

ORIGIN OF MANKIND.

DR. TALMAGE PINS HIS FAITH TO THE DIVINE ACCOUNT.

Evolution Is Infidelity—Attempt to Galvanize an Old Heathen Doctrine Into Life—Scientific Absurdities to Drive Out God and the Bible.

[Copyright, 1898, by American Press Association.]

WASHINGTON, Aug. 21.—The question of human origin, so prominent now in scientific and religious circles, is discussed in characteristic style by Dr. Talmage in this discourse, in which he also advocates the theory that all the world's progress has come through Christianity; text, I Timothy vi, 20, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding oppositions of science falsely so called."

There is no contest between genuine science and revelation. The same God who by the hand of prophet wrote on parchment, by the hand of the storm wrote on the rock. The best telescopes and microscopes and electric batteries and philosophical apparatus belong to Christian universities. Who gave us magnetic telegraphy? Professor Morse, a Christian. Who swung the lightnings under the sea, cabling the continents together? Cyrus W. Field, the Christian. Who discovered the anæsthetic properties of chloroform, doing more for the relief of human pain than any man that ever lived, driving back nine-tenths of the horrors of surgery? James Y. Simpson of Edinburgh, an eminent for piety as for science, on weekdays in the university lecturing on profoundest scientific subjects and on Sabbaths preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ to the masses of Edinburgh. I saw the universities of that city draped in mourning for his death, and I heard his eulogy pronounced by the destitute populations of the Cowgate. Science and revelation are the bass and soprano of the same tune. The whole world will yet acknowledge the complete harmony, but between what my text describes as science, falsely so called, and revelation there is an uncompromising war, and one or the other must go under.

At the present time the air is filled with social and platform and pulpit talk about evolution, and it is high time that the people who have not time to make investigation for themselves understand that evolution, in the first place, is up and down, out and out infidelity; in the second place, it is contrary to the facts of science and, in the third place, that it is brutalizing in its tendencies. I do not argue that this is a genuine book, I do not say that the Bible is worthy of any kind of credence—those are subjects for other Sabbaths—but I want you to understand that Thomas Paine and Hume and Voltaire no more thoroughly disbelieved the Holy Scriptures than do all the leading scientists who believe in evolution. And when I say scientists of course I do not mean literary men or theologians who in essay or in sermon and without giving their life to scientific investigation look at the subject on this side or that. By scientists I mean those who have a specialty in that direction and who through zoological garden and aquarium and astronomical observatory give their life to the study of the physical earth, its plants and its animals and the regions beyond so far as optical instruments have explored them.

I put upon the witness stand living and dead the leading evolutionists—Ernst Hæckel, John Stuart Mill, Huxley, Tyndall, Darwin, Spencer. On the witness stand, ye men of science, living and dead, answer these questions: Do you believe the Holy Scriptures? No. And so they say all. Do you believe the Bible story of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden? No. And so they say all. Do you believe the miracles of the Old and New Testaments? No. And so they say all. Do you believe that Jesus Christ died to save the nations? No. And so they say all. Do you believe in the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost? No. And so they say all. Do you believe that human supplication directed heavenward ever makes any difference? No. And so they say all.

Herbert Spencer, in the only address he made in this country, in his very first sentence ascribes his physical ailments to fate, and the authorized report of that address begins the word fate with a big "F." Professor Hæckel, in the very first page of his two great volumes, sneers at the Bible as a so called revelation. Tyndall in his fa-

mous prayer test, defied the whole of Christendom to show that human supplication made any difference in the result of things. John Stuart Mill wrote elaborately against Christianity, and to show that his rejection of it was complete ordered this epitaph for his tombstone, "Most Unhappy." Huxley said that at the first reading of Darwin's book he was convinced of the fact that teleology had received its death blow at the hand of Mr. Darwin. All the leading scientists who believe in evolution, without one exception the world over, are infidels. I say nothing against infidelity, mind you. I only wish to define the belief, and the meaning of the rejection.

Evolution Is Infidelity.

Now, I put opposite to each other, to show that evolution is infidelity, the Bible account of how the human race started and the evolutionist account of how the human race started. Bible account: "God said let us make man in our image, male and female created he them." He breathed into him the breath of life, the whole story settling forth the idea that it was not a perfect Largaire or a perfect orang-outang, but a perfect man. That is the Bible account. The evolutionist account: Away back in the ages there were four or five primal germs or seminal spores from which all the living creatures have been evolved. Go away back, and there you will find a vegetable stuff that might be called a mushroom. This mushroom by innate force develops a tadpole, the tadpole by innate force develops a polliwog, the polliwog develops a fish, the fish by natural force develops into a reptile, the reptile develops into a quadruped, the quadruped develops into a baboon, the baboon develops into a man.

Darwin says that the human hand is only a fish's fin developed. He says that the human lungs are only a swim bladder, showing that we once floated or were amphibious. He says the human ear could once have been moved by force of will just as a horse lifts its ear at a frightful object. He says the human race were originally webfooted. From primal germ to tadpole, from tadpole to fish, from fish to reptile, from reptile to wolf, from wolf to chimpanzee and from chimpanzee to man. Now, if anybody says that the Bible account of the starting of the human race and the evolutionist account of the starting of the human race are the same accounts, he makes an appalling misrepresentation.

Prefer, if you will, Darwin's "Origin of the Species" to the book of Genesis, but know you are an infidel. As for myself, as Herbert Spencer was not present at the creation and the Lord Almighty was present, I prefer to take the divine account as to what really occurred on that occasion. To show that this evolution is only an attempt to eject God and to postpone him, and to put him clear out of reach I ask a question or two. The baboon made the man, and the wolf made the baboon, and the reptile made the quadruped, and the fish made the reptile, and the tadpole made the fish, and the primal germ made the tadpole. Who made the primal germ? Most of the evolutionists say, "We don't know." Others say it made itself. Others say it was spontaneous generation. There is not one of them who will fairly and openly and frankly and emphatically say, "God made it."

The nearest to a direct answer is that made by Herbert Spencer in which he says it was made by the great "unknowable mystery." But here comes Huxley with a cup of protoplasm to explain the thing. This protoplasm, he says, is primal life giving quality with which the race away back in the ages was started. With his protoplasm he proposes to explain everything. Dear Mr. Huxley, who made the protoplasm?

To show you that evolution is infidel I place the Bible account of how the brute creation was started opposite to the evolutionist's account of the way the brute creation was started. Bible account: You know the Bible tells how that the birds were made at one time, and the cattle made at another time, and the fish made at another time, and that each brought forth after its kind. Evolutionist's account: From four or five primal germs or seminal spores all the living creatures evolved. Hundreds of thousands of species of insects, of reptiles, of beasts, of fish, from four germs—a statement flatly contradicting not only the Bible, but the very A B C of science. A species never develops into anything but its own spe-

cies. In all the ages and in all the world there has never been an exception to it. The shark never comes of a whale, nor the pigeon of a vulture, nor the butterfly of a wasp. Species never cross over. If there be an attempt at it, it is hybrid, and the hybrid is always sterile and has no descendants.

These men of science tell us that 100,000 species came from four when the law all through the universe is that, starting in one species, it keeps on in that species, and there would be only four now if there had been four at starting. If I should say to you that the world is flat, and that a circle and a square are the same, and that twice two make 15, I would come just as near the truth as when these evolutionists tell you that 100,000 species came from four. Evolution would have been left out of question with its theory flatly contradicting all observation and all science had not its authors and their disciples been so set on ejecting God from the universe and destroying the Bible that they will go to any length, though it lead them into idiotic absurdity. You see what the Bible teaches in regard to it. I have shown you also what evolution teaches in regard to it.

Agassiz says that he found in a reef of Florida the remains of insects 30,000 years old—not 3,000 but 30,000 years old—and that they were just like the insects now. There has been no change. All the facts of ornithology and zoology and ichthyology and conchology but an echo of Genesis first and twenty first, "Every winged fowl after his kind." Every creature after its kind. When common observation and science corroborate the Bible, I will not stuff myself by surrendering to the elaborated guesses of evolutionists.

To show that evolution is infidel I place also the Bible account of how worlds were made opposite the evolutionist's account of how worlds were made. Bible account: God made two great lights—the one to rule the day, the other to rule the night; he made the stars also. Evolutionist account: Away back in the ages there was a fire mist or star dust, and this fire mist cooled off into granite, and then this granite by earthquake and by storm and by light was shaped into mountains and valleys and seas, and so what was originally fire mist became what we call the earth.

The First Cause.

Who made the fire mist? Who set the fire mist to work? Who cooled off the fire mist into granite? You have pushed God some 60,000,000 or 70,000,000 miles from the earth, but he is too near yet for the health of evolution. For a great while the evolutionists boasted that they had found the very stuff out of which this world and all worlds were made. They lifted the telescope and they saw it, the very material out of which worlds made themselves. Nebula of simple gas. They laughed in triumph because they had found the factory where the worlds were manufactured, and there was no God anywhere around the factory. But in an unlucky hour for infidel evolutionists the spectroscopes of Fraunhofer and Kirchhoff were invented, by which they saw into that nebula and found it was not a simple gas, but was a compound, and hence had to be supplied from some other source, and that implied a God, and away went their theory, shattered into everlasting demolition.

So these infidel evolutionists go wandering up and down guessing through the universe. Anything to push away back Jehovah from his empire and make the one book which is his great communication to the soul of the human race appear obsolete and delusive. But I am glad to know that while some of these scientists have gone into evolution there are many that do not believe it, among them the man who by most is considered the greatest scientist we ever had this side of the water—Agassiz, a name that makes every intelligent man the earth over uncover.

Agassiz says: "The manner in which the evolution theory in zoology is treated would lead those who are not special zoologists to suppose that observations have been made by which it can be inferred that there is in nature such a thing as change among organized beings actually taking place. There is no such thing on record. It is shifting the ground of observation from one field of observation to another to make this statement, and when the assertions go so far as to exclude from the domain of science those who will not be dragged into this mire of mere assertion then it is time to protest."

With equal vehemence against the doctrine of evolution Hugh Miller, Farraday, Brewster, Dana, Dawson and hundreds of

scientists in this country and other countries have made protest. I know that the few men who have adopted the theory make more noise than the thousands who have rejected it. The Rutinia of the Canadian line took 500 passengers safely from New York to Liverpool. Not one of the 500 made any excitement. But after we had been four days out, one morning, we found on deck a man's hat and coat and vest and boots, implying that some one had jumped overboard. Forthwith we all began to talk about that one man. There was more talk about that one man overboard than all the 500 passengers that rode on in safety. "Why did he jump overboard?" "I wonder when he jumped overboard?" "I wonder if when he jumped overboard he would like to have jumped back again?" "I wonder if a fish caught him or whether he went clear down to the bottom of the sea?" And for three or four days afterwards we talked about that poor man.

Here is the glorious and magnificent theory that God by his omnipotent power made man and by his omnipotent power made the brute creation, and by his omnipotent power made all worlds, and 500 scientists have taken passage on board that magnificent theory, but 10 or 15 have jumped overboard. They make more talk than all the 500 that did not jump. I am politely asked to jump with them. Thank you, gentlemen, I am very much obliged to you. I think I shall stick to the old Creator. If you want to jump overboard, jump and test for yourselves whether your hand was really a fish's fin and whether you were webfooted originally and whether your lungs are a swim bladder, and, as in every experiment there must be a division of labor, some who experiment and some who observe, you make the experiment, and I will observe!

There is one tenet of evolution which it is demanded we adopt—that which Darwin calls "natural selection" and that which Wallace calls the "survival of the fittest." By this they mean that the human race and the brute creation are all the time improving because the weak die and the strong live. Those who do not disavow because they are the fittest. They say the breed of sheep and cattle and dogs and men is all the time improving, naturally improving. No need of God or any Bible or any religion, but just natural progress.

Not the Survival of the Fittest.

You see, the race started with "spontaneous generation," and then it goes right on until Darwin can take us up with his "natural selection" and Wallace with his "survival of the fittest," and so we go right on up forever. Beautiful! But do the fittest survive? Gardfield died in September; Guiteau surviving until the following June. "Survival of the fittest!" Ah, no! The martyrs, religious and political, dying for their principles, their bloody persecutors living on to old age. "Survival of the fittest?" Five hundred thousand brave northern men marching out to meet 500,000 brave southern men and die on the battlefield for a principle! Hundreds of thousands of them went down into the grave trenches. We staid at home in comfortable quarters. Did they die because they were not as fit to live as we who survived? Ah, no, not the "survival of the fittest!" Elsworth and Nathaniel Lyon falling on the northern side; Albert Sidney Johnston and Stonewall Jackson falling on the southern side. Did they fall because they were not as fit to live as the soldiers and the generals who came back in safety? No! Bitten with the frosts of the second death be the tongue that dares utter it! It is not the "survival of the fittest."

How has it been in the families of the world? How was it with the child physically the strongest, intellectually the brightest, in disposition the kindest? Did that child die because it was not as fit to live as those of your family that survived? Not "the survival of the fittest." In all communities some of the noblest, grandest men dying in youth or in midlife, while some of the meanest and most contemptible live on to old age. Not "the survival of the fittest."

But to show you that this doctrine is antagonistic to the Bible and to common sense I have only to prove to you that there has been no natural progress. Vast improvement from another source, but mind you, no natural progress. Where is the fine horse in any of our parks whose picture of eye and mane and nostril and neck and haunches is worthy of being compared to Job's picture of a horse as he thousands of years ago heard it paw and