

*came first class mail  
no. sender's name*

# RADICALISM UNMASKED

by

Rev. G. W. McPHERSON

No. I.

Reply, as given in *The Old Tent Evangel* on July 23rd, 1922, to  
the recent criticisms of Old Testament Miracles, by the  
Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick, Professor in  
Union Theological Seminary, and the Right  
Reverend Howard Chandler Robins,  
Dean of the Cathedral of Saint  
John the Divine.



PUBLISHERS  
YONKERS BOOK COMPANY  
34 ST. ANDREW'S PLACE  
YONKERS, N. Y.

Price 25 Cents

Books

By REV. G. W. McPHERSON

**THE CRISIS IN CHURCH AND COLLEGE**

Third Edition

Cloth, \$1.45; postage, 10 cents

**THE MODERN CONFLICT OVER THE BIBLE**

Third Edition

Cloth, \$1.45; postage, 10 cents

**SOCIALISM AND THE NEW THEOLOGY**

Paper, 25 cents

PUBLISHERS

**YONKERS BOOK COMPANY**

34 St. Andrews Place

Yonkers, N. Y.

## RADICALISM UNMASKED

**W**E are here tonight to examine somewhat into the teachings of two advocates of modernism,—Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, and the Reverend Howard Chandler Robins. Dean Robins is a prominent clergyman in the Protestant Episcopal Church in New York, a man of ability and personal charm. I have no desire to reflect upon the many noble men in the Episcopal ministry, nor upon the laity of this great Church, or upon any church, in anything I shall say tonight. I have the greatest respect for the Episcopal Church as I have for the Presbyterian, and all other evangelical churches of Christ. We never indulge in unjust criticisms of the churches in this place. Neither do I desire to appear as personal in my remarks. These two names are mentioned—Dean Robins and Dr. Fosdick—because they are known as representatives of the modern school of religious liberalism and outspoken critics of the evangelical faith. They have both, in printed sermon and in the public press, put themselves on record as defenders of what is called modernism, rationalism, or liberalism in religion. We therefore violate no code of ethics in mentioning their names, or discussing in public their teachings and the school which they have championed.

Dr. Fosdick is, as you may know, a Baptist clergyman, serving as pastor of an honored Presbyterian Church. That he has the right to serve in this capacity, and that this great church should feel justified in having him as a pastor, even though he refused to become a member of the Presbytery because of his disbelief in infant baptism, it is neither our purpose tonight to discuss or question. Doubtless, both Dr. Fosdick and the First Presbyterian Church feel justified in sustaining their present relationship, irrespective of their opposite views regarding some of those matters which have caused divisions in the one true Church of Christ. Dr. Fosdick is free to enjoy his liberty of conscience, while the great Church he is serving is free to hold to its sacred convic-

tions regarding the proper subjects for baptism, and thus enjoy the same liberty.

Dr. Fosdick has attained distinction as the author of a book entitled "The Meaning of Prayer," which book is largely a collaboration of the prayers of saints in the medieval age with comments of his own, though in his own contribution he has in a very subtle way denied that God can or does answer prayer aside from what is termed the laws of nature. While the author has repudiated the doctrines or theologies of the Church of the medieval period, nevertheless, that which has given real substance and value to his book are the prayers of men who were made Christ-like by what he calls "medieval theology", the theology which he has rejected, though this fact, probably, does not lessen the satisfaction brought to him from the revenue received from his book.

The honored Doctor has also achieved some distinction because of his bold and vigorous attacks upon our common evangelical faith. He is on record as charging it with being false in fact and pernicious in result. As Dr. James M. Gray has recently said, in a published criticism of one of Dr. Fosdick's sermons, that he [Dr. Fosdick] "has quite definitely and thoroughly rejected the evangelical faith." And Dr. Gray adds: "Dr. Fosdick is the gentleman whom the liberal wing of the professing church, the Modernists as they are called, sent to China last year to try to overthrow the Bible Union and to counteract there the work of Drs. Torrey, Thomas and Kyle. Dr. Gray further says: His rejection of the evangelical faith comes nearer the description of the persons indicated in Heb. 6:4-6, than anything I can recall in current religious literature.

While Dean Robins has not been so outspoken in his defense of modernism, yet he is becoming known as a champion of liberalism or radicalism in all its fundamental aspects.

Some years ago when the first edition of my book appeared,—The Modern Conflict Over the Bible,—in which I undertook to defend the orthodox faith, the late Mr. Francis Lynn Stetson of New York, who was stirred by reading this volume, took my book to his friend Dean Robins and requested him to preach a sermon in the Cathedral on the new theology. This the Dean did, and in his message he indulged in a criticism of my defense of the atonement. This sermon the Dean had printed, a copy of which was sent to me by the courtesy of Mr. Stetson.

There appeared in The Evening Sun of June 29th, 1922, a statement from Dean Robins in which he repudiated the miraculous element in the Old Testament. A reporter is represented as having interviewed him, and one of the questions asked is this:

Do you believe that man was made the subject of the first operation under anesthesia, and that during the deep sleep that was caused to come upon him his side was opened and a rib removed and out of this rib an adequate helpmeet was made?

The reporter also asked:

Do you believe the origin of differences of languages was in God's jealous guarding of his own prerogatives by causing confusion of tongues at Babel?

It may be observed that the formulation of these questions suggests the creative genius of a theologian. The Dean replied to both in an emphatic "No", and he adds:

These accounts of the mode of creation of men and of the origin of differences of language reflect primitive beliefs. . . characteristic of the childhood of the race.

Thus the Dean rejects the book of Genesis in its account of the creation as a "naive" story that modern men cannot accept as history or true to fact. In the same article, the learned Dean rejects, as untrue, the miracle in the Old Testament where an axe was made to come to the surface of the water, as also the miracle of Jonah's preservation in the great fish, but he goes on to assert his belief in the miracles as recorded in the New Testament, with what he termed, "discrimination," by which I venture to assert, he means to say "I must be my own judge as to what is or what is not a miracle in the New Testament." This assumption of reason above the Word of God we shall discuss later.

And this also is the view held regarding miracles by Dr. Fosdick. I have heard him in his pulpit, in the First Presbyterian Church, refer, in a sneering and belittling manner, to the creation of our mother Eve from the rib of Adam, to the flood, to serpents and beasts made to talk, the axe to float, and to Jonah in the whale. These great miracles which Almighty God wrought to reveal His power to the people of those times, and for other gracious purposes of His sovereign will, are used by Dr. Fosdick and Dean Robins, and rationalists generally, as their common stock in trade,

when they attempt to assert their puny reason above the authority of Holy Scripture.

Some of us are not surprised at hearing this of Dr. Fosdick, as he is widely known as an unbeliever in the miraculous element in the Bible, though, like the Dean, he occasionally professes respect for some of the miracles as recorded in the New Testament. This goes to show how wide-spread is the movement of rationalism today in our denominations, which is permeating much of the teaching and ministry of our time, in both pulpit and university. As the years come and go the dividing line between the two groups who accept the Bible as our supreme and only authority in matters of faith and practice and those who reject the Bible as supreme authority is become more and more apparent.

We might well raise the question: Why do some of the rationalists profess to accept the miracles of the New Testament as fact, though, as Dean Robins says, with "discrimination," and reject the miracles of the Old Testament? The New Testament is no more substantiated than is the Old Testament, for both have been proven by outside sources, beyond the shadow of a doubt, to be trustworthy history.

Take the book of Genesis at which the rationalists are at war. You know how they have scoffed at the idea of a flood, but they don't scoff at it today. Why? Because some of the ablest scientists have shown that the earth abounds in proof of the fact of the great flood. Dr. George McCready Price, a scientist, professor in biology and geology, has made it clear in his books that the Genesis account of the flood is true.

In the Pierpont Morgan Library in this city is part of a clay book copied by an Amorite whose name was Azag Aga. Scientists claim that this book has been written about the time of Abraham, long before Moses wrote the Book of Genesis.

The interesting thing about this book, says the Evening Mail, is not its antiquity, because other clay books have been found, but the fact that it gives an account of the flood, substantially the same as the account in Genesis. The flood is also substantiated by Assyrian inscriptions, and the old Greek version of the Amorite record, all proving by unquestioned records, aside from Genesis, that the flood covered the entire earth including the mountains. And, according to all these accounts, this process did not take thousands of years, or one year, but only a few weeks.

Recently I was talking in the subway with a Columbia teacher in history regarding the Book of Genesis, and he affirmed that this book is not history but fable and myth, and that the record of creation is only an hypothesis—a guess. I asked him how about these records which corroborate the Genesis account of the flood? He relied, "I am not familiar with them; but they are only myths." Then I asked him, "How about the record of those Kings in the 14th Chapter of Genesis?" "Well, what about them?" he replied. I said: "Do you not know, as a teacher of history in Columbia, that the names of these Kings have been found inscribed in the Tel El Amarna Tablets?" And he confessed that he was not aware of that fact. Then I asked: "How about the Store Cities of Python and Ramesis, discovered in 1883, confirmatory of the Book of Genesis (Exo. 1:11, and Exo. 5)" He replied: "I am not familiar with that discovery." After a few more questions, that increased the uneasiness of the learned Columbia professor, he arose and went into another car. This is the type of teacher whose work in our universities is resulting in the destruction of the faith of their students in the Old Testament, as reliable history.

Now we ask: When the book of Genesis and the Old Testament generally have been corroborated by such infallible witnesses does it not seem strange that the modern rationalists and radicalists, like Dean Robins and Dr. Fosdick, should deny that these Old Testament miracles are found in books that have been well authenticated as reliable history, and that they should refer to them as myths, or as parables, or as not literal facts, when these books present them as literal facts? Why is this? I shall tell you why.

But before I do this, I desire here to raise another question or two: Why do these men pretend to attach importance to the New Testament miracles including the Incarnation, though with "discrimination"? Why do they affirm the Deity of Jesus, as recorded in the New Testament, and assert their belief in some of His miracles, including the Incarnation, and yet reject others of His miracles? Is the God who wrought these miracles, not the God of the Old Testament also? Could not Jehovah work a miracle in the age or ages prior to the appearance of Jesus? If not, why not? Further, did not our Lord, whom some of these rationalists affirm to be authority, endorse Adam and Eve as his

torical characters? And did He not also endorse the writings of Moses—the first five books of the Old Testament—as the inspired prophesies of God which tell of Him? If Jesus is the authority why do these men rule out of court his testimony as to the historical trustworthiness of the Old Testament? And further, why do they profess to accept some of the New Testament miracles and reject others? Rationalists generally reject the miracle of the raising of Lazarus from the dead. Has any man the power to comprehend just how a miracle is wrought, and why this record of Lazarus is impossible of acceptance, while other records of New Testament miracles may be accepted? Who knows anything about the mystery of a miracle? Is not such manifestation of power beyond the ability of man to understand? Of course it is. Then why, in the same breath, this rejection and this professed acceptance of miracles with “discrimination”? Why this rejection of the Old Testament miracles and this professed acceptance of some of the New Testament miracles? Are these preachers simply playing with words, camouflaging their real beliefs, which is a secret rejection of the miraculous element in the Bible, in order to prevent a rupture with their churches, and thus retain their positions with all the emoluments their honored offices bring to them?

That these men are inconsistent in their teaching is apparent to all thoughtful persons. That their position as to the miracles recorded in the Bible is unreasonable, untenable, and ridiculously absurd, is apparent, and it is not unethical to affirm that the churches, where all such teachers serve and thrive on the sacrificial gifts made by those who believe the Bible to be the Word of God, and who expect them to faithfully teach it, as such, should bring these men to book without delay and tell them that they have missed their calling, that they can no longer be permitted to continue with them to destroy the faith, once for all committed to the saints.

Now I will answer the question raised—Why do these rationalists assume such an inconsistent attitude toward the Bible? Here is the real explanation. These men are evolutionists, and in their philosophy there is no room for the supernatural element in the Bible, or for any of those great fundamental truths upon which the Christian church is built.

Dr. Fosdick recently preached a sermon which he had widely circulated, entitled, “Shall the Fundamentalists Win?” in which he tried to show that it would be a calamity to Christiaity if the Fundamentalists should win. Well, who and what is a Fundamentalist, that he should be thus held up before the people as a menace to the Christian cause? A Fundamentalist is simply one who believes in the inspiration of the Bible; that it is our only guide in matters of faith and practice; that Jesus is the veritable Son of God, truly God and truly man; that He redeemed by His death all who believe on Him; that He rose from the dead in His human body, glorified; that He ascended into heaven in the same body; that He will return in this same body; that men must be born from above; that after our Lords return this earth will be transformed into heaven; and that the supreme business of the Church is to preach the Gospel to every creature, to witness for Christ our Lord to the ends of the earth and until the end of the age.

The people who believe these things constitute the dangerous type of folks whom Dr. Fosdick declares are a menace to Christianity, and he calls upon the Christian people everywhere to oppose them, to defeat them in religious conventions, in local gatherings, in church official management in educational institutions—everywhere.

Well, as we look back over history, we find that these dangerous Fundamentalists had a pretty large share in the work of Christ's great church. We find that the most noted of them all was Jesus himself, for he taught these truths, hence He is the Father of Fundamentalism. We find that the Apostles taught these same truths, as did the church fathers and the reformers. And as we look into modern church history, we find also that the most illustrious Christian leaders, scholars and thinkers believed and taught these same truths. Luther and Calvin, Knox and Bunyan, Wesley and Whitfield, Spurgeon and Moody, Edwards and Chapman, all were Fundamentalists. And when we think of the laity we know that ninety per cent of them are Fundamentalists. Yet Dr. Fosdick calls for their extermination, because the new school of rationalists and evolutionists have no place in their philosophy for the Supernatural. That is why Dr. Fosdick froths at the mouth when he discusses these matters, and pleads in a pretended righteousness and deceptive

rhetoric for a revival of rationalism. Truly his ministry seems comical were it not so suicidal, such an awful travesty upon real Christianity. I think I have shown you why Dr. Fosdick, and all others of similar views are habitually misrepresenting the teachers of real Christianity, referring to them in their worn-out phraseology, as static, medieval, dogmatic reactionaries.

The Christian world is becoming divided today into these two groups, the rationalists, or rejectors of the Supernatural on one hand, and those who take the Bible for what it says on the other hand. There is no use our blinking at this fact, and the Christian people must think through this problem and take their stand. This is an hour of great widespread theological, scientific, and social unrest. The crisis for Christ and His cause is here. Advocates of spiritism, like Doyle and Lodge are lining up with men like Fosdick and Robins and many others to attack the Bible, as God's revelation to man, and they are ensnaring thousands. The last thirty years have been called the evolutionary period; the present is the revolutionary hour. Two men, Darwin and Spencer, both unbelievers in revelation, not only shaped the scientific and philosophic thought, but to no inconsiderable extent have shaped much of the theological thought of the past three decades.

Now, I ask you to follow me closely as we discuss the question, Is there any basis of truth underlying the widespread hypothesis of evolution, and which hypothesis has resulted in the present conflict? Dr. Fosdick and Dean Robins, with others, have rejected the fundamental doctrines of Christianity because they have accepted this hypothesis. This is the problem we are face to face with today, and this problem must be faced by the man who would bear weight in the cause of Christ. Mr. Bryan was quick to see this, and after an investigation of evolution, and being fully convinced of its falsity, quickly cast in his lot with those who are defending the Bible as the Word of God. We must form our own convictions on this matter, for unless our faith is founded on strong intellectual convictions we shall easily be swayed by a rhetorician like Fosdick, a sentimental preacher on the love of God by one like Dean Robins, and by the pretense of scientists and historians who are truly neither, and we shall believe their false assertions that evolution is

an established fact. and that all the modern scholarship is on their side, and thus thousands will be led astray from the Christian faith.

In case it may be thought that I have exaggerated the gravity of the present crisis, I will quote what a rationalist has said,—Canon Barnes, of Westminster, London,—before the British Association of Scientists, in Cardiff, in 1921. He said:

The Christian churches are face to face with a serious dilemma. Shall they accept scientific truths which conflict with Christian doctrine such as the Fall of Man, or shall they cling to the doctrine and deny the truths of science?"

According to science, the Biblical account of the creation of the Universe and the creation of the first parents of mankind, are childishly absurd.

To the Christian who accepts modern biological principles, the Christ Spirit is the supreme and final power in the evolution of man. Jesus Christ was the miraculous example of what we should try to become. Man was not made perfect and then marred. His evolution is still proceeding; he is growing to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. Why need we trouble about the Fall as long as we can preach that "in Christ shall all be made alive"?

This is a concise statement of the deceptive phraseology of the modernist, and a greater travesty of divine truth has never been uttered, but it reveals the gravity of the situation. You note that Canon Barnes used that misleading phrase—"The Christ Spirit." That phrase is much today upon the tongue of the spiritist and evolutionist. By it is not meant the historic personal Christ of the Gospels, but an ethical abstraction of varying and often valueless significance.

Now, my friends, you see the issue. Prof. Fosdick and Dean Robins heartily agree with Canon Barnes, as all three are evolutionists. The question we have to face is: Does the Scripture view of the origin of the world and the origin of man and his primitive condition clash with the professed findings of science; or are they irreconcilable merely with the vagaries of a passing philosophy?

In order to arrive at an impartial answer to this question, let me first state the Christian view of the origin of man and his primitive condition, after which I shall state the rationalists' view as held by Dr. Fosdick and Dean Robins and then weigh them in the balance and see which is found wanting.

God has written two books—the Book of Nature and the Book of Revelation. Let us see whether God has in any way contradicted Himself. It is claimed today that some great discovery has been made, as revolutionary in the realm of Christian thought as that associated with Copernicus, Kepler, and Sir Isaac Newton, and that the Christian view is untenable under its searching light. That is the problem we have to face. We have arrived at a time when we must discover the truth for ourselves and know what is our real authority.

At this stage I wish to quote some sentences from a great Scottish theologian—the late Professor Denney, who was tinctured by rationalism:

The modern mind is no more than a modification of the human mind as it exists in all ages, and the relation of the modern mind to the Atonement is one phase of the perennial relation of the mind of man to the truth of God. Once the mind has come to know itself, there can be no such thing for it as blank authority. It cannot believe things, the things by which it has to live, simply on the word of Paul or John.

Now, does the Bible view of the origin of man hold the mind in this authoritative fashion independently of mere blank authority? And does an impartial study of the Book itself lead to the conclusion of its Divine origin and authority?

Next I shall quote a great author, a man whose name I hold in reverence second to none, and this reverence increases the more I study his masterly writings. I refer to that great defender of the faith, the late Professor James Orr, of Glasgow. This is a man whom the theologians of Germany always criticised with the utmost respect, because he was considered, even by the Germans, to be a great scholar.

In the narrative of Creation we have already that noblest of possible utterances regarding man—'God created man in His own image.' The manner in which this declaration is led up to is hardly less remarkable than the utterance itself. The last stage of the work of Creation has been reached, and the Creator is about to produce His masterpiece. But, as if to emphasize this event, and prepare us for something new and exceptional, the form of representation changes. Hitherto the simple fiat of Omnipotence has sufficed—'God said.' Now the Creator is represented as taking counsel with Himself: 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'; and in the next verse, with the employment of the stronger word 'created' [bara], the execution of this purpose is narrated. 'So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them.' This grand declara-

tion that man is made in the image of God, after His likeness, is determinative of the whole Biblical idea of man. It is the conception, tacit or avowed, which underlies all revelation. It is, in truth, the presupposition of the history of God's dealings with man from first to last.

In the account of Genesis, man's creation is referred to as a special supernatural act of God; while in it man appears as the head and crown of nature, the goal and resting point of the whole creative movement, he is yet not a mere creature of nature, but stands in a peculiar relation to God, as bearing His rational and moral image, and standing under moral and religious responsibilities to Him.

Man is pictured in Genesis as beginning his existence under the simplest conditions, but he is neither a child nor a savage. He is capable of knowing, understanding, conversing with, worshipping, and obeying his Creator. His nature is undefiled by sin. He has the power to remain obedient. He is not under the law of death.

What we have in Genesis is that Creation was not the result of a single act, but was accomplished in an ascending series of acts, culminating in man, in whom the creative activity came to rest.

Such is the sublime narrative of man's creation as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis. I want you to know that the rationalists have been scoffing at the first chapter of Genesis as a piece of antiquated superstition, untenable under the searching scrutiny of modern science. I should like to answer that superficial criticism by quoting the greatest of modern rationalists, before whose scientific eminence all the rationalists must shrivel into insignificant pigmies. Professor Haeckel, the only scientist of note who held Darwinism pure and simple to the end of his day, paid this remarkable tribute to the first chapter of Genesis:

The Mosaic history of creation, since, in the first chapter of Genesis, it forms the introduction to the Old Testament, has enjoyed, down to the present day, general recognition in the whole Jewish and Christian world of civilization. Its extraordinary success is explained, not only by its close connection with Jewish and Christian doctrines, but also by the simple and natural chain of ideas which runs through it, and which contrasts favorably with the confused mythology of creation current among most of the ancient nations. First, God creates the earth as an inorganic body; then He separates light from darkness, then water from the dry land. Now the earth has become habitable for organisms, and plants are first created, animals later; and among the latter the inhabitants of the water and of the air first, afterwards the inhabitants of the dry land. Finally, God creates man, the last of all organisms, in His own image, and as ruler of the earth. Two great and fundamental ideas, common also to the non-miraculous theory of development, meet us in the Mosaic hypothesis of creation with surprising clearness and simplicity—the idea of separation or differentiation, and the idea of progressive development or perfecting. Although Moses looks upon the result of the great laws of organic development [which

we shall later point out as the necessary conclusions of the doctrine of descent] as the direct actions of a constructing Creator, yet in his theory there lies hidden the ruling idea of a progressive development and a differentiation of the originally simple matter. We can therefore bestow our just and sincere admiration on the Jewish lawgiver's grand insight into nature, and his simple and natural hypothesis of creation, without discovering in it a so-called Divine revelation.

That is what the greatest of modern rationalists has to say about that sublime chapter the first of Genesis.

There you have the Bible view of the origin of man and of the first chapter of Genesis from the Christian scholar like Professor Orr, and a rationalist scholar like Professor Haeckel, and, according to both, that chapter stands out in perfect harmony with the latest findings of true science.

In spite of our modern life, and our marvelous grasp of the secrets of nature, although we have counted the stars, and know a great deal more of electricity than our forefathers did, and a great deal more of geology and biological science, you will not find today, in the whole of the world, a dozen scientists who, even after the most careful collaboration, could write a first chapter of Genesis; and yet Moses, 3500 years ago, wrote that sublime record, which, according to Haeckel, is in accord with the latest findings of science, and not a single phrase of which can be transposed without doing damage to the harmony of the work.

But notwithstanding these facts we find men, like Dean Robins and Dr. Fosdick, speaking in the lightest and most frivolous vein of the marvelous record of the miraculous element in the Old Testament, these men attributing belief in these miracles to the low state of mind of the primitive man, to his ignorance, as if the intelligence of that day, a day that produced a book without an equal in all the field of literature and science, did not know when a miracle was performed. Yet Haeckel, who was not a Dean of an Episcopal Cathedral or the pastor of a noted Presbyterian church, who in fact was an avowed agnostic and evolutionist, speaks in the highest terms of this remarkable record as given of creation by Moses, declaring that it is, in its order of progress, in harmony with the best science. It would appear that these New York preachers have far less regard for the book of Genesis than had one of the most noted rationalists of modern times.

Thus we have taken a survey of the field, and have seen the character of the conflict. We are now prepared to examine, in the light of the Bible itself, the teachings of Dr. Fosdick and Dean Robins in one particular at least, and note what the result of such teachings must be upon the future of the churches of Christ.

Look at what the Bible teaches as to the origin of man and woman.

In the day that God created man he made them man and woman. Adam therefore was not of a woman, as Paul states in First Cor. 11:8, and if not of a woman he must have been of a beast or from God. But according to Genesis, 1:21, 24, and 25, beasts could bring forth only of their kind, and this the New Testament affirms in First Cor. 15:39—"All flesh is not the same flesh. There is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes and another of birds."

If evolutionists, like Dean Robins and Dr. Fosdick are right, that beasts can bring forth men

and men also can bring forth beasts, and fishes can bring forth birds, and a bird-fish can bring forth a bird-fish-beast, and a bird-fish-beast can bring forth a bird-fish-beast-man. And this would be a worse confusion than hell. Let us thank God that no beast or reptile produced Adam and Eve, as their flesh was of another kind, and they could bring forth only "after their kind." If man was not of woman or of beasts, then he must have been of God—a special creation.

But if these men are right

then there is a break between God between God and Adam, and the Apostle is wrong in his record of the human genealogy of Christ as given by Luke in Chap. 3:38, which reads: "The son of Enos which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God." If Dean Robins and Dr. Fosdick are correct this should read as follows: "Jesus. . . the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of a monkey, which was the son of an ass, which was the son of a vulture, which was the son of a scorpion, which was the son of a lizard, which was the son of a bumble bee, which was the son of a bug, which was the son of a tadpole, which was the son of God."

But we believe that the New Testament is true. "The Apostle James says: 'for Adam was made after the similitude of God himself.'" [James 3:9]. Genesis says: Adam was made after God's kind [Gen. 1: 26, 27], not by natural propagation, but by a special act of Divine creation. Adam could not have evolved sexually as there was no female of his flesh prior to Eve, who was the mother of all humanity.

The beasts were formed out of the ground, male and female, [Gen. 2:19], but for Adam there was no helpmeet [Gen. 2:20]. Eve was not formed out of the dust of the ground like Adam. Her creation, was supernatural in a very special and different way. She was taken out of Adam after God had breathed his living Spirit into him. [Gen.



2:23]. God took a rib from Ada's side and the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman [Gen. 2:22]. The woman did not evolve out of the rib. God made the rib a woman with the same power that he made an incarnation of Himself in the womb of the Virgin Mary, the water wine, and the dead to live."

The man was formed of the dust of the ground [Gen. 2:7] not of beasts. The woman was formed of the man, not of beasts. And both were made on the same day [Gen. 5:1, 2] which was the sixth day [Gen. 1:27, 31]. (The Pilgrim Alcolu, S. C.)

In all this we get a glimpse of the glory and dignity of man. As the New Testament says of him, "Man was made a little lower than the angels" [Heb. 2:7]. He was not evolved a little higher than the beasts.

So you see that Dean Robins and Dr. Fosdick in repudiating the Genesis account of the creation of man and woman repudiate also the New Testament, which they inconsistently profess to believe.

As Rev. J. W. Porter of Louisville has well said:

All such teachers, if consistent in the propagation of their theories which deny the word of God should establish a new church for evolutionists and not seek to destroy the true Church of Jesus Christ. And they should name it, A Church for the Descendants of Apes for the trail of these men leads not to Bethlehem's Manger, or Calvary's Cross, or the open grave, or the Coming Triumphant Christ, but to the wilderness. One should naturally gravitate to his own company, and if he is truly ethical, get his own crowd to pay his salary, and not leech-like engraft himself and his pagan ideas on the Christian Churches built upon the inerrant Word of God. It is not only a question of honesty, decency, and good taste, but also of heredity.

And Dr. Porter further says:

The man who has accepted Darwin's unproved theory of evolution has rejected Christ, and it is but natural that he should exchange the 'Bride of the Lamb' for the beasts of the jungle. Those who profess beastly ancestry should form churches of their own, and the sooner this is done the better for all concerned. Those who claim to bear the mark of the beast cannot be in full fellowship with those who believe they are made in the image of God, for between reptilian progeny and the redeemed people of God enmity is quite natural and should be eternal.

If these evolutionists, these botanical baboon boosters, are consistent, they will see that they form new churches, and that above the doors of such there appear in large letters, Only those admitted to membership here who believe themselves to be of beastly origin. It might also be helpful to the study of natural history, and the family history of the worshippers to have a large number of specimens of fowls, beasts, insects, and reptiles adorn the walls of the building in which the descendants of beasts engage in ancestral worship. Seeing that they were "compassed about by such a cloud of witnesses" to their origin,

they would be made to feel at home, not in the house of the living God, but in a den of varmints.

It might also be well to name their Sunday School classes to commemorate the virtues of their ancestors. For example, one class could be called "Industrious Ants," another, "Shrewd Foxes" and another "Snakes in the Grass."

Should there be a quartette they might designate the members somewhat as follows: The roaring lion, the screeching owl, the howling wolf, the screaming eagle. At least once a year the pastor should preach on the text, "In the Beginning was Protoplasm." It might be that many of the professors who are drawing salaries from Christian sources would offer themselves for membership if assured of their salaries. Nor would it be amiss to have the baptistry and font filled with tad-poles which evolutionists claim as their ancient ancestors.

By all means let these men start a new church, with their new yet old pagan doctrines. And in the meantime let the Churches of Christ assist the movement by withdrawing fellowship from those who have crept in unawares to defile the sanctuary of God.

In closing, permit me to say that a religion of reason, of rationalism, as above faith and Revelation, the religion which dominates Dean Robins and Dr. Fosdick, will never win the world to God.

The rationalists have started a great campaign of rationalism in religion, that is, by the principle not to believe anything you cannot understand. By this principle they are attempting to defend Christianity, but that is a thing impossible. If Christianity, which has to do with the great mystery of God, of man, and the universe, could be understood by reason I for one would have nothing to do with it. While Christianity gives free scope to man's reason, for God says, "Come now and let us reason together," so that man will learn of God, yet the fact that the revelation of God is above our highest reason is what appeals to my mind and wins my allegiance to it. Can these religious liberals understand the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement of Christ for man's sin and guilt? Can they understand any supernatural act of God, as revealed in the Bible? No! Then why do they make war on the miracles and say with Dean Robins we accept them only with "discrimination"?

I was not converted to Christ because I found out that Christ must be true according to my reason. I was converted because He did a sacrificial deed of love for me and drew me with a power which showed me that there is something between God and man that is above my reason. "Thy

faith hath saved thee, go sin no more," said Jesus Christ, and faith begins where reason surrenders, gives up the search for God, and puts her trust in a Power above and beyond us. "Could anything necessary for our happiness be reached by reason, through science, then there would really be no reason for Christ at all. If reason is our guide and can save us then the universities and the educated man only could know God, while the common man, or the man with little brain would be at a great disadvantage." O no, my friends, we must believe; we must trust; we must surrender our intellects to God. It is as Tennyson said, "believing where we cannot prove," and it is the response of faith to Christ that brings the heavenly power and life that sets us free! Reason can only teach us that we need God, that we need a Power that is beyond ourselves to lift us, and that "salvation is of the Lord," but reason is not the connecting link. Faith furnishes that, and when faith cries, "I believe", our logic and reason and science are all left behind, and we rise up to the heights of transfiguration with Christ and behold his glory. It is when reason says

Nothing in my hands I bring,  
Simply to thy Cross I cling.

that the power of Omnipotence becomes ours.

Let us fall prostrate into the dust; let us bring our vain hearts and haughty minds down in humility; let reason be silent; let the laws of nature cease to work; let philosophy bashfully veil her face; let all the sciences give up their principles; let the universe tremble and listen, when the Lord God, the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel speaks. And He speaks, speaks through His word, the Bible, and we must listen and believe,—even if we do not comprehend.

When this is done, we shall know the significance of Paul's immortal words: "the just shall live by faith."