virgil, Cicero, Caesar, and others of their kind.

Let me repeat that Greece and Rome were sunk to the depths of immorality that ruined them, under the teaching, and BECAUSE of the teaching, of the men who wrote the literature that is “classical” in the schools of today. And upon that awful fact, I inquire, How can the study of that same literature save people nowadays, and make them Christians? I want to know how long people who wish to be Christians can study that literature to profit? And when the colleges and the State schools throughout the nation are teaching these things to their students, and are turning out these students by the thousands every year, how long will it be before, under *such* teaching, this nation shall be brought to the same condition, which must end only in the same sort of ruin to which the Greeks and the Romans, as nations, were brought by like teaching in their day? That is worth thinking of by all Christians, by all those who profess to be Christians, and by all who desire to be Christians.

Now to the thought of the “object of these studies being to develop capacity.” Let it for the occasion be admitted. Of what use is this capacity when the student has not taken into it anything valuable? He has the capacity, if you will; but as to any real good, it is *empty*. And don’t you forget that every degree of capacity that is made and not filled with that which is good, will, in these days, inevitably be filled with that which is NOT GOOD.

[Voice]: Amen.

That is the evil that there is in that system of education; while the philosophy of true education is to develop capacity only by putting in the good, and develop it no faster than it can be filled with that which is good.

The very idea of what the world supposes to be education is an error; that is, that education is a *drawing out*. The Latin word *educare* means to draw out; and therefore it is said that this means that we are to draw out, to develop, the powers that are within. But all the powers that are within are only the powers of self; and this development is only the development of self.

TRUE EDUCATION

Now, *the truth* as to education is just the opposite of that. True education is the putting *the good* INTO the man. The true definition of education, and the true philosophy of it, is to “restore the image of God in the soul.”⁵⁴ *That* is the taking of something from without, and putting it within the man; and that is true education. The false education is that which takes a man, and develops him as a balloon—puffs him up. It is that which develops a vast intellectual capacity, with nothing in it except what he can gather from the world, which is nothing but bad. Then, when he really desires to receive Christianity, he must throw out all that is there before Christianity can ever possibly get in.

Let Christians hold to only such education as will put into the minds of the children nothing but the truth. And as the word of God is the truth, this demands that the Bible shall be the textbook in all education. It is literally true that there is nothing in the world that will develop intellectual capacity and power as well the word of God.

[Voices]: Amen.

The true philosophy of it is this: The word of God is known and understood only by faith. Faith, as it is exercised, “grows exceed-

⁵⁴Ellen White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 595.

ingly,”⁵⁵ and thus develops the mind on its own part. On the other side, the righteousness of God is revealed to each degree of faith,

Romans 1

¹⁷ ...from faith to faith.

And the righteousness of God is an expanding principle. And so the mind being developed from the side of the individual by the growth of faith, and from the side of God by the expanding power of the righteousness of God revealed to each degree of faith, the Bible is the greatest educating power in the world. *And it never develops a degree of capacity that is not filled to the full by the truth of God,* by the word of God, by the Spirit of God himself.

[Voices]: Amen.

This principle is expressed in the Scriptures thus:

Colossians 1

⁹ [I cease not] to pray for you, and to desire that you might be filled with the knowledge of His will in wisdom and spiritual understanding;

¹⁰ That you might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God.

Filled, and increasing,—filled, and yet increasing.

Thus in Christian education you have the double advantage: you have that which develops most of all, the human mind; and that which fills all the capacity as fast as it is developed.

Morality is the only security in education. And Christianity is the only true morality. Therefore the only secure, the only true, education is Christian education. The book, the literature, of Christianity is the Bible. Therefore the only true Christian education is that of which the Bible is the sum and the substance, the warp and the woof.

⁵⁵ 2 Thessalonians 1:3.

Christian education is more than the cultivation of the intellectual part of man: it is the cultivation of the moral as supreme, and the highest possible cultivation of the intellectual only as tributary to the supremely moral. Yet neither is it the cultivation of only the intellectual and the moral: it is the cultivation of the physical as well. And this, too, as tributary to both the intellectual and the moral. Christian education, therefore, is the symmetrical and the highest possible cultivation of every faculty,—physical, intellectual, and moral,—in order to glorify God on the earth, and finish the work that He has given Christians to do.

Therefore as certainly as we are Christians, as certainly as we *profess* to be Christians, as certainly as we *would be* Christians, is it not most proper, and high time, that you and I, and all such, should diligently seek a Christian education in its veriest sincerity and its highest perfection?

33. The Bible as a Textbook

Advent Review, November 14 & 21, 1899⁵⁶

PP Editor's note: The first part of this sermon was included in Chapter 7 of the book, *The Place of the Bible in Education*.

Part 1

November 14, 1899

I AM to speak to you on the subject of the Bible as the basis of all education, the text-book in all studies. I speak to you on these subjects to persuade you, as far as possible, to give to the Bible the place which really belongs to it, and which Christians profess belongs to it.

THE FIRST PLACE

The Bible should be the first thing in every line of study, for the same reason that it must be the first thing with the child; and that reason is expressed in a saying familiar to all:

First impressions are most lasting.

The Bible should be the source of the first instruction that the child receives in the world; and, as everybody is a child in every line of study that is new to him, the Bible should be the first of all things in all studies.

It is the truth that when a person lives, and a few do live, in such a way that the life simply fades out because of age, the last thing that such a person thinks of is the first thing that he ever learned. I say it again, for it is a *principle* of education: The first thing that is ever fixed upon a person's mind, is the last thing that that mind dwells upon, if the life is completed, and simply fades out in old age.

You all know of Gladstone, the great English statesman, who died only last year. He died a very old man. As his life was fading out indeed, it was noticed that he was saying over and over again the Lord's prayer in French. That excited some query, as he was

⁵⁶This sermon was delivered at the Seventh-day Adventist camp meeting, Ionia, Michigan, Thursday evening, August 24, 1899, and stenographically reported.

an Englishman. Why should he be saying the Lord's prayer *in French*? Inquiries were made, because of the interest that was thus aroused; and it was learned that when he was a little child, he was in charge of a French nurse, and that the French nurse was a Christian, and had taught him the Lord's prayer in her native language. And as that happened to be the first thing that was fixed upon his mind, it was the last thing that was dwelt upon by his mind as it faded out in death.

Now, if that nurse had not been a Christian, and had taught that child, "Hi, diddle, diddle, the cat's in the fiddle," it would have worked precisely the same way, and *that* would have been the last thing that he would have spoken on his death-bed. If she had taught him Aesop's fables instead of the Lord's prayer, they would have been the last things that he would have murmured as his mind faded away. Not long ago I knew of another person who died at a little past ninety-six years of age. The Lord's prayer was also one of the things that that person repeated. Another thing she did in the last days of her life was to count—one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, and so on up to ten, but not beyond—just as a little child learns to count. So that mind, in its last hours, was dwelling on things and upon scenes of her first hours of conscious memory—the things that were first fixed in her mind. How beautiful it is that the last thought of a mind fading out in death is thought of God in His word! How aptly in the resurrection will the first thought take up the connection! This is enough to illustrate the principle that is the basis of the philosophy of using the Bible as the first thing in all Christian education.

This, you will all admit, is all well enough in the case of the child, the little infant who is learning the first things. But it is no more necessary there than it is everywhere else; for every one is a child, an infant, in the things that he is first learning. If you or I were to begin to study any new language, we would be altogether babes in that language. We know nothing at all there; there is not a thought in the language that is ours; not a word in the language that is ours; not a word in the language that can possibly convey

a thought. That is the way it is with the child as he begins to learn in the world. He has to receive things to be impressed upon the mind, to give thought, to awake intelligence. All that you will ever know in that language must be learned from, and by, the language itself. You must learn the language first of all, in order to learn anything in the language. And whatever impressions are first made in your mind in that language will go with you through all your life in that language. Whatever it may be, it will cast its influence over everything that you ever learn in that language afterward where the same words are used.

For instance, you begin to study the language that you may have chosen, with any part of the Bible—the first verses of *Genesis*, or the first of *John*. Suppose it be Greek. And as the book of *John* is about the simplest, easiest book in the New Testament, in Greek, suppose you begin with that. The first words are, as translated:

John 1

¹ In the beginning was the Word.

There you have five words: *en arche en ho logos*—*en arche en ho logos*. The word *arche* means “the beginning,” and the word *logos* means “the word.” Now, if that is the first Greek that you ever learn, the thoughts in these words being the first that you ever think in that language, then whenever afterward you meet, in the Greek language, that word *arche*, you will be reminded of the beginning of all things; and whenever you read the word *logos*, you will be reminded of the Word of God, which is God. And this even though the word *arche* or *logos*, which you may read elsewhere, may have no reference in its place to *this* beginning, or to the Word of God. Thus wherever you go in that language, your mind will carry the thought of God, and of Christ, the Word and the beginning of all things.

Now suppose that, on the other hand, you begin the study of the Greek in some pagan authors; and the first word that you learn there should be this same word *arche*, referring to the be-

ginning of some pagan project or mythological exploit. That is the first thought that you receive in Greek. Then suppose that afterward you come to the same word in the Bible, even this very word in the first of *John*,—as certainly as you do, that pagan thought and the scene connected with it, which you first received from that word, will cast their pagan shadow over the divine meaning of the same word when read in the word of God. It is impossible to be otherwise; for that is the only thought that you have in your mind in connection with that word. And whatever other thought may afterward be attached to the word, that first one will forever remain.

Now which is better: which affords the better prospect to the mind—to begin in such a way that wherever you go after that, the thought of God himself shall be with you, and accompany you in all your study in that language; or to begin in such a way that paganism will be first in all things, even to the overshadowing of the word of God, when you study that? To ask the question is to answer it: you see that plainly enough.

Now, in illustration, I will cite an actual occurrence: A few years ago I was passing through a high school, in which persons of another language were studying English. The book that lay open on the desk as I passed by, was their book of study in English; and it was opened at the subject of “The Mischievous Monkey.” Those students were taking their first lesson in a foreign language. The first and only thoughts they were getting in that language were thoughts about “a mischievous monkey.” When they had studied that short piece clear through, all that they knew in the English language, and the only thoughts that they could possibly think in English, were thoughts concerning a mischievous monkey. Now, in the account of that mischievous monkey, words were used that we frequently meet in the Bible: because they were common English words.

Suppose, then, that these students should some day turn to the Bible in English, and meet some of those same words that were

met in the lesson upon “The Mischievous Monkey.” Every time they meet those words in the Bible, there will be that mischievous monkey obtruding himself upon, and rollicking among, the things of the word of God. That is as certain as that those students received such thoughts as their first thoughts in that language. But suppose that instead of the mischievous monkey, that teacher had given them the Bible, presenting to them the thoughts of the *Gospel of John*:

John 1

¹ In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

² The same was in the beginning with God.

³ All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made...

Suppose that their minds had thus been filled first of all with the thoughts of God in English; then suppose that afterward they had read, for amusement, of a mischievous monkey. The thoughts of the words of God would accompany them in their reading, and would rob the reading of any of the mischief that might be gathered from it.

This is the philosophy of learning from the Bible, and of using the Bible as the first thing, in every line of study. Now I ask again, and appeal to you: Which is better—to begin a language in such a way that the thoughts of God will go with that mind wherever the mind goes, even though it be into pagan literature; or to begin in such a way that the thoughts of the pagan literature, or of trifling things, will, in spite of everything, go with the mind into the word of God? It *will* go with the mind in spite of everything; because it is a law that first impressions are most lasting; that whatever is learned first, associates itself with everything in that connection that comes to our minds in all after-life. Now, that is enough to show you then, and to convince you, too, I think, of the justice of making the Bible the text-book, and the first of all things in all language study, in Seventh-day Adventist schools.

Part 2

November 21, 1899

THE THOUGHTS OF GOD

Whoever understands the Bible best, knows most fully that it is the greatest and best book in the world. Its being the word of God, having the eternal thoughts of the eternal purpose of God,—the wisdom of God himself set down for our study and our education,—it could not be anything but the best book that there can possibly be—the greatest in every sense. And, then, whenever anybody gets the idea that to make the Bible first in all education would be a very small thing, that only says that to him the Bible has not yet become a very large thing. Only let all Seventh-day Adventists freely accept the fact that the Bible is the greatest thing in the world, and give it the place that it deserves in all education, then Christian education will soon show itself to be the greatest and best education in the world.

THE BASIS OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

Regard the Bible as the text-book, the basis of all study, in English literature. English literature as a study is regarded as essential in education today. I will not deny it.

As to the language in which English literature is written, the English of the Bible is the purest and best English that there is in the world. There are in the Bible more pure English words, and better English words, than in any other book in the English language. Then, whoever would become acquainted with the purest and the best English *must* study the English of the Bible. The Bible, being the purest English, should be the beginning and the basis of all study in English literature. In the Bible there is every phase of literature that is involved in expressing or describing human experience. This being true, it furnishes an immense advantage over all other matter in the study of English literature.

Lord Macaulay speaks of the Bible as...

...that stupendous work, the English Bible—a book which, if everything else in our language should perish, would alone suffice to show the whole extent of its beauty and power.⁵⁷

No one who is acquainted with the English Bible and the spirit of it and with other literature in English will question for a moment this estimate of the wealth that there is in the Bible as the best English literature.

But the transcendent value of the Bible as literature is that it is all true. Whereas, how much of that which is studied today as English literature, in the schools, colleges, and universities, is true? Is not nine tenths of it fiction? And is it not the fictional that stands the highest in these schools, as literature? What can give a man prominence today in the world of English literature more quickly than the writing of a popular novel? Even a minister of the gospel, an earnest, godly, powerful minister of the gospel, never can gain the prominence, even among people who profess the gospel, by simply preaching the gospel of the word of God, that can be gained by writing a novel: and especially if he writes two or three; and so demonstrates that he has special ability as a novelist.

There is a notable instance of this just now before the American public. One of the most prominent of the novelists of the present day, before he became a novelist was a minister of the gospel. Secondarily he is yet a minister of the gospel. He had preached the gospel for years, and was just as able a preacher then as now; but, instead of his being then called from Europe to America, because he was an able preacher of the gospel, it was never until he became a capital novelist that he had any special standing as a preacher of the gospel; that is, his standing as a minister of the gospel is made dependent on his popularity as a novelist.

Now which is better, which is the more Christian for Christians, or for a Christian school—to study English literature that is inferior in quality, and is fictional besides, or to study it in that “Book

⁵⁷ *Essay on “Dryden.”*

which, if everything else in our language should perish, would alone suffice to show the whole extent of its beauty and power,” and which, in addition, is all the very perfection of truth—the truth of God? To ask the question is certainly only to answer it, in the mind of every Christian, and in the mind of every one who would receive a Christian education.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY

Natural philosophy will be studied in Christian schools. Take, for instance, gravitation. The word “gravitation” is derived from the word *gravis*, signifying “weight.” The *law* of gravitation is the *equilibrium*—the system of balances—of the universe. It is the law by which each particle of matter in the universe draws with its full weight upon, attracts, or is balanced with, every other particle. Now a Bible text that is the basis of study on this whole subject is *Isaiah* 40:12, in which it is said that God has...

Isaiah 40

¹² ...comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and *weighed* the mountains in scales, and the hills in *a balance*.

The hills are balanced with the mountains, the mountains with the earth, the earth with the tiny flower that grows from its bosom, and all with the grand universe throughout.

Another text on this subject is *Hebrews* 1:1-3:

Hebrews 1

¹ God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,

² Has in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He has appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds;

³ Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and *upholding all things by the word of His power*.

His power is but another word for gravitation; for in science, gravitation is what holds all things up. Yet in the field of accepted science alone, that is as far as a student is generally allowed to go.

He may ask,

“What holds all things up?”

The answer is,

“Gravitation.”

He then may ask,

“What is gravitation?”

And the answer usually is,

“That which holds all things up.”

But that is not a valid answer: it is only asking him to move in a circle, and find no goal. Now, in a Christian school, when it is taught that the law, or system of balances, according to which all things are held up and in their relative places, is gravitation, and then the question is asked,

“What is gravitation *itself*?”

The answer is,

“The power of God in His word.”

Then with these and other scriptures as the texts on gravitation, let the teacher lead the student as far afield in the vast realm of that subject as opportunity and facilities will allow. At every step of the way he is walking with God, and so is advancing in the way of true science and genuine philosophy.

HISTORY

History, both national and church, is an essential study in Christian schools. And for universal history, national and church, from the flood until now and to the end of the world, the Bible is the one grand text-book. The Bible, as it stands from *Genesis* to the captivity to Babylon, the true text-book of the history, both national and church, of that period. From the captivity to Babylon to

the end of the world, that portion of the Bible from the captivity to Babylon unto the end of the Book is the text-book of the whole history, both national and church. And in this portion of the Bible the books of *Daniel* and *Revelation* are the keys:

- *Daniel* in national history, and
- *Revelation* in church history.

You begin with the text in the Bible on the history of Assyria, Egypt, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, or Rome, then all the history of that nation, whether in the Bible or out of it, is open to you for the study-book. And when once you really find this secret, you will be surprised to see how much history there is in the Bible alone. You will be surprised to find how much of the history of Babylon, of Medo-Persia, Grecia, or Rome, is made plain in the Bible alone. Indeed, you will find that with the exception of the dates and the names of individuals, the whole history of the nation is told in a verse or two in the Bible. Take, for instance,

Daniel 7

¹⁴ The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it.

That tells the whole history of Babylon.

LAW

Law is a subject that must be studied in Christian schools; and the Bible must be the only text-book. I do not mean law as the term is used and generally understood by lawyers and judges in earthly courts, but as the term is used and understood by the Judge in the court of heaven—law as it is in the divine principles of justice and righteousness. It is painful to see the indifference of professed Christians to the principles of daily justice and righteousness between man and man as they are made so plain in the Scriptures, especially in the books of *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, and *Deuteronomy*.

The truth is that every Seventh-day Adventist should read, over and over, simply for the principles of justice, and fair and honest dealing, *Exodus* 20-24; *Leviticus* 19, 25; and the book of *Deuteronomy*, until these principles become his very life; then read and re-read the sermon on the mount, and the first eight, and from the 12th to the 14th chapters of *Romans*. Every Seventh-day Adventist should read, over and over, these portions of Scripture. And especially should these portions be read over and over by every minister; every president of a Conference; every manager, superintendent, and foreman in every institution; every teacher in all the schools—especially by every one in responsible position in our ranks in all the world.

This is essential. It is our life. It is only Christian education. Why should we slight it?

LOGIC

Logic is a subject that must be studied in Christian schools. And the Bible must be the only text-book. I do not mean the logic of Aristotle, nor of any other man. I do not mean the logic that is in the books in the schools. I mean the logic that is manifested in the divine reasoning that is in the Bible.

I mean that the word of God must be studied until the very thoughts in that word shall become the thoughts of the one who studies, until the reasoning, the logic, of the word of God shall be his reasoning, yea, till the very mind that gave the word of God shall become his mind. This only is Christian logic. And only such study as this, is the study of Christian logic. In this the Bible is not only the text-book but also the study-book. For is it possible to find truer logic, sounder reasoning, than in the divine reasoning? And He has extended the invitation to all people,

Isaiah 1

¹⁸ Come now, and let us reason together.

What then shall be thought of professed Christian teachers and professed Christian schools that turn from the fountain of divine

logic to drink from the turbid streams and stagnant pools of human reasoning?

SUMMARY

In these studies I have endeavored to set before you as fully as possible what is Christian education, and what is meant by the Bible as a text-book. I hope you begin to see that the thought of the Bible as a text-book in all Christian education has some consistency to it; and that the Bible as the basis of all education has the true philosophy in it. Not long ago a university graduate, who is now an editor of a prominent magazine in this country, was talking with me about this view of education. In a little while he caught the principle of it, and exclaimed,

“Why, with such a system as that in full operation, every one of your schools will be a university, and every teacher will be a genius—he will *have* to be.”

It is true. When we get God’s view of education, and carry it out in the Spirit and power of God, it is true that every Seventh-day Adventist school will be a university. It will not be called that, but it will *be* that; because the universal Book will be the text-book, and the universe itself will be the study-book. And with teachers who are guided and taught by the Spirit of the King and Author of the universe, what but universities can such schools be?

Then, please do not allow any false alarm from those who do not understand the subject, to draw you away from your interest in Christian education in our schools. Instead, we need to put our whole souls into this, instead of holding it off at arm’s length, and eyeing it suspiciously. Take the Bible as the word of God; put your whole soul’s confidence in it, and trust God to lead you in His own way, into the education that He has chosen to give us in our own schools. It is high time that this were so.

Job 36

⁴ He that is perfect in knowledge is with you;

-and...

Job 36

²² Who teaches like Him?

34. Wanted: An Education That Will Truly Educate

Signs of the Times, March 14, 1900

IT CANNOT be denied that there is, even among leading educators, quite a general dissatisfaction with the education and the educational system in vogue in the United States. Any one having access to the channels of public expression cannot escape the conviction that this is so. To thoughtful observers this is so plain that it is difficult to suppose that any one at all acquainted with the situation, would deny it. It seems to have become almost a conviction that modern education does not truly educate. Now there is a cause for this and that cause is neglect of opportunity and ignoring of principle.

As to the State

No State ever had better opportunity to apply principle, nor better principle to apply in education, than had this nation. In every other nation, State education has inevitably blended with religion; and, as in any case State religion is powerless for good because of its essential lack of the vital spirit of Christianity, the education given was necessarily impotent. In the United States, however, one fundamental principle was the complete separation of religion and the State; and the educational system, professedly, was to be conducted according to this principle. And, as the one great object of education by the State is to secure good citizens, this nation had in the Declaration of Independence and the national Constitution its greatest opportunity and best foundation for the building of an education which would, in very best measure, accomplish the desired end of securing good citizens.

The Declaration of Independence, the charter of American institutions, and the foundation of the United States Government, sets forth the principle that:

All men are created equal, [and that] they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life,

liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Therein is the basis of the best State education that ever could be. It is the perfect principle of civil government; and if every youth taught by the State had been so taught this principle that he would recognize it and actually practice accordingly, the citizenship of this nation today would be another thing altogether from what it is. If that had been done, then each one would have understood that when he acts in anything in such a way as to interfere with the free exercise by any other person of the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, in such measure he denies the principle upon which the government itself rests, and thereby undermines his own civil safety, and in effect forfeits his own right to the free exercise of...

...life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Thus, since rights are equal, what one has the right to do, every other has the equal right to do. If one can claim the right to act in such a way as to interfere with another's exercise of the right of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," then all have an equal right to do the same thing; and if all should do so, then all government would be gone, and only anarchy reign. Therefore, as government is established to secure the equal inalienable rights of men, no one can act in such a way that in anything he shall infringe the rights of another to any degree, without at once striking at the foundation of government itself.

But, instead of these things being inculcated in all the schools of the State, they were almost wholly neglected, and were wholly neglected in the very years when it was most essential that they should have been inculcated; so that, practically, the neglect was complete. And instead of teaching what thus should have been taught, to accomplish the only purpose of State schools, resort was had for that purpose to other things, that is, chiefly to a so-called "morality without religion." And as the so-called "morality

without religion” had its first exponents and examples among the ancient pagans, this called in the use of the literature, philosophy, etc., of those persons, with the result that, as one educational writer has stated it:

It is one of the curiosities of our civilization that we are content to go for our liberal education to literatures which, morally, are at an opposite pole from ourselves. . . . Our hardest social problem being temperance, we study in Greek the glorification of intoxication, while in mature life we are occupied in tracing law to the remotest corner of the universe, we go to school for literary impulse to the poetry that dramatizes the burden of hopeless fate.

The result could not possibly be anything else than that a nation so educated should go the same course as did those nations whose literature was the pabulum in the school provender.

This dangerous tendency was at last discerned, but instead of getting down to national fundamental principles as to State education, a remedy was proposed,—that the Christian religion —“general Christianity”—“nonsectarian religion”—should be a recognized part of the teaching. And as this inevitably involved a recognition of the Christian religion, it was actually proposed that the Christian religion should be recognized by the State, and its Book be made the standard in State education. But this was simply lowering the nation to the level of all the nations which were before it, and to the repeating of their impotent methods in education. It inevitably involved the abandonment by this nation of its own fundamental principles, and the adoption of the essential principles of the union of Church and State, which it was the glory of this nation to abandon.

Thus the State in education ignored its sure foundation in its own fundamental principle, missed its grand opportunity to inculcate a true State education, and, “in wandering mazes lost,” in the education which it did give, is brought at last to where it is acknowledged that modern education does not educate. And the cry comes up:

“There must be in this country a better system of education, a system that is in closer touch with life, and that fits rather than unfits for life. There must be something in our common schools that will make for self-respect, and for that respect for others that is a part of true self-respect; something that will develop faithfulness and intelligence, and pride in work; something that will link head and hands by indissoluble bands.”

This is a vain cry, too, so far as the State is concerned. For now that, as to principles, the Declaration of Independence is repudiated, and the Constitution is abandoned, there is no possibility of the State ever regaining its lost opportunity. That opportunity is gone forever, and with it has gone all possibility of the State ever giving an education that will truly educate, even in that which pertains to State education.

As to the Church

The Church proposes to be Christian. By her very profession, therefore, the only education which the church can ever employ, or even recognize, must be Christian education, that is, that all who profess to be Christians must see to it that their children have a distinctly Christian education; and, in order to this, the Bible must necessarily be the text-book in every line of education and in every phase of study. Thus, then, the children of the church, being so taught, would, by being Christians, certainly be the most quiet, peaceable, even model citizens; being strictly moral, in the nature of things they would be supremely civil. Then, with the State on her part faithfully inculcating the perfect principles of civility in all who were not of the church and of Christianity, there would have been secured in these that which is the object of the State education, good citizens. Thus there would have been secured all-around quietness, peaceableness, and that true civility which is becoming to the grandest of civil governments.

But, instead of the church taking this course, the only true or becoming one for the church to take, she on her part, also missed

her opportunity, and ignored the vital principle which belonged to her; she sent her children to the State schools in their earliest years; and when from these her children came into her own academies and seminaries, she likewise had them taught in the literatures of pagan Greece and Rome. And in her care there was presented, even more emphatically, the curiosity that she was content, for the liberal education of her children, to go "to literatures which, morally, are at an opposite pole from" all her principles and profession. Temperance being one of the fundamental virtues of Christianity, the church, in the education of her children, was content to have them "study in Greek the glorification of intoxication," and, proposing to recognize a personal, omniscient, omnipresent, loving, merciful God, was content that her children should receive literary impulse from "the poetry that dramatizes the burden of hopeless fate."

And now the church likewise is reaping her sure reward in the fact that in her own schools, theological seminaries, or what not, the education there inculcated does not truly educate, but educates only in the doubting, the questioning, and the rejection of the book of Christian truth, "in the wandering mazes lost "of the "higher criticism" and evolution; this until even from a master in theology the plaint has actually gone forth that there is no school on the American continent where a young man can go and learn the Bible as a whole, under the direction of deeply pious and thoroughly-learned teachers. There are schools where a young man fitting for the ministry can go and spend three years, and have himself stuffed with speculative philosophy under the name of theology, and with infidelity under the name of "higher criticism." This is a positive and a burning shame. The writer cherishes the hope, that some pious man or woman of means will found a school in this country where men can be trained who will not only know the Bible from first to last, but teach it from first to last. That would be something new under the sun.

This, too, is a vain cry, so far as the popular recognized church is concerned; for she has not only lost true respect for the book of

Christian truth, but has lost the key of knowledge. And now she cannot give an education which will truly educate.

True Education

Therefore, the situation as it is today, in the schools of both Church and State, calls for an education that will truly education. And, as “morality without religion,” is only paganism, and has been demonstrated over and over to be a dismal and ruinous failure, the only education which will supply the need is an education which inculcates morality only by means of religion. And, as there is no true religion but Christianity, it must be an education which inculcates morality only by Christianity,—the morality of Christianity.

And as it has likewise been demonstrated over and over that a professed Christianity, inculcating education that is drawn from classical and so-called philosophical sources instead of the Bible only, is also a dismal and ruinous failure, it follows that the education now called for, the only education that will meet the demand, is a Christian education, drawn wholly from the Source of Christianity, which is Jesus Christ, and from the Book of Christianity, which is the Bible.

And here there is hope, high hope. For the third angel’s message, which is represented in the *Signs of the Times* and its sister journals, and which is committed to the people who publish these journals—this third angel’s message is, in this time, to establish Christianity on an eternal basis. This organization, in its families, its churches, its colleges, will give a distinctly Christian education, and so will give an education that will truly educate.

The schools in which this education will be given, whether they be family schools, church schools, academies, or colleges, will be schools...

...where a young man can go and learn the Bible as a whole under the direction of deeply pious and thoroughly learned teachers,

-while a youth...

...can be trained who will not only know the Bible from first to last, but teach it from first to last.

In these schools God will be sought and found for that which He is, the Fountain of Knowledge. In these schools Jesus Christ himself, by His Holy Spirit, will be the great Teacher. In these schools, the Word of God, the Bible, will be the text-book, in every phase of education and every book of study.

And with the Bible, as the text-book in Christian education, declaring that if any man will not work he shall not eat,⁵⁸ and with Jesus Christ, the embodiment of Christianity, as the Great Teacher, and the one Example, showing in that example that He spent nearly six times as much time working at a trade as He did in preaching in His official ministry, thus ennobling manual labor by bringing God into daily work, and making the service of God just as certainly as He made preaching the service of God; this true Christian education will develop genuine faithfulness as true intelligence, and laudable pride in work. This will “link heads and hands” and heart in “indissoluble bonds,” by an education that will make Christian, all-around, manly men and womanly women in this world, who will delight, as did the Author of Christianity in going about doing good.

⁵⁸ 2 *Thessalonians* 3:10.

35. A “Needed Educational Reform”

Advent Review, May 22, 1900

THE *Outlook* of April 21, 1900, describes and urges “A Needed Educational Reform.” This reform is one that will make it possible that “religion can be preserved and promoted while education is being acquired.” Thus says the *Outlook*:

One problem of education sorely needs to be taken up by our educators, which we are persuaded has not yet sufficiently occupied their attention. It is sometimes considered under the aspect of education and religion—the problem how religion can be preserved and promoted while education is being acquired—but the problem is really larger than this.

That which makes this reform so sorely needed, is the present educational processes. These are most aptly described by the editor of the *Outlook*; who on this subject is thoroughly qualified to speak. He says:

The educational processes of our time—possibly of all time—are largely analytical and critical. They consist chiefly in analyzing the subjects brought to the student for his examination, separating them into their constituent parts, considering how they have been put together, and sitting in judgment on the finished fabric or on the process by which it has been constructed.

Thus all or nearly all study is analytical, critical,—a process of inquiry and investigation. The process presupposes an inquiring if not a skeptical mood. *Doubt* is the pedagogue which leads the pupil to *knowledge*.

Does he study the human body? Dissection and anatomy are the foundations of his study. Chemistry? The laboratory furnishes him the means of analysis and inquiry into physical substances. History? He questions the statements which have been unquestioned heretofore, ransacks libraries for authorities in ancient volumes and more ancient documents. Literature? The poem which he read only to enjoy he now subjects to the scalpel, inquires whether it really is beautiful, why it is beautiful, how its

meter should be classified, how its figures have been constructed. Philosophy? He subjects his own consciousness to a process of vivisection in an endeavor to ascertain the physiology and anatomy of the human spirit, brings his soul into the laboratory that he may learn its chemical constituents.

Meanwhile the *construction* and synthetic process is relegated to a second place, or lost sight of altogether. Does he study medicine? He gives more attention to diagnosis than to therapeutics, to the analysis of disease than to the problem how to overcome it. Law? He spends more time in analyzing cases than in developing power to grasp great principles and apply them in the administration of justice to varying conditions. The classics? It is strange if he has not at graduation spent more *weeks* in the syntax and grammar of the language than he has spent *hours* in acquiring and appreciating the thought and the spirit of the great classic authors. It has been well and truly said to the modern student that he does not study grammar to understand Homer, he reads Homer to get the Greek grammar. His historical study has given him dates, events, a mental historical chart; perhaps, too, it has given him a scholar's power to discriminate between the true and the false, the historical and the mythical in ancient legends; but *not to many* has it given an understanding of the *significance of events*, a comprehension of, or even any new light upon, the real meaning of the life of man on the earth. Has he been studying philosophy?—Happy he is if, as a result of his analysis of self-consciousness, he has not become morbid respecting his own inner life, or cynically skeptical concerning the inner life of others.

It is doubtless in the realm of ethics and religion that the *disastrous results* of a too exclusive analytical process and a too exclusive critical spirit are seen. Carrying the *same spirit*, applying the *same methods*, to the *investigation of religion*, the Bible becomes to him simply a collection of ancient literature, whose sources, structure, and forms he studies, *whose spirit he*, at least for the time, *forgets*; *worship* is a *ritual* whose origin, rise, and development he investigates; whose *real significance* as an expression of penitence, gratitude, and consecration *he loses sight of altogether*. *Faith* is a series of *tenets* whose biological development he traces; or a form of consciousness whose relation to brain action he in-

quires into; or whose growth by evolutionary processes out of earlier states he endeavors to retrace; forgetting meanwhile what is the meaning of the *experience itself* as a *present fact* in human life, what vital force and significance it possesses.

Vivisection is almost sure sooner or later to become a post-mortem; and the subject of it, whether it be a flower, a body, an author, or an experience, generally dies under the scalpel. It is *for this reason* that so many students in school, academy, and college *lose*, not merely their theology, which is perhaps no great loss, but *their religion*, which is an irreparable loss, while they are acquiring an education.

When the destructive nature of the educational processes of the present day are thus so clearly set forth by one who is not only friendly to that system, but is himself a part of the system; and when in view of this even he urges “a needed educational reform;” surely that people whom God has made the light of the world in these last days should not need to be *urged* to this “sorely” needed educational reform. And where any of these *should* need to be *urged* to it, the measure of the urging could be only the measure in which these themselves are blindly imbued with love of these destructive processes.

36. That "Needed Educational Reform" Again

Advent Review, June 26, 1900

IN the *Review* of May 22 we printed the *Outlook's* statement and ground of "A Needed Educational Reform." We reprinted the *Outlook's* analysis of the present educational processes, by which students lose their religion while they are acquiring an education, which is summed up in these two sentences:

The process presupposes are inquiring, if not a skeptical, mood.
Doubt is the pedagogue which leads the pupil to *knowledge*.

In religion, the *Outlook*, as a matter of course, refers only to Christianity. And since Christianity is absolutely and pre-eminently the religion of faith, it is impossible for a process of education in which doubt is the pre-eminent thing to do anything else than to cause students who are subject to such process, to lose their religion while acquiring their education.

The *Outlook* described the process of education in the schools in general. It might be supposed that in theological schools the process would not be the same; that there, instead of doubt being the guide to knowledge, faith would be recognized, and given that place. But such supposition would be altogether a mistake. The same process is employed in the theological schools as is so fully described in our quotation from the *Outlook*, in the *Review* of May 22.

That this is true, is put beyond all possibility of controversy, by an article in the *North American Review* of April, 1900, entitled "The Scientific Method in Theology," by Frank S. Hoffman, professor of philosophy in Union College, Schenectady, NY, who was educated at Amherst and Yale, and spent two years in philosophical study in Germany, and from 1883-85 was instructor of philosophy in Wesleyan University. Thus every circumstance of the article is a pledge that it is authoritative. Professor Hoffman says:

Every man, because he is a man, is endowed with powers for forming judgments, and he is placed in this world to develop and apply those powers to all the objects with which he comes in contact. In every sphere of investigation he should *begin with doubt*, and the student will make the *most rapid progress* who has acquired *the art of doubting well*. . . . We ask that every student of theology take up the subject precisely as he would any other science; that he *begin with doubt*.

Bear in mind that this is concerning the study of theology; and theology is...

The science concerned with ascertaining, classifying, and systematizing all attainable truth concerning God and his relation to the universe; the science of religion; religious truth scientifically stated.

With this, remember also that the Lord himself has spoken, declaring that...

Hebrews 11

⁶ Without *faith* it is impossible to please Him,

—and...

Romans 14

²³ Whatsoever is *not of faith* is *sin*.

These things, therefore, simply show that in the schools of today, in which is taught particularly the science of the knowledge of God, the process is directly the opposite of that which is stated by the Lord himself. God has said that...

Hebrews 11

⁶ ...he that comes to God must BELIEVE *that He is*, and [must believe] that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.

The process of education today, in the schools which teach the science of God, is, inevitably, that he who comes to God must *doubt* that He is, and must *doubt* that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.

The result of such a process can be nothing else than that each mind shall create its own god, according to the dictates of its own reason. Nor is this simply a deduction from the quotation already made, though it is clearly deducible from that quotation. It is actually stated in the sentences immediately following the one quoted. And here they are:

We ask that every student of theology take up the subject precisely as he would any other science; that he begin with doubt, and carefully weigh the arguments for every doctrine, accepting or rejecting each assertion according as the balance of probabilities is for or against it. We demand that he thoroughly “test all things,” and thus learn how to “hold fast that which is good.”

We believe that *even the teachings of Jesus* should be viewed from this standpoint, and should be accepted or rejected on the ground of their inherent *reasonableness*.

Thus, reason being set above God, and above Jesus Christ, to analyze, to criticize, and to judge, becomes, itself, the god. In this process, as thus authoritatively defined, it is proper enough that doubt should be pre-eminent, because, as has been truly said:

The highest effort of reason is to produce doubt.

Let us, then, follow this process a little, in its direct working. Again we quote:

The great and distinctive element in all induction is the formation of the hypothesis, and there can be no inductive science formed, of any sort, where this is not the chief feature.

When, then, is to be understood by a hypothesis, and what is the process the mind goes through in bringing it to view? A hypothesis is a *supposition, a guess or conjecture*, as to what the general fact is which includes the given particular facts, or what the cause is which has brought about the given effects. . . .

Much might be said about the conditions most favorable for making a good hypothesis; but the chief thing that concerns us for our present purpose is the fact that every hypothesis, however formed, is always a product of the constructive *imagination*.

All previous acts are simply by way of gathering material for *the imagination to rearrange* and recombine into a *new creation*.

In a certain sense, the mind takes a leap into the dark. It literally passes, *per saltum* [by a leap], from the realm of the known to the realm of the unknown. From all the material that the memory places at its disposal it makes a *guess*, or *conjecture*, as to what will best meet all the exigencies of the situation.

It is for this reason that men of science, in all realms and in all ages, have always been men of powerful imaginations. The Greeks were the first great scientists of the race, because they were far more highly endowed than any other people with great imaginative powers. What they saw excited these powers, and urged them to conjecture, to reason about things, and try to explain their nature and cause.

How could this process be more clearly or more fitly described than it is in *Romans 1:21-22*?

Romans 1

²¹ When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

²² Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.

And the rest of that description will follow as certainly as this process shall be followed. For, even in the quotation made, it is admitted that this process is identical with that of old, of which the Greeks,

...the first great scientists of the race,

–were the exemplars,

...because they were far more highly endowed than any other people with great imaginative powers.

But let us follow the process farther, and see what is the ground upon which it finally lands, as to knowledge:

Given the hypothesis, the next step in the scientific process is to verify it; and this is done by making the hypothesis the major

premise of a deductive syllogism, and noting the results. If the conclusions obtained coincide with the observed facts with which we started, the hypothesis is *probably* a correct one [italics here are the author's], and, other things being equal, may be accepted as an established truth.

From this outline of the scientific method we see that no induction can be established beyond a high degree of *probability*; that is, *no one can ever be absolutely certain* that the hypothesis he assumes is a *veritable truth*. All generalizations in *every science* thus have their logical basis in the theory of *probabilities*.

When Bishop Butler asserted that “probability is the very guide of life,” he might have added, “and *we have no other*.”

Great thinkers, from Thales, Plato, and Moses, have had their theologies,—their explanations of the origin and nature of the universe, as they understood it,—and many of these explanations have been of extraordinary merit; but *even St. Paul himself* could *never have been certain* that his explanation was more than a *probably* true one.

As to knowledge, then, the result of this process is exactly described in *2 Timothy 3:7*:

2 Timothy 3

⁷ Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

And, as if he would make it absolutely certain that this is the sole ground, as to knowledge, which can ever be reached by this process. Professor Hoffman really goes to the limit, and declares:

Whether there ever existed on the earth such a person as Jesus, and what He experienced, are purely matters of historical evidence. And as everything that is a matter of evidence is a matter of *probability*, this *must be also*.

And thus the process of education as it is today, ends, as well as beings, only in *doubt*. Its beginning, its course, and its end, is doubt, and only doubt. And instead of doubt being indeed, as is professed, the pedagogue to lead to knowledge, upon the author-

ity of its own masters it is seen to be what it is in truth—the positive and chosen obstruction to all knowledge. Is it any wonder that students lose their religion while they are getting that education? In real truth, Christianity has to be abandoned in order to get that education; for Christianity is faith that knows, while that education is only doubt that never can know.

Surely, there is needed, and sorely needed, today, an educational reform. And since the educational process of today is one in which *doubt* is the beginning, the course, and the end, it is certain that the only true educational reform for today is one in which *faith* is the beginning, the course, and the end: and *that* faith, the faith of Jesus Christ—the faith which enables him who exercises it to “comprehend,” to “understand,” and to “know” the truth, and only the truth—the truth as it is in Jesus.

It is the truth that, in the change of the Sabbath, this tearing down of God’s memorial and exalting in its place the papal counterfeit by the government of the United States, in 1892-93, under the threats of the apostate Protestantism of the National Reform combination, the government of the United States was delivered over to the spirit of disorder and lawlessness, as really as was the Roman Empire in the fourth century. And that lawlessness, individual and national, will here increase, as it did in the Roman Empire of the fourth century, until it shall swallow up in ruin this nation, as it swallowed up in ruin the Roman Empire.

37. More on That “Needed Educational Reform”

Advent Review, July 3, 1900

ON the subject of the “Needed Educational Reform,” we have given, on authority, the process of education in general, to the effect that...

Doubt is the pedagogue that leads to knowledge,

—with the consequence that students “lose their religion while gaining an education.”

We have seen that, in the realm of education in theology, the process is still one in which doubt is the means of attaining unto knowledge, and that he makes the most progress who has best learned the art of doubting well; and the admitted consequence is that the one who follows this course, never really knows that he knows anything.

There is yet one other field that is worthy to be noticed, and that is the field where *the children are taught* until they become old enough to enter upon a course of education, to be finished, perhaps, in theology. And the statement with respect to this field we have upon the highest authority; that is, the authority of the United States Commissioner of Education, Hon. W. T. Harris. In his annual report for the school year, 1896-97, he says:

The secular school gives positive instruction. It teaches mathematics, natural science, history, and language. Knowledge of the facts can be precise and accurate, and a similar knowledge of the principles can be arrived at. The self-activity of the pupil is before all things demanded by the teacher of the secular school. The pupil must not take things on authority, but, by his own activity, must test and verify what he has been told. He must trace out the mathematical demonstrations, and see their necessity. He must learn the method of investigating facts in the several provinces of science and history. The spirit of the secular school therefore comes to be an enlightening one, although not of the highest or-

der. But its enlightenment tends to make trust in authority more and more difficult for the young mind.

On the other hand, religion, which gives the net result of the wisdom of the race in the form of authority, omits, and must omit, the long lines of proof which have established it. The experience of thousands of years shrinks to a mere point, and is stated in the dogmas which seem to be immediate spiritual facts resting on external authority, the substructures of thousands of years being almost entirely concealed. Not only are these long periods of experience kept out of sight, but also the vast labors of religious thinkers who have grappled with psychology and philosophy, and assisted in making the religious results systematic and without contradiction.

Religious education, it is obvious, in giving the highest results of thought and life to the young, must cling to the form of authority, and *not attempt* to borrow the methods of mathematics, science, and history from the secular school. Such borrowing will result only in giving the young people an overweening confidence in the finality of their own immature judgments. They will become conceited and shallow-minded. It is well that the child should trust his own intellect in dealing with the multiplication table and the rule of three. It is well that he should learn the rules and all the exceptions in Latin syntax, and verify them in the classic authors; but he must not be permitted to summon before him the dogmas of religion, and form pert conclusions regarding their rationality.

All this is an excellent reason why religion cannot be taught in the public schools.

To make up for this lack, the Sunday-school has been employed in this field where the children are taught. But instead of the managers of the Sunday-school really employing the true process of religious education, and so holding the children in the field of religion, they actually adopted the methods of the public school, and made them the process in the Sunday-school; they adopted the *secular method* in *religious education*. This, with its results, is also well stated by Commissioner Harris:

With the spectacle of the systematic organization of the secular schools and the improvement of methods of teaching before them, the leaders in the church have endeavored to perfect the methods of the religious instruction of youth. They have met the following dangers which lay in their path; namely, first, *the danger of adopting methods of instruction in religion which were fit and proper only for secular instruction*; secondly, the selection of religious matter for the course of study which did not lead in a most direct manner toward vital religion, although it would readily take on a pedagogic form.

Against this danger of sapping or undermining *all authority in religion* by the introduction of *the methods of the secular school*, which lay all stress on the self-activity of the child, the Sunday-school has not been sufficiently protected in the more recent years of its history. Large numbers of religious teachers, most intelligent and zealous in their piety, seek a more and more perfect adoption of *the secular school methods*.

On the other hand, *the topics of religious instruction have been determined largely by the necessities of the secular school method*. That method is not adapted to teach mystic truth. It seeks everywhere definite and especially mathematical results. *But these results*, although they are found everywhere in science and mathematics, *are the farthest possible* from being like the subject-matter of religion. Hence it has happened that in improving the methods of the Sunday-school, greater and greater attention has been paid to the history and geography of the Old Testament, and less and less to the doctrinal matters of the New Testament.

And thus the professed Christian church, instead of employing the *Christian process* in her teaching in the schools designed especially for religious instruction, has adopted and drawn into these schools the *secular process*. Instead of keeping herself in her own distinct field of religion, and upon her own sure Christian foundation, and teaching religion by a distinctly religious process, the church abandoned all that, and stood only on the *worldly* foundation, and employed a process in religious instruction which is "the farthest possible" from being like the process in religious instruction. And this being so on the part of the church even in the

teaching of the children, it is not by any means to be wondered at that it should be continued through the higher education, even to its culmination in the theological seminaries.

Since, therefore, it is upon the highest authority made evident that neither in the public school nor in the Sunday-school do the children receive truly religious teaching, it is equally evident that, for the children, and in the field of the education of the children, there is a sorely needed reform, just as certainly as in the higher education, in the theological colleges and seminaries, there is a much-needed reform, in education.

