The Principle of Truth.

The last century has been one great interrogation point. Never before has the spirit of inquiry so possessed the people as at present. Yet the questions which today are most seriously troubling the minds of some of the best thinkers of the world, are questions which have troubled scientific men from the beginning. The question relating to man's own origin, his present life, and his future destiny.

What must the first man and woman have thought of this life as they looked about them, which learned out of the Garden of Eden when they saw the fiery disk of day, rising in a sea of gloom and traversing his burnig course through the dark and airy of heaven, only to sink to rest, leaving the brightness of his track to fade gradually from view; wondering what was all this mystery, what was it that they had asked themselves when they gazed into the midst of starry realms of stars.

What mystery is it that we have such
surround the second place things, about the
high mountain and the valleys, the rivers and the
seas above all else, in the many and varied
forms of life around them— from the most
minute organisms, insects on the one side, to the
beautiful and colorful flowers of the field and
the mighty trees of the forest, and, on the other side,
through all the glories of animal life, to the majestic
monsters of the air, and the magnetic heads of
the field, and last and most wonderful of all—to
man himself, with his complicated structure
and his inner mind filled with wonder at
the marvelous things about him.

We have searched for the secret of life in all three
integral parts of nature— in the plants and animals
the air and water— earth and sky— yet all is dark
and uncertain. The mystery of life is a mystery
still— though every age has probably offered some solution
to the problem. From the time where the preludical
sage reverently asks, "What is man, that Thou art
mindful of him?" until Darwin expounded his theory
of evolution, we have been searching for the truth, yet even
at the present day, the world seems to be still far from
the object of its search.

In his study of life, the student has two chief books at
his disposal, the Bible and the Book of Nature; and
This fact has led scientists to many grave difficulties and mistakes. Science, in studying nature, has discovered facts from which she has drawn conclusions apparently directly opposed to the truths as taught by the Bible, and hence, from time immemorial, Bible students have categorized the sciences of nature, while the latter have denied the truths of the Bible.

When Galileo taught that the earth moves around the sun when Newton proclaimed his theory of gravitation—indeed, when each and every one of the great laws which are now recognized as the governing machinery of the universe was first discovered, it was bitterly opposed, under the impression that its acceptance must overthrow the authority of that other Book of Revelation—the Bible. Yet today, men are taking more interest in both scientific and Biblical research, and as far as science has proved her laws to be true, they have been found, after bitter opposition, to be in perfect harmony with Bible teaching. Both the Bible and Nature are God's books, written for the instruction and guidance of man; and, having the same author, they cannot disagree. Properly interpreted, each explains the other; the mysteries and incomprehensible things of one are made clear by the other. Nature teaches principally the history of the past, with just a suggestion of the future, while the Bible is concerned frequently with the future, and only incidentally with the past. One is not the rival, but the complement of the other.
Science has made many mistakes, in the past, and it is more than probable that she is today teaching false theories for truths, but, as her mistakes have been so

known heretofore, they will be hereafter, for truths of

nature are infallible and eternal.

Why, it may be asked, have so many of the world's greatest

scientists, deepest thinkers, most intellectual men, rejected

the Bible and its teachings? I answer that men who study

science alone reject the Bible because they do not know

the Bible, and hence they entertain the fundamental prin-
ciples of nature. On the other hand, men who study the

Bible alone are very apt to reject the great truths of nature,

and for the same reasons - they do not understand

nature, they do not see the close and intimate connection

existing between the two revelations.

There existed, as I believe, to be one great and important

reason why science and religion have so long been antagonistic.

Thus broad-minded, intellectual thinkers who have

carefully and thoughtfully studied both of these Books of

Revelation, accept the divine nature of both. To them the

mistakes in the interpretation of one are rectified in study-

ing the other. The God of the Bible becomes a real, a

great, real God to the man who sees him in his works.

Nature is the lawbook of the universe - and law is the

fundamental principle which governs all created things.

The great work of science today is the discovery of these govern
When Sir Isaac Newton saw the apple fall to the ground, it was not simply that individual phenomenon that he saw—it was the law of gravitation. Through that simple event, the reign of chaos over the universe was changed, in the minds of men, to the reign of law. Gradually the acceptance of this principle has become more and more nearly universal. The scientist in every individual phenomenon. The chemist, bending eagerly over his crucibles, by the aid of law, is enabled to predict the exact nature of the reaction that will take place between the ingredients of his compounds. The botanist and the geologist find sure evidence of law, in the growth, development, and decay of organisms of all kinds; and the geologist in his study of the wonders of the inorganic world, finds law still requiring sequence.

About Charles Darwin, through his love of nature and his close and patient study of the phenomena, because impressed with the regularity and uniformity of the processes he drew the conclusion from his meager data, that all existing things are governed by the same great law of development; that the sea, moon, and stars, the earth and all things in it, rocks, water, air, plants, and animals, and, last but greatest, man are all the closely related parts of one vast and magnificent whole, each integral part is but a step up from the next lower part, and all are but different stages in this great law of derivation.
It is a beautiful theory, and although it has been and is most energetically opposed, it is today accepted, either partially or entirely, by thousands of scientists of greater or lesser repute. Many even of the Christian students of nature accept this wonderful theory as a law. But the latter do not make the same great mis take of the majority of Darwin's followers. They see the hand of a personal God, back of all guiding and controlling the forces which he has set in motion. While the former deny the existence of this guiding hand, as revealed in the Bible. They draw conclusions which are surely disproved by the very facts upon which they are based. All nature teaches that life comes not only as the result of life, yet they would have us believe that the beginning of life was in not life—that something springs from nothing—that life is but a higher stage in this scheme of development.

But the mistakes are not all on the side of science. From the earliest times, theologians, in their religious zeal, have refused to accept the conclusions of science. They preferred to believe that the universe is governed by a God who conceives to make confidants of his creatures—that each individual part of the universe is a law unto itself, controlled only by the special will or decree of its arbitrary Creator.

By this very attitude they have helped to widen the breach between nature and revelation. Their God was too small tomorrow, for the scientist, the magnitude of whose deity was infinite, and hence the scientists rejected the Bible revelation.
after, and created a God of his own, whose greatness was as the

medusa of the universe itself—whose greatness was shown
in the order and regularity of nature in all her parts and
processes—a God of power and of law.

Rather, the student of nature near the student of the Bible is
willing to compromise—each rejects the teachings of the other, claim-
ing them to be the mere fancies of men. Yet, as the years have
gone by, and men have, by little and little, learned more of
the things around them and of their own natures—science
has descended deeper and deeper into the wonder of the universe,
and religion has come closer into the nature of its Author,
both have found mistakes in their creeds, but both have found
new truths to modify their beliefs, and in every case they have come nearer together. Science has given up some
of its wild, fantastic theories and has established almost be-
good question, many of its laws; while religion, whose funda-
mental principles were set up as firm as a foundation
as they were in the beginning, has given up its claims in
many unnecessary points. Thus it must always be—the
truth alone will stand the test of years. So long as science
has nature for her authority, she cannot be harmed; and
just as certainly, the principles of Bible teachings will stand.

It has been said that successful application in art is
the surest test of the truth of science, and since social
conduct is the art corresponding to the philosophy of life,
whatever makes men universal, better, and holier.
is by that very means, proved to be true.

If nature is the book of law, the Bible is the book of law, and as long as men need sympathy, as long as the weak need help against the strong, as long as the sorrowful need comfort, and sinful, suffering humanity needs encouragement, just as long it will stand unassailed amid the poisoned arrows of ridicule, of distrust of unclouded worldly scholarship, of the selfish superiority of bigoted men. But the Book of love is truth, of eternal life. True science says, There is no God, where it denies the divinity of Christ, where it questions the existence of spirit or the power over matter, the Bible will show forth its fallacies.

On the other hand, science will, as doubt, tear down many doxologies of theology, it may perhaps all-pervading belief in regard to God's methods and processes in accomplishing his wonders.

But true religion cannot more be harmed by science than can the truths of nature by theology. Truth is truth, wherever it is found, and the ultimate triumph is assured. It may be obscured by the cloud of darkness and distrust, it may be trampled under foot of arraignment and bigoted sneer, but when the clouds are swept away by the winds of wisdom, and knowledge, and common sense, we shall have come to see nature in the light of the Bible.
and the Bible in the light of modern science, the
truth will come forth from her obscurity, un-
varnished and unharnessed—all the more bright
and shining, because of the dark background
of doubt and skepticism.

Truth crushed to earth by falsehood, will
rise again, victorious and strong from the con-
flict, and God and nature will take their
proper relative positions in the eyes of men.
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