

ATHEISM

Immoral and Irrational

by

J. B. Moody, D.D.



AFTER DEATH AND AFTER RESURRECTION WHERE AND WHAT?

Read what the brethren say:

Illinois Baptist: “After Death and After the Resurrection.” This is the title of a work by Dr. J. B. Moody, Dean of the Hall-Moody Bible Institute, Martin, Tenn., and we consider it a master-piece. It contains 300 pages and there is not a dull paragraph from the beginning to end. Years ago we read Dr. J.R. Graves “Middle Life,” and we have never gotten away from what it taught us. But Dr. Moody’s “After Death,” is to our mind, a still more satisfactory work than “Middle Life.” After reading it we had a grander conception of Paul’s unspeakable vision when he was caught up unto Paradise, and as we think of it now the question rings through the chambers of our soul – “What must it be to be there?” Ah, brother, sister! Get the book and read and it will give you a glorious vision of that spirit-land and make you feel that while death is not to be desired, even by a Christian, yet beyond death is “gain” of things “far better” than the best we have on this side. So you can contemplate putting off your tabernacle with resignation and with a joyous anticipation of the glory beyond.

And then when you go on and read the “second second,” “After the Resurrection,” you will continually be reckoning how little the best is here, compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us, when we meet the Lord in the air, in our resurrection bodies, and enter with him on his reign. Not only are we to rejoice in the redemption of our bodies, but the creation itself is likewise to be delivered from all the horrors that have come by reason of sin and wrong, and the earth itself shall ultimately be the eternal resting

place of the race for whom it was made. – Send \$1 and get the book. Address, Dr. J.B. Moody, Martin, Tenn.

The following is a fair outline of the book from a Post paper – **The Word and Way**, Kansas City:

“After Death and After Resurrection,” J. B. Moody, is both vigorous and courageous as a writer.

ATHEISM

Immoral and Irrational.

LECTURES DELIVERED OVER EIGHT STATES,
AND URGED FOR PUBLICATION

BY

J. B. MOODY,

WATERTOWN, TENN.

Price 10 Cents; per hundred, \$5.00

TWO SPECIAL OFFERS.

	CLOTH	PAPER
“My Church,” Its Character and History (Enlarged).....	1.00	
Exceeding Riches of His Grace (Enlarged)	1.00	
After Death and Resurrection, Where and What?.....	1.00	
Same in paper covers (2 Volumes).....		\$0.70
17 W’s of Baptism (Enlarged).....	75	50
Rights and Restrictions of Women.....	50	25
Lord’s Supper, Church’s Passover.....	25	25
Missions versus Anti-missions, alias Gospel Missions and Methods.....	.25	25
Sabbaths and Their Antitypes.....	.20	20
The Name Christian.....	.15	15
Two Addresses (Hot Springs and Crystal Springs)		25
Living, Giving and Forgiving Grace.....		15
The Exceeding Sinfulness of Sin.....	10	10
Barren Fig Tree – Fruitless Christians.....	10	10
Atheism – Immoral and Irrational.....	10	10
Baptismal Regeneration (John 3:5).....	10	10
Baptismal Remission (Acts 2:38).....	10	10

Any number or all at half price, prepaid.

J. B. Moody
Watertown, Tenn.

INTRODUCTION

President H. E. Watters, of Hall-Moody Institute:

“It is without doubt the greatest deliverance of modern times against that evil. It completely demolishes every argument and every doubt against the solid foundation of our religion.”

Eld. Wm. D. Nowlin, D.D.:

“It is one of the greatest exposures of follies of Atheism I ever heard. It is terrific in its destructive power, and yet as entertaining as any popular lecture on the platform. No intelligent person should fail to hear this masterful address.”

Eld. A. J. Barton, D.D., Waco, Texas:

“The keenest and most colossal thing that I ever heard on the subject of Atheism; an avalanche of keen, convincing and invincible human reason and Bible argument.”

Dr. W. M. Harris, Texarkana, Texas:

“An address of tremendous power. Its thought is high, deep rapid, with language simple and popular, bringing the discussion within easy grasp of any intelligent hearer.”

The Hopkinsville New Era:

“The lecture on ‘Atheism’ at the Baptist church last Sunday morning, at Fairview, by Rev. Joe B. Moody, Dean, of the Hall-Moody Institute, of Martin, Tenn., was the finest thing in the way of a lecture that has been our pleasure to hear in many years. Mr. Moody held his congregation for an hour with his flow of language

and they could have listened to him double the time, and then not grown weary. The house was filled.”

From the Calloway Times:

“The consummate skill and rapidity with which he demolished infidelity made the audience dizzy.

“As well attempt to describe in detail the mighty sweep of the cyclone, as to describe this avalanche of testimony that swept the weak assumptions of agnosticism like so much debris in the tornado’s path.

“Suffice to say that it was one of the greatest lectures ever delivered in Murray, and those who do not hear it miss the opportunity of their lives.”

Eld. G.H. Crutches, D.D.:

“His discussion of Atheism is one of the finest addresses I have ever heard. It is a gem. Everybody should hear it.”

D.F. Marlin, Grayville, Ill.:

“Dr. J.B. Moody gave us that wonderful lecture on ‘Atheism.’ Many say that ‘it was the greatest lecture ever given in town.’ The superintendent of our city schools says it was the best he ever heard.

R.M. Shipp, Supt. W.C. S. Winchester Ky:

“I do not see how it would be possible for the most skeptical, after hear you on ‘Atheism and Agnosticism’ to have any doubts to the existence of an all-wise and all-loving Creator.

“From the view of sparkling wit, unanswerable logic, and eloquent descriptions, I have never heard a discourse that pleased me more than this particular lecture of yours.”

Bro. J.A. Brown

“Your lecture on Atheism is the greatest I ever heard. It is the lectures of lectures. I wish everybody could hear it.”

Dr. W. A. Gaugh

“Dr. J.B. Moody, gave his great lecture on Atheism to the people of Trimble. The best informed people in town said it was the finest thing of its kind they ever heard. Dr. Moody is truly a giant.”

Elder M. E. Dodd, D.D., Paducah, Ky:

“I do not hesitate to pronounce it the greatest deliverance of the kind I ever heard. It is an intellectual treat, a scientific study, a philosophical wonder, a rhetorical gem, an oratorical cyclone, a theological marvel; poetry and pathos, learning and logic, wit and humor, ridicule and sarcasm; ponderous in thought, weighty in matter, sweeping a popular audience on with the speaker in demolishing the frivolous fancy of fools.

“Every one who has a mind that thinks, a heart that feels, and a soul that lives would be greatly benefited by hearing this lecture.”

Atheism – Immoral and Irrational

(Read Rom. 1:18-32; and Psa. 14:1-5)

Text: “*The fool hath said in his heart – No God*”

I will not imitate the preacher whose custom was to read his text and announce his subject, which he divided into three parts; first he told them what he was going to tell them; then he told them, then he told what he had told them. I promise not to weary you with repetitions, but I fear I may weary you with rapidity. My territory is so large and my time so short that I must go rapidly over the fields of investigation. Let us first emphasize the Moral and the Rational, and then give some heed to the Scientific, and the Religious aspects of this subject.

My subject is not infidelity, for that is an undefined and indefinable term. Deists, who acknowledge the existence of God, are Infidels, because they deny the Deity of Jesus Christ, the Personality of the Holy Spirit, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, and also Particular Providence. Beside these there is a great variety of Infidels who deny some vital truths of the Gospel. Indeed, I might be called an Infidel myself, as I deny some doctrines deemed vital, and of world-wide and age-lasting acceptance. Such as Baptismal Regeneration and its belongings. I also reject much that is taught in the “Vain Philosophies” and “Sciences falsely so called.” Thus ecclesiastical popes and scientific high priests might charge me with heresy, and convict me as an Infidel.

So I say Infidelity is not my subject. Nor would I indict the honest doubter, for I am one myself. I honor all such, provided they are honest. This means that his investigations have not yet proved satisfactory, and he must doubt until his mind is satisfied. There

are many theological and scientific questions I am not yet settled on, and my rule is the Bible rule: “Prove all things, hold fast to that which is good.” I must assure my understanding as well as my faith and my hope.

Nor am I after the man who might wish there be no God; nor the man who might think thus; no, nor the man who might timidly say so with his mouth; nor all who might boldly say thus with the heart, for even then, his early training and surrounding moral influences and associations, may prevent, or hinder the legitimate fruits of his doctrine from showing themselves in his life. I am not so much after the man, but after his doctrine. ATHEISM is my subject rather than ATHIESTS. My claim and charge is this: If Atheists were to isolate themselves from counter influences and associations, and have every thing their own way; in a generation, more or less, they would lose all Moral perceptions and inclinations, and also Rationality on the subject of Divine Existence. Indeed, I have seen some, despite their good surroundings, with no more moral perceptions than a dog, nor rationality on this subject more than a hog. Like hogs they wallow in moral filth, and like dogs they love to eat their own insane corruption. Such is the fruit of Atheism when allowed to bear its own fruit unhindered by better influences. Not many such are found under Christian influences.

My argument is offered, not so much as a cure as a preventive. Some may hear or read who are headed that way, which way is broad and smooth and short and down hill, and it does not take much time or labor to land there.

The best way to prevent bullfrogs from bellowing, and mosquitoes from buzzing and biting is to work with tadpoles and wiggle tales. “An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.”

The term “FOOL” is used in a variety of senses in the Scriptures, and that proves there is a variety of them. If I mistake not, there are seven Hebrew and Greek words translated by this term “Fool;” and as seven stands for completeness, this may suggest not only a variety, but that the variety is a complete variety of foolishness in the fools. But as the word is often used in the Scriptures in a modified sense, so I will use it in this discourse though I may have to modify the text to do so.

This solemn and sweeping indictment was twice made by David and repeated by Paul; and as these men “Spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit,” who knew what was in man, they did not lay more to the charge of such than is true. Atheism, like every principle, good or bad has its beginning in the heart. As some understand the text: “The fool has said in his heart – I would there were no God.” If this is the right reading, then the Atheist is a Moral fool. But the wish soon becomes father to the thought, for a man can generally persuade himself to believe what he wants to believe; hence the second step in Atheism is easy – it is to think there is no God. This makes him an Intellectual fool. The third step is easier – it is to Say there is no God. This makes him a PRACTICAL fool. The fifth step is to become a Hater of God. This makes him a WICKED fool. The sixth step is to become a FIGHTER of God. This makes him a Ferocious fool. The seventh and last step is to die without God. This makes him a FINISHED and FOREVER fool.

And as this Moral, Intellectual, Presumptuous, Practical, Wicked, Ferocious, and Finished fool graduated in folly, he became corrupt and did abominable iniquity. None of them at any time or in any way did any moral or spiritual good. They may have loved their families and fellowshiped their fellow-companions, but in these things they did not excel the beasts and the birds of a feather that

flock together, and which love and companionate one another. It is to their interest to do so, hence selfishness and not God's glory was their motive, and motive is the moral quality of all intellectual actions. They became haters of God because of his exactions in holiness and righteousness. They even hate God's people and try "to eat them as they eat bread" although they so poorly partake of and reflect the Divine character. Professing themselves to be wise, they become as fools; and boasting that they fear not God nor regard man, yet obtain in life, and always in death, they find themselves to be in great fear, where they said no fear was. Thus the course of the Practical fool is reckless, raving, rapid, riotous, ruinous. Examples of morality are not expected in their Voltaires, Tom Paynes, and Ingersols. The Moral fool who says in his heart, I *would* there were no God, virtually says: I would there were no law, no order, no virtue, no limit to passion, no restraint to lust, no punishment for sin; and should these lawless principles become universal, the world would become a Sodom, a Bedlam, an Aceldama.

Bad principles lead to bad practices, and were it not for salt of the earth and the light of the world, we would to-day be living in a colony of hell.

But I must not assert more than I can prove. Does not the prevailing religion of any people mould and fashion the character of that people? All nations have their god or gods, and men invariably assimilate in character to the object of their worship. The worship of a God of perfect purity, affects the life in favor of righteousness and true holiness just in proportion as he is sincerely and devoutly worshipped. A god of lasciviousness has lascivious worshippers; and so on the end of the chapter. It is also equally evident, that those individual Atheists who would isolate themselves from the universal law of nations, and would have for

themselves no god, are left to themselves, and it is not dogmatism to say that a man left to himself, without any restraining, or constraining influence of any religion, will degenerate towards diabolism. The no-God people, and the false god people are alike without moral character. The first chapter of Romans gives the true history of all such in all ages. The only question for debate is, as to the rapidity of the degradation, and the time required to touch the bottom, if there be any bottom, which of course would be varied by varying circumstances, more than by the varying natures and characters of men. Not a ray of hope can anchor itself on any thing in nature of men, uninfluenced by a pure and undefiled religion. Men! Brethren! Boys! Hear me! I have seen the practical fool, living as though there were no God, wallowing in the mire of moral nastiness, and eating the vomit of a dog, and that before they had reached the meridian of life; despite two ten thousand parental restraints, despite the Bible filled with warnings and exhortation to a better life; despite the fact that they were once enlightened, and had a knowledge of the truth; despite the lightening of Sinai thundering in their ears; despite the blood of Calvary flowing at their feet; despite the great white throne and Him that sits there on, and from the terrors of whose countenance the heavens and the earth are to flee away; despite the exhortations of father and mother, wife and children, church and minister, providence and grace, with the protest of conscience and the Holy Spirit. All restraints I have seen early overcome in their downward plunge to moral degradation and death. Who were they? Practical fools who acted as though there were no God. That is the fruit of their doctrine.

The HABIT of Immorality may become so fixed that they cannot cease from it; as fixed as the Ethiopian's skin or leopard's spots, which nothing can change, save extraneous re-creating power. Men

by nature do not love holiness. They love sin, and they roll it as a sweet morsel under their tongues. Men cannot love one thing without hating its opposite. Those who love sin hate holiness, and vice-versa. Hence the carnal mind is enmity against God. And oh, what enmity! Should our gracious and just God make bare the bosom of his universal benevolence and make it tangible to our race, it would be stabbed millions of times a minute. Is that too strong? Let us see. God was once manifest in human flesh. No proposition is more susceptible of proof. His life was one of spotless purity. "He went about doing good." The verdict in his case was: "I find no fault in him." "He did nothing amiss." His enemies said: "Surely this is a righteous person;" "surely this is the Son of God." And yet the very best type of unregenerated human nature ever known; that class that made long prayers and oft repeated them; and who loved to pray; that best class among natural men; these were the ones who cried the loudest: "Away with him; crucify, crucify him; let his blood be on us and our children." And they of the false god party tried to kill him as soon as he was born. And to make sure of it, they killed all the children in his native town from two years old and under. What had he done? Why all this slaughter? The answer is plain. The sentiment prevailed that the time had come for one to come into the world who would overturn all of its kingdoms, and take to himself the reins of universal empire. They did not want this Divine person to rule in righteousness over them, either in secular or religious matters?

Pilot and Herod; Jews and Gentiles, never agreed but once, and that was on Deicide. The charge made against him was, that he made himself God, or the equal of God. And what cared they for pretentious claims? What troubled them was, He was proving it, and all the world was running after him: they said if we let him

thus alone, all the world would believe on him. They were maddest when he did the works that none but God could do, and they strove together to put him to death.

Now, if the natural Jews, who acknowledge the true God, and Gentiles who worshipped false gods, would unite to crucify God manifest in flesh, what would not Atheists have done who were violently opposed to all gods? Let the bloody streets of Paris, and other histories answer. Christ and Christianity and Christians never had bitterer foes than Atheists. If men love sin, and hate holiness, and I need not stop to prove that to any one, then it follows, that they must hate him who is represented as the perfection, and personification, and exemplification of all holiness, and who cannot look upon sin with allowance.

Heathen nations may be moral, and practical fools, but they are not intellectual, and presumptuous Atheists. They neither think, nor say there is no God. They are those “who knowing God, did not like to retain him in their knowledge,” but “gave themselves to corrupt idols, and to vile passions so they could work all uncleanness with greediness.” Being moral fools they tried to *forget* God, but they are not the intellectual fools who *deny* God. When you show me a nation that does not walk in the *sunshine* of God’s revelation, I will try to show that they walk at least in its *moonshine*. “For the heavens DECLARE the glory of God, and the firmament SHOWETH his handiwork. Day unto day UTTERETH speech, and night unto night SHOWETH knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. There line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world.” Not only the visible, but the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.

Now, as the Bible is the sunshine of God's revelation and nature is its moonshine; and as the greater light is too strong for some evil eyes, I will leave this Book, the Bible, as it does not claim to be the only witness, and will meet my brother man by moonshine, where like the owl he thinks he can see. With God's foot-stool under my feet, and God's canopy over my head, I would stand side by side with my brother according to nature, and I will endeavor in all kindness to reason with him. I would show him that in saying there is no God; he makes himself at least an intellectual fool. I would not further judge his heart, lest he might think I do him injustice. Dismissing now the moral aspect of his character, I beg him as a brother man, endowed as I am, responsible as I am, going as I am, to stand hard by me, and let us REASON together. Atheists charge Christians with being the most credulous and gullible people on earth, believing that concerning which they have not sufficient testimony. But we think we have the testimony, and think they have not believed it because they have not rightly considered it. But now, if one is here and has ears to hear, and eyes to see, I beg that he be honest in heart that he may hear, and see. But let us first look at the position we each occupy, and see the great disadvantage the Atheist is placed under in the matter of reason, and argument. Theism, which I espouse, is a belief in support of which we have many mighty truths, and force facts. We have a formulated creed on which all Theists stand. It has positive institutions with veritable laws, so that when they attack our position they have positive, tangible, veritable realities to contend with, such as a converted life, not reformed only but regenerated or reversed life. But Atheism is not a creed, not facts, not faith, not testimony; but nonentity. It is a denial of facts; a rejection of testimony; a want of faith; a disbelief, an aching void this world can never fill. Hence I could not expect him to prove his No-God theory, for that is not possible by any process of right reasoning and sound logic. He

can't possibly prove that *God is not*. He blindly disbelieves, but he can't possibly disprove. He can only think it, or say it in the heart. But God hears the heart, and pronounces him a fool. Say it not I pray you with the mouth, lest man should hear it and repeat the charge. Existence may be proved, non-existence never. Non-existence is beyond the realm of reason, and the latitude of logic. Yea, even beyond the domain of imagination. Existence does not depend on human knowledge.

Mr. Atheist! Do you say that the Lord is nowhere? Yes, that is what you say, but how do you know? Have you been there? Do you say he is not anywhere? How do you know? Have you been everywhere? Do you say he is nobody? How do you know? Are you everybody? Do you know everybody? Do you say he is nothing? How do you know? Are you everything? Do you know everybody and everything? Then I would not talk so loud. I congratulate you on your honest confession in the naming of yourselves. You call yourselves Agnostics, that means Know-nothings. It is the Greek word for ignorance, and you knew it. You say that on the subject of Divine Existence, "you don't know." Who said you did? The Bible tells of those who know not God, and who by worldly wisdom can't find him out. Of course human intellect alone can't reach to the Infinite. And yet that book says, that in the day we seek after God with all the mind and with all the heart, that God would be found of them. We must "feel after him" both with the intellections and affections. Millions in all ages and all lands thus sought him and found him. When they hated him they could not find him, though he was not far from all of them. But afterward they said they found him, and knew both God and his Son, Jesus Christ, whom to know is life everlasting. You say you can't believe without sufficient testimony. But that is the very thing you do. You excel the whole credulous Christian world doing

that very thing. You assert there is no God, while you have not the shade or shadow of proof, and can't possibly have. Where and what is the evidence or proof that there is no God? Why such zeal in getting others to assert what can't be prove and hence can't really be believed? I would not allow myself to talk so long and loud on a subject, after confessing that I knew nothing about it. Because *you* don't know, does it follow that *others* do not?

See what presumption there is involved in the assertion, there is no God. How it is it possible for a man to grow to such immense intelligence? Why nothing short of all the light in all ages could bring a man to this knowledge. The man who can prove there is no God must possess such infinite attributes, then there would be a God for he would be one himself. To prove such a proposition he must absolutely possess all knowledge. If he does not, and there be many things he does not know, how dare he say as a rational man, that the many things he is ignorant of, fail to prove there is a God? If a man had seen the first clock or watch, contrived to keep the passing hours, minutes, and seconds, and had crossed the ocean to either hemisphere to tell the joyous news, and had encountered by infidels, who derided and mocked the assertion, because so unlike the things of his observation, and knowledge; the controversy would be quite similar to this. Existence of the device might be proved, while proof of its non-existence would require the pulverization, and sifting of all matter in the universe; even then it might be claimed that the device was pulverized or hidden in the pulverized matter in one of the millions of worlds after it was sifted. Disproof of its existence would be an impossible undertaking. If a man is not familiar with all the *propositions* involved in universal truth, how can he know that those he is not familiar with, fail to establish the existence of God? If he is not acquainted with the doer of all things, always, and every-where,

how dare he say that none of these things were done by God? If he does not know who made the sun, how can he say God did not make it? Who but a “fool” would talk that way? If he is not absolutely certain of every cause of everything that exists, how can he say the cause he is ignorant of is not God? If he is not omnipresent and eternal, that is, everywhere in the universe at the same time, and has always been there, possessing all knowledge, how does he know, but that at some time, and in some place there may not have been manifestations of a Deity that would prove overpowering even to his own mind? How can a man prove there is no God unless he possessed all the power, presence, and knowledge within the possibilities of infinity? But if a man should possess all these attributes, and should offer the proof, the result would go to establish the existence of a God; for he would be one himself. Nay! Let him attack, ridicule, and even overthrow every argument that was ever adduced in favor of Theism, and then he would utterly fail to prove there is no God; for no one has ever vainly presumed to assert, that one ten-thousandth part of the argument has been adduced, that the subject admits of.

Now I will go to the utmost extent of concessions for argument, and say, that if the Atheist could grind in powder, every argument that man could make, and then scatter the dust to the nethermost parts of the universe, still the question of Divine existence would remain as before. For verily, verily I say unto all, that He who made, moves and manages this universe, and some one made, moves and manages it, that the existence of such a being could not depend at all, on the ability of finite creatures like man to prove it.

We are not dependent on reason for our greatest faith, and highest knowledge, as we believe and know many things we can't understand and prove. I know that the earth produces and that food nourishes, and that God answers prayer but I did not learn them

from reason. My arm moves but who can explain it? Physiology tells us how it is constructed so that muscles can move the arm. But what moves the muscles to move the arm? Psychology tells us that the brain through the nerves moved the muscle to move the arm. But what moves the brain to move the nerve to move the muscles to move the arm? They tell us the will moved the brain. But what is the will? Did any one ever see, taste, smell, hear, or feel one? What moved the will to move the brain to move the nerve to move the muscles to move the arm? Reason may be as dumb as an oyster but that need not keep us from believing and knowing. The grass of the field can be turned into all kinds of flesh of beasts and fowls, and that into the flesh of man, and reason is impotent to explain, but that don't keep us from believing and knowing. As I see it, the Atheist has not a grain of sand for his irrational foot. But I don't concede that Atheists have ever succeeded in overturning a single argument in favor of Theism. As I understand it, they have excelled the whole world into two things, first in asserting what they can't prove, and ridiculing what they can't answer. They ridicule dogmatics, and then try to monopolize the privilege. Some of the assertions of Scientists are shockingly senseless. Look at this. They tell us that a cubic inch of gas of whatever kind, contains two hundred sextillions of molecules, and that each molecule contains several atoms, and that these atoms are flying around in these molecules at the rate of seventy-five miles per second. It may be six sextillions instead of two hundred sextillions, but what difference does that make as science don't have to be so exact. But taking the smaller number, and counting thirty million of seconds to the year, and allowing him to count 1000 each second and it would require six trillion, six hundred and sixty six billion, six hundred and sixty-six million, six hundred and sixty-six thousand, six hundred and sixty-six years to count them. If they could see there were several atoms in each molecule, why

did they not count them, and how could they tell they were traveling at the rate of seventy miles a second? I don't believe they could see an atom traveling that fast. Then how could they calculate the speed? For dogmatism commend the infidel scientist.

Col. Ingersoll charged Christians with superstitions and then ridiculed it. Idolatrous religions are superstitious and deserve ridicule, but there is one "pure and undefiled religion" which teaches us "to prove all things and to attain to an assurance of understanding, as well as assurance of faith and hope. The sciences are saturated with superstitions, and speculations of the imagination, but they are not to be ridiculed. Though they fall short of knowledge they are helpful in attaining to knowledge of truth. A superstition lies outside the realm of reason, and inside the domain of the imagination, but is credible, and should be entertained. Look at logic called the science of sciences, "the creator, redeemer and preserver of sciences." Its great implement is the syllogism, which enables one to detect the fallacies in any process of reasoning. It rests on the famous dictum of Aristotle, that whatever can be affirmed or denied of a class, can be affirmed or denied of any member of that class. Example: All men are mortal, John is a man, therefore John is mortal. The conclusion is infallibly true if the premises are. But the major premise is a superstition. No one knows all men, but that does not prevent the assertion: I don't believe it. Enoch and Elijah did not die, and millions will escape death in the translation when Christ comes. But there is so much truth in the premise, that John had better not take any chances, but prepare himself for the great ordeal. They tell us that all conductors are non-electrics; liquids are conductors, and therefore liquids are non-electrics. But who knows all conductors and all liquids? Let us honor all superstitions that can be made to serve, and ridicule the rest.

Let us now try Physical Science. It tells us that matter is infinitely divisible. That after dividing an infinite number of times, we come to atom, which can't be cut, because it has no size. Atom is unknowable, and may be unthinkable. It has neither size or weight. We must believe that all atoms of the same element have the same size and weight, because they have no size and weight, yet atoms of different elements have different sizes and different weights, although atom can have no size and weight. It must be infinitely small, for if it have any size, it can be cut; and if it can be cut, it can't be atom. All atoms have some size, because they have no size; and hence, all must have the same weight, because they have no weight, yet atoms of different elements must have different weights. Example, H₂O: That is, each molecule of water must have two atoms of hydrogen and one of oxygen. Can't be reversed or altered. Two atoms of one element and one of another having neither size or weight unite in another that has size and weight. It looks like a contradiction, but we will call it a paradox, or useful superstition, and make it serve the best we can, till we can fully know even as we are fully known. Now try atomic space. Divide a half inch into an infinite number of parts, which can be done only in the imagination, and cause a solid body to move over it, and it will taken an infinite number of portions of space. But an infinite number of portions of times is eternity; therefore, it will take a moving body an eternity to move half an inch. Does theology offer a greater strain on faith and knowledge?

Mathematics tells us that the asymptote to the hyperbola continues to approach the curve, but will never meet it, how far soever it may be produced. This is in the teeth of an axiom which says that two lines approaching each other will meet if sufficiently produced. Is this a contradiction in mathematics, the only real science we have? I exhort infidels to be fair, and treat the mysteries

of science and theology alike. That is, know all you can, believe all you can, hope all you can, and go on to perfection.

But atheistical scientists, after exhausting themselves in dogmatizing what they can't prove, and ridiculing what they can't answer, often proceed to make themselves a god or gods of what they call nature, matter, motion, mind, man, beasts, birds, reptiles and creeping things. Then, instead of being atheists, they become polytheists, pantheists, or some other corruption of theism. Atheists do not array themselves against false gods so much as against the only one and living God, the Creator of all things and the primal cause of the cosmos and universe.

Now, let us re-adduce very briefly just enough of the argument in favor of Theism to test the boastful efforts of overturning it. But where shall I begin? Standing in the midst of infinite truths and universal facts, observable optically, telescopically, historically, or otherwise, or anywise, or every-wise, or all-wise; what shall I do with such a mass of evidence, such accumulated testimony? Shall I lay tribute on the starry skies, with their burning orb of day as he comes forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber, rejoicing as a strong man to run a race? See that grand retinue of revolving escorts, beginning with Mercury and Venus, both unattended by moons, because so near the center of light that they need not to borrow. Then, further off is our own planet, with its grand chandelier to shine by night, because now so far from the sun that its light fails to dissipate our shadow. Then further out still is little Mars, with its Deimos and Phobos – two moons - to shine on its pathway, lest it stray from its orbit. And still further out is grand old Jupiter, thirteen hundred times bigger than we, with his four or more moons, marching majestically through the azure meads of heaven. And further out still is huge old Saturn with his eight lanterns lit by the sun, lighting up his circuitous pathway through

the mazes of pitchy darkness. And further out still Uranus and Neptune, whose great distance and darkness prevent a very familiar acquaintance. These, may be more, marching in perfect order to the rule of the spheres, proudly escorting that mighty man as he runs his race from one end of heaven to the other. And as the planets revolve around the sun, and the moons around the planets; with the sun, moons and planets as a system, and thousands and tens of thousands of other planetary systems, all flying with a rapidity that sickens the mind to contemplate, around some unknown central holy of holies; these hundreds of millions of stars, the supposed solar centers of larger planetary systems, in comparison to which ours is but a plaything; with those thousands of eccentric comets recklessly dashing across all paths, and that at a speed that makes lightning lazy, yet never producing a jar; but instead they seem to greet each other in passing with Christian salutation, and good speed, in continuance of that obedience that has not varied a breath of a hair in a million of years. And these confounding fractions are not less imperative, but even such irregularities are to be, and have been obeyed in their minutest details.

Who made that burning, shining ponderous orb, and who hung him in the heavens on nothing? Who made our own and other planets, and who threw them out over utter emptiness, at *particular* distances apart, and sent them whirling in their orbits through the infinitude of space, and that at a speed that exactly counterbalances their centripetal and centrifugal forces? From whence is that all-pervading, all-comprehending, and never-varying design, that keeps each and all in their respective orbits and movements so as to prevent conflict and destruction? Who devised this scheme of infinite intelligence which like the Bible, the mind of man can never fully comprehend? Where is that omnipotent power that

takes up and handles these mighty worlds as very little things? Where is that all-seeing intelligence; that omnipresent, omnipotent, that originated, upholds, governs and guides these flying worlds through tractless voids of space?

Do you say it is nature? Then nature is omnipresent, omnipotent, and omniscient. You clothe it with the attributes of Deity, and you have but another name for our God. Do you say then that it is Matter? That cannot be; for things of which I have spoken are composed of matter, and inert, senseless matter could not have created itself, else it must have had an *intelligent* existence before it had a *formal* existence which is absurd, as all matter must have *form*. Do you say then that it was Motion? That cannot be, for motion is not a reality, but a result. There can be no motion, unless matter moves. Matter must be prior to motion, as motion is matter moving. Do you assert that matter is eternal, for you must assert where you can't prove. Then I ask how cam matter to move? How can it in all its forms and phases, and at immense distances apart, to move always, and everywhere by one all-pervading inflexible rule?

You claim that motion gave shape and bulk? Grant it, but tell me how came matter to move? Do you say motion is an inherent quality in matter? Then you put a lie in the teeth of a philosophical axiom which says that inertia is the natural quality of matter; and this we know to be true, for you may take matter in any of its forms and phases, as iron, wood, rock, earth, etc., and lay them here on this desk, and it will be there to-day, tomorrow, and forever, if not moved by extraneous power.

But materialists beg the question again by saying "that matter may have qualities we know not of." Thus they would decide against we known by what they do not know. By putting

hypothetical possibility against acknowledged certainty, they forfeit fellowship as rational beings. We know that matter is inert and senseless, and that knowledge can't be destroyed by a supposition of something we don't know. If that which is known is to be overruled by what is unknown, then certainty is an impossibility, since our ignorance is greater than our knowledge. The immateriality of mind and the unconsciousness of matter are conclusions forced upon us by every consideration. If cogitation is an inherent quality in matter, then every atom is a thinking being. If not, then a constituent part of matter is devoid of thought. Matter differs from matter only in form, density, bulk, motion and direction. To which of these is cogitation inherent? The only modes of material existence we know, are to be round, square, solid, fluid, large, small; and to be moved slowly, swiftly, one way or another.

Is intelligence inherent in all of these? Locate it and prove it, or I will not believe it. Do winds blow and waters flow and plants grow by their own intelligence? A great scientist told me that his old hickory cane came into being of its own accord, and that it was going out of its own accord, and that it would assume some other form of its own choice. I congratulated him on having such a cane, and expressed the hope that it would teach him what he did not know, for I knew that he did not come into existence of his own accord; that he was not passing out through degeneration of his own accord, and that he was going into another form of existence of his own choice, for I knew that he would fight degeneration, disease and death to the very last and get others to help him.

Even on this or any other hypothesis, intelligence must have existence before matter to give it these modes of existence; and if there was intelligence before matter, where was it? Had matter pre-intelligence enough to form, qualify and direct itself, and yet not

post-intelligence enough for preservation? For these forms and modes and motions are being continually changed and destroyed by watery flood and fiery flame and tooth of time. Then it is easier to create than to preserve, which seems absurd.

But do you contend that some matter is intelligent as brain, and that it is the matter of brain that thinks, since a pressure upon the matter of brain suspends thought? Then how about brain after death? Do you replay that after death the quality of brain has changed? Then brain must of a certain quality to be intelligent. Then matter is not essentially intelligent, as all matter has not the form and quality of the thinking brain. Brain itself has not always this quality. But I would further enjoin, that each mass of matter in the form and quality of thinking brain thinks differently and independently; but in the government of this vast, universal machinery there is unity of thought, for all things work together. Then, where are the brains of the universe? For, unless it be of one mass and quality, there would be conflict, instead of harmony.

Was not that foolish matter that formed itself into a slimy snake, full length in the dirt, rather than in some higher order, even into an angel of light and beauty? Then surely, foolishness, and not intelligence, is the characteristic of matter.

But up jumps another schools, deifying Law, saying that all this is governed by law. Then whence the law? Was law prior to matter? Then matter is not eternal, and over goes that system. Was matter prior to law? Then matter has existed without law; and, I ask, whence came the law? And will give you till the death of time to answer that question. Does law make and execute itself? All we know about law is, that it is the uniform procedure of law makers and law executors. There is nothing deader than law when left to itself.

Seeing these insurmountable difficulties, another school, advancing the theory that the orderly-arranged universe, as it now exists, is from eternity. This cannot possibly be; for, in the present arrangement of the universe, we see matter in motion. Then motion is a present arrangement of the universe; and since that cannot be eternal which has anything before it, and since matter certainly existed before motion, as motion is only matter moving, then the universe as now arranged is not from eternity.

As there is no end of the schisms and sects among infidels and scientists, whose theories run well only for a short time, next comes Evolution, discarding all these theories, and kicks the heretics out of the back door of the synagogue of science, and offers its solution of a no-God or vague deistical theory of the universe. This theory contains some truth not peculiar to itself, and much error that is. Its effort on the primo-geniture of the primordial germ is unsatisfactory to reason. Evolution does not propose to bring the universe out of nothing, but it gets near to nothing as it can, as the primordial germ is only a big name of the old atom. It seems to me that what is too small to evolve or generate the universe out of. Mr. Darwin's definitions need defining, and especially to his assertions need proving. For the life of me, I can't understand his most familiar words, such as his "Natural selection," and "election?" These terms imply choice, and choice is the product of reason, and reason implies a purpose, and it can't be proved that nature has such qualities, and attributes, and I don't and won't believe it until it is proven. I recognize the law of "Tendency" and "Results from use," but these cannot be substituted for design, as in many cases they are the operation of design. Use may have hardened the woodpecker's bill, but it didn't shorten it and dull it as use requires. Thus, if "Law of Tendency" holds good in one requirement, it fails in two, for not only is the

woodpecker's bill the hardest, but it is yet the longest and sharpest. They think the Crane was not equipped by a designing Creator with long legs and neck to give it large latitude in feeding, but that the Crane having elected and selected his food in the water, and being a voracious bird, he was led to wade beyond his capacity, which brought a tension in its limbs, and cause them to grow, as the woodpecker elected and selected the wood-worm that necessitated the picking of the wood that resulted in hardening the bill. And so the elephant's snout grew from constant tension to feed itself. But they fail to show us in the history of books or rocks when the elephant's snout or Crane's limbs were any shorter than now. But do you ask for a more plausible theory than these? That is right. Before giving it, tell me which was first, the hen or the egg? If the hen, then there was a hen that did not come out of an egg, and whence came it? If the egg was first, then there was an egg a hen did not lay, and that egg had the future hen in it, in all its embroil fullness. Whence came the egg? Here is the way I reason about such things. A watch or other machinery has design and mechanism, and so I conclude they had a designer and mechanic, and could not otherwise evolve out of chaos. And so of the Cosmos world, and the universe. These are stamped with designs, and mechanisms, and only intelligence could have brought them out of chaos.

There is more satisfaction for reason, faith, and consciousness in the first statement of Revelation, than in all the vain philosophies, and sciences falsely so-called. "IN THE BEGINNING, GOD CREATED THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH." Here reason can rest, and until it takes hold of this Gibraltar of strength, it must be driven by tempests of direful doubts and unsatisfying uncertainties; and like the comfortless spirit going about seeking rest and finding none, it will be compelled at last to return to the

house it left, to live in the blackness of darkness, and to die in the damnation of disbelief; and the last end will be worse than the first.

O Atheism! What meanest thou? Do you say I see no design in the whole created universe? Do these eyes see, yet not designed and made to see? Does these ears hear, but were not designed and made to hear? Then I know what manner of spirit you are. You are of your father the devil, and he was a liar from the beginning. But Atheism is more than a lying spirit. It is a wicked spirit, for it seeks to cover the earth with sackcloth, and to blot out every hope of immortality. And what has it to offer instead, save a shameful life of sin, and the degraded death of a dog? Is he not a fool who sees law, yet denies a law-giver and executor? Who sees design, yet denies a designer? Plan, yet denies a planner? Mechanisms, but no mechanic? Contrivance but no contriver? Building, but no builder? Wisdom, but no previous knowledge? Benevolence, but no original goodness? Wise motion that is not the intelligent expense of power? Wise results, without previous purpose? Wise motion that is not the intelligent expenditure of power? They will say that motion is at the expense of power, and that in proportion to the gravity, and velocity of the moving body. Yet, seeing mighty worlds, with mighty gravities, and mighty numbers, flying at mighty velocities, must be at the expense of mighty power, according to their mighty philosophies; they had rather make a mighty denial of these mighty facts, and thus make themselves mighty fools, rather than there should be a mighty God. Lord have mercy on the man who says in his heart, or mind or mouth, or life, or emotion, - "THERE IS NO GOD," and then spends his powers in hating and fighting Him who they say is not. Fighting nobody. Great waste of power.

Do you ask for satisfactory proof of the deity of Christ and the inspiration of the Scriptures? Here it is: Go honestly to the Bible to

learn of human nature and to see yourself as you really are. You may, at first, grin at Gen. 6:5, and many other like scriptures. But read on as you ought, and your grin will turn to groans, and your groans to grief, and your grief to despair. Soon you will lose your rest, your appetite and your sleep. You will have convictions that grip you irresistibly. Then you will realize the truth and will seek relief – the only relief – and that will be faith in a crucified Saviour – God’s sacrifice and remedy for sin. Meet God at the cross, and your sins will roll away, and a sweet peace that passes all understanding will possess your mind and heart through Jesus Christ. Then you will know with the most satisfying knowledge that Jesus has power on earth to forgive sins; and this light will grow brighter and brighter as the truth is put to the test. Millions of the greatest minds and most of the greatest scientists have tested it, and will testify for it.

I close with an epitaph found on a tombstone in Europe. It is supposed to have been dictated by an infidel who had lost a child; and Infidels and Atheists love their families as well as Christians. There is no moral virtue in either, as it is God-given instinct implanted in men, beasts and birds. Col. Ingersoll was never so rational on this subject as at the funeral of his brother. Many times this severe lesson of experience is necessary to bring a man to God. So the epitaph reads:

“Blind infidelity! Turn pale and die:
Beneath this sod an infant ashes lie.
Say, is it saved or lost? If death’s by sin, it sinned, for it is
here;
If heaven’s by works, in heaven it can’t appear.
Blind infidelity! Turn pale and die.
It died, for Adam sinned;
It lives, for Jesus died.”

From sinful man comes sin and death; from sinless man comes light and life. Who can deny these hereditary principles, with a world full of examples? Depravity and death are hereditary; so holiness must come of a new birth from above. The world abounds with both. You all have experienced the first; may you also experience the second.