

All Rights Reserved By HDM For This Digital Publication
Copyright 1993 -- 2004 Holiness Data Ministry

Duplication of this disc (CD or DVD) by any means is forbidden,
and copies of individual files must be made in accordance with the
restrictions stated in the B4UCopy.txt file on this disc.

IS MAN AN ANIMAL?

By Edgar Painter Ellyson

General Sunday School Editor
Nazarene Publishing House
Kansas City, Missouri

Copyright, 1926
Nazarene Publishing House

* * * * *

Digital Edition 07/22/2004
By Holiness Data Ministry

* * * * *

CONTENTS

- 01 -- Foreword
- 02 -- The Source Books
- 03 -- The Four Kingdoms
- 04 -- Evolution Not Necessary To Explain Origin Or Series
- 05 -- Man Is Spirit
- 06 -- Spiritual Consciousness
- 07 -- What Is Man?
- 08 -- Conclusion

* * * * *

01 -- FOREWORD

War is declared; the fight is on. Whatever we may think as to the wisdom or folly, of the right or wrong, the facts are apparent. For several years past, each year has witnessed the lines being more closely drawn between that which has been termed fundamentalism and modernism. The anti-evolution law recently passed by the legislature of Tennessee and the Scopes trial growing out of it, and such cases as that of Harry Emerson Fosdick, affecting both the Presbyterian and Baptist bodies, and Bishop Broom of the Protestant Episcopal body, have greatly intensified this conflict. It breaks out frequently in school and church and has now been

thrown somewhat into the state. Its final correct settlement, however, is beyond the power of any legislative body, it is not a conflict of law. Neither can it be settled by a secular scholarship, nor an unregenerate ecclesiastical body.

This is not a conflict of intelligence against ignorance. A certain type of professional scholars by their constant slurring of their opponents as ignoramuses and intolerant bigots would seem to infer that all ignorance and bigotry was on one side, and that the side opposite to them. But there is no greater intolerance and bigotry to be found today than in the assumptions of this class of scholars. They talk as if they held all knowledge, that their interpretations must be received if the world is saved, that if they should be rejected wisdom would die with them and the world go back to barbarism. While they admit they do not know everything, yet they are the intelligencia, and those who are not of their class and do not accept their conclusions are ignoramuses. They seem to forget that the Bible and Christianity have been the forerunners of the best and the greatest civilization of our day and the great promoters of schools, and that just as great scholarship may be manifest in a continued loyalty to these as in the following of the hypotheses -- guesses of those who are mere nature students even though they are called scientists.

The basic point of this conflict is the question as to what is the authoritative source of information, the correct revelation of truth, and what is the correct method of interpreting this source, or sources. This will, of course, ultimately involve all truth but the question that is uppermost now is as to the origin, nature and development, of life. This leads to such questions as, Is there a personal God? If there is a personal God, what is His method of work? Who was Jesus Christ? What was His origin? What was His nature? What part does He play in our world affairs? From whence came man, what is he, and where is his place in the universe of being?

In the recent trial at Dayton, Tennessee, when Professor Scopes was being tried for teaching the evolutionary theory the chief defendant lawyer was the notoriously, self-confessed agnostic and enemy of Christianity and the church, Clarence Darrow. Associated with him was Dudley Malone, an evolutionist and church member professing to be a Christian. In the course of the trial these asserted that man was a mammal, the descendant from a lower form of animal life. William Jennings Bryan of the prosecution counsel flatly denied that he, and that man, is a mammal, that man is an animal descended from a lower form of animal life. Mr. Bryan's frank denial occasioned much newspaper talk, with some ridicule from his opponents and certain newspaper correspondents. He was called ignorant and unscholarly just because he did not swallow whole the unproven theories called the findings of science and assumed to be true by a certain class. What if it should be finally proven that Mr. Bryan is right? Whose turn would it be to laugh then? "He who laughs last, laughs best." One thing is very sure, that while certain persons proclaim it loudly, it has not yet been proven that man is an animal. Some proof has been offered but it is not at all conclusive. Is there anything to be said as to his not being an animal? We propose briefly to investigate this subject and see if we can determine who is right, Mr. Bryan the believer or Mr. Darrow the agnostic and his evolutionary associate. It will of necessity be our first task to determine the correct source of information, especially since there is some disagreement here, then we may seek for the answer to our question in this source.

* * * * *

02 -- THE SOURCE BOOKS

One of the most outstanding facts relative to man is that he is capable of knowing. He does not know innately or originally, but he is born with the capacity of knowing and, as is the case with his other faculties such as sight and hearing, upon the very first opportunity the faculty functions, is operative, and he knows. His primary knowledge is intuitive, but intuition is not sufficient for life's needs; he soon begins to learn by other means. Having this capacity man is sure to learn something, he must learn, he will learn. But being finite there is very great danger of his learning error, especially is this the case in his present fallen condition. His character and destiny being at stake in this learning he needs the truth, he must have truth, and he must have certainty at least at certain points. But what is truth. Is it the opinion of man; the conclusion of human reasoning, the professed finding of science? No. Truth is a fixed external something or somewhat and is to be discovered and the discoverer has nothing to do with creating it. There must then be a source of information that is true, a source that is sufficient and within his reach, and a teacher to help him discover the truth.

There is a first great cause, -- God. We assume the fact of God. The evidences of His existences are so apparent that to undertake proof would be to weaken the cause. God is the ultimate source of all truth. Jesus said, "I am . . . the truth" (John 14:16); not just a certain kind of truth, but the truth; not just a teacher of truth, but the truth. All truth is known by, and may be found in God. God has revealed some truth and has placed it within the reach of man. He would not create man with the capacity to know and then not place truth within his reach, at least sufficient truth for his well-being. But how does God reveal truth to man? We are told that "in the mouth of two witnesses," not just one, "shall all things be established." (Matt. 18:16, 2 Cor. 13:1.) God has two methods of revealing truth to men. And these two methods or witnesses, both coming from Him, will harmonize and substantiate each other and thus enhance the possibility of certainty and lessen the liability of error. And both of these witnesses speak on all essential subjects. Scholarship of a certain type has been much inclined to neglect one of these witnesses and to over exalt the other, and theology has sometimes been equally neglectful of the one which scholars have exalted, and serious results have followed.

God has revealed truth in what we are pleased to call the Book of Nature, by the things that are all about us and the laws governing their existence and movements. Nature is an embodiment of and a revealer of truth. We are surrounded everywhere by physical facts and natural phenomena. Also we ourselves have mental experiences and we see manifestations of mental facts in others. These physical and mental facts become knowledge to us, nature's revelation to us of a certain line of truth. We may know from nature something of the present facts and laws .as they are now operating, nature is a reliable source book within its sphere and man's ability to interpret or read it. That sphere is largely the present. So far as natural revelation is concerned when we turn to the past or the future we can only speculate with more or less certainty, quite often it is less. E. W. Maunder, F. R. A. S., in his book of Astronomy says, "Science therefore cannot go back to the absolute beginning of things, or forward to the absolute end of things. It cannot reason about the way matter and energy came into existence, or how they might cease to exist; it cannot reason about time or space, as such, but only in the relations of these to phenomena that can be observed. It does not deal with things themselves, but only with

the relations between things. Science indeed can only consider the universe as a great machine which is in 'going order,' and it concerns itself with the relations which some parts of the machine bear to other parts, and with the laws and manner of the 'going' of the machine in those parts. The relation of the various parts, one to the other, and the way in which they work together, may afford some idea of the design and purpose of the machine, but it can give no information as to how the material of which it is composed came into existence, nor as to the method by which it was originally constructed. Once started, the machine comes under the scrutiny of science, but the actual starting lies outside its scope." That which is, is no absolute proof of that which has been or shall be, for conditions and causes may change, some things may cease or new things be introduced; and there is also free personality with its choices and activities to be reckoned with, which cannot be certainly forecast or its past known short of divine omniscience.

Nature has not only a revelation of physical and mental facts, but it has also a revelation beyond itself. Matter as originally formed and all earth's original arrangements were built after a heavenly pattern, were types or pictures of heavenly things. The divine instruction to Moses relative to the building of the tabernacle was, "look that thou make them after their pattern which was shown thee in the mount." (Numb. 25:40.) And it seems clear that God followed this same method in His work of world building and arranging, that He created and formed matter and mind, that He built the earth and all things therein, after the pattern of things spiritual and heavenly. This would make nature a revelation from God of things beyond and greater than itself, of things greater than matter, physical phenomena and mind. Paul evidently had this in his thought when he wrote, "For 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." (Rom. 1:20). Nature is then a revelation, not alone of itself, but of God and spiritual things; nature is a true source of information relative to temporal and material things, and it speaks also relative to things heavenly and spiritual. It is because of this that the greatest of teachers, of philosophers, of scientists, -- Jesus of Nazareth, could say so often "the kingdom of heaven is like" and then refer to something of nature, and Israel's great song writer could say, The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth forth his handiwork.

It will be freely admitted by all that nature, that physical and mental fact all about us, is a great source of information, is a reliable source book for certain lines of truth. Certain men have been studying this book very largely, and some of them almost exclusively. The science of today is quite largely man's attempt to interpret this source book and systematically tabulate the findings, which they suppose are correct, are the exact facts; but it is quite evident that what they have recorded is sometimes mistakes of interpretation. Philosophy as we have it is man's effort to discover from this source book the ultimate cause for the existence and working of the things of nature and man. This source book may not be recognized as a revelation from God, but it is recognized as an authoritative source of information. Too often it is searched only for its physical and mental facts and its larger and more important revelation is entirely unobserved, and by some even denied.

Nature being the work of God, and a revelation from God, as it came from Him it must be accurate. And had there been no fall, had the original conditions continued unchanged, this might have been a sufficient source of information for man. But it is not. a sufficient source now.

Two reasons may be given for this. First, sin, or the result of sin in the world, has so entered into all nature and so become a part of everything as to almost necessarily be mistaken as a normal part of nature. This makes quite probable very mistaken interpretations or conclusions and errors in science and philosophy, a calling of evil good and of the abnormal normal. There must be something additional to discover to us the truth of the abnormal and the evil. Second, the fall has impaired man's faculties and very greatly increased his liability to error in interpretation, especially has moral and spiritual truth been obscured. Some clearer source book must be provided if man is to find all of the truth, and that certainty that is necessary for him.

Nature has no power to reveal original causes or final destiny, it cannot go back and tell us the absolute beginning or forward to the absolute end of things, it can but tell us how things now are, and how they now work, and leave the rest for us to speculate and theorize over. Nature is insufficient to reveal much that pertains to the nature of being, in fact there are some forms of being that, under the present conditions, nature seems scarcely to reveal at all, at least not so man can thereby discern it. The physicist can with the spectrum divide light into the primary colors, the chemist may divide compounds into their primary elements, but when we come to life, especially the life of man, the case is much more difficult and often the real man is not found. It was with much difficulty that the early philosophers separated between the material and the immaterial. They could see there was a force acting upon and within matter but they saw it as a part of matter. To this very day there are some extreme materialistic scientists who find no separate place for the immaterial; and the strong tendency in modern psychology is to find a physical basis for everything. This shows where nature study alone may lead, and often does lead. However it would seem that such a result was unnecessary. Nature seems to be able to say that animals and man are dual beings, that they are more than material being and mechanical force that is a part of the material. Intelligent men should find life through nature, as well as matter and mechanical force. They may not be able to see it independent of and working through matter, but they should see it as something very different from matter and mechanical force. But nature must stop at this point, it is unable to further analyze life and show that man is more than a superior animal, or, as some state it, a "religious animal." Again, nature can do no more than to hint at the continuance of the species, it has no revelation as to individual immortality. We are not surprised that Clarence Darrow, accepting only this source of information, said, I find no satisfactory evidence of immortality. All men desire, and generally intuitively believe in immortality, but cannot find a sufficient assurance for it in nature. The Ancients speculated much about it, some of them (with certain modernists) held to various theories of transmigration and absorption but with no certainty or proof of any postmortem life. Further, nature can reveal imperfection and weakness but it cannot reveal sin, it can see deformity and wrong relations but cannot say that any of this is sin. To all present appearances the birth condition is normal, there is weakness and imperfection, there are many undesirable things that come through birth but there is nothing in nature to show that these are not a normal part of nature's heredity and that man's only need is for a proper growth, training, education and culture. By nature study no fixed moral standards have ever been found, nor has the ultimate good been discovered; right and wrong are no more than the changing creations of the human mind. That great Christian scholar, Paul of Tarsus, is referring to this inability of nature to reveal moral truth when he says, "I had not known sin" had there not been a further revelation of nature given, a revelation which he calls the law. (Rom. 7:7.)

With nature alone as our source book it is very evident we can get no satisfactory answer to our question. There is need for some supplementary light to direct us, nature can help but it is not sufficient. In an earlier day men at sea guided their boats by the observation of the stars. They were then enabled to sail about the shores of the continents and the small inland seas. Before they could sail far away and cross the ocean with safety and reach the New World an additional guide, the compass, was necessary. Just so nature can give us much light, much information, so that we can do some quite safe sailing as we keep close to the shore of matter as it now exists and the present working of natural law but when we come to sail out into the ocean of the past and future and seek the origin and end of life and the true nature of man we must have also the compass. .And it is well for us that there is a compass; there is another source book given to us by the same reliable Author.

God's second method of revealing truth, His second witness, is by the spoken and written word. He has spoken, not only in an inarticulate way through His works and providences, but in the very words of human speech. Holy men of old wrote the Bible as they were moved by the Holy Spirit (2 Peter 1:21), so the Bible is the Word of, a revelation from, God. Those necessary truths which nature could not clearly or sufficiently reveal, if there were such (we know not what man's original, normal intuition may have been able to give him), were given directly to man by God in His walks with him in the garden of Eden. But for sin these might have been accurately transmitted from generation to generation by oral tradition. But, since the entrance of sin, man has ever been prone to vain philosophizing and his intuitive powers have been impaired so that, whatever the primitive revelation and knowledge may have been, it soon became buried beneath the debris of myth and error (Rom. 1:21-25), and a new revelation became necessary, which, for accurate preservation, must be put into writing. God called Abraham out from this idolatry, out from this muddy, debris filled stream, and gave to him a new revelation of the true God, a true knowledge of God, and made of his seed the agents and custodians of this revelation. The permanent writing of this revelation began with Moses, extended over many centuries and closed with John and through these writers the Bible came into existence as a source book equal with nature, thus providing the double witness.

There are those who will admit the Bible as a source book for theology but deny to it a place in science and philosophy. This is to deny it all place. It is freely admitted that the Bible's chief field of revelation is the moral and religious, hence its primary place is as a source of ethics and theology; but if God, if Jesus, if the Holy Spirit is what the Bible represents Him to be, -- the embodiment of all truth, then, while its primary field may be morality and religion, yet whatever God says bearing on any subjects even though it should be somewhat incidental, must be true. It is not sensible to assume that the Bible is inspired only upon certain subjects and at certain points. Were this the case who would be the authority to determine when the inspiration was present? It is inspired throughout or not inspired at all. If in the correct canon God makes references concerning matters of science and philosophy they must be correct, if it is a reliable source book at all it must be concerning these things also. And why should not the Bible have some voice in science if nature has some voice in theology? The great purpose of the Bible is to reveal God. But it is almost equally its purpose to reveal man. The world is in almost as great error relative to man as it is relative to God. The need is not so great in the study of Physiology, but the Bible can be of some service there. But when it comes to Psychology the help of the Bible is necessary. And there can be no science of Pneumatology without the Bible. There is a

human equation that has entered into the canonization and the translations of this written revelation that has admitted some minor errors, but these are not errors of revelation. The original revelation and presentation were inerrant and the revelation continues inerrant, the Bible is a reliable source book on whatever subjects it speaks. With whatever of error may have slipped into the Bible as we now have it through copying, interpolation and translation it is still as correct and reliable a source of information as is nature as now affected by sin and is no more difficult of interpretation. We have full sympathy with the study of nature but we object to the neglect of the Bible. To use but one of God's means of revealing truth when there are other means is not scientific and is not just.

We are fully conscious of the fact that the position we are taking relative to the Bible is smiled at and passed by as unscientific by a scholarship that is noisy and sarcastic and irreverent, and that lacks the humility of the true scholar. But we have also read that "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God" (1 Cor. 3:9). There are very many however who do not scoff, honest people who are going on about their business and saying but little, and many true and strong scholars who are not flaunting their learning or posing as authorities, that agree with us in this position. It is only the boastful who assert that all but the ignorant believe as they do, and only an unkind bigot could speak of the sincere believer in the Bible and Christianity as an ignoramus.

The Bible and nature are the two source books of information for man, both coming from the same Author, of equal authority and in perfect harmony. Theology may sometimes misinterpret the source books, one or both of them, and thus be in error and not be in harmony with either. Science may at times misinterpret the source books, one or both of them, and thus be in error and harmonize with neither. Theology and science, one or both of them, may be in error and out of harmony with each other and with the source books. But the source books themselves, nature and the Bible, are always in perfect agreement. The true method of study, the correct scientific method, is to consult both of these sources. The failure to do this is the reason for much of the past and present error, for the so great uncertainty and the frequent change in both science and theology. Theology has neglected nature and science has neglected the Bible and the two have been put in conflict with each other when they should be friends, and sometimes both have been bigoted in their field and have hindered progress. There is nothing either intelligent, reverent or scientific in the neglect of either source.

We would not be so foolish as to assert that by consulting these two sources man may deduce a perfect science or theology, free from all error. Clarence Darrow spent his talent as an expert questioner to elicit from William Jennings Bryan a confession that the Bible must be interpreted and seemed to think he had gained a point when he had gained that end. Of course the Bible must be interpreted. So must nature. But interpretation does not mean to discard the Bible as Darrow would do or to change it as would be the case with Mr. Malone and other evolutionists. Interpretation, translation and revision without criticism or change of thought is man's only right with the Bible. And there must also be reverence and great respect for the facts in the interpretation of nature. The imperfection of man's intellectual powers makes it impossible for him to always make perfect interpretations however perfect the source may be. But we do assert that by the use of the two sources we greatly reduce the need of error and greatly increase the possibility of a correct conclusion and of the discovery of truth. And this possibility is still

further increased when we admit the Holy Spirit as teacher. With the Holy Spirit as the teacher, and when man prays and consults these two source books, he has reduced the danger of error to the minimum. This is Christian scholarship, and the only true scholarship. We must have these two sources in reaching a correct answer to the question we are considering. While nature reveals much relative to man it does not speak clear enough or full enough to give us all of the facts we need to draw a safe conclusion, but with the Bible information added we may hope for a quite satisfactory answer.

* * * * *

03 -- THE FOUR KINGDOMS

Analysis and classification are necessary for study, for definition, for explanation and for comprehension. That which we cannot understand as a whole is often made clear by separation into its parts and placing in its class. Sometimes a variety of classifications may be made of the same things from different standpoints. When we think of the nature and essence of being, we may first divide it into two parts, i. e., the material and the immaterial, or powerless matter and invisible force or power of activity. Then when we observe a bit more closely and see something of the way these are related to each other, the way matter is acted upon by force we may make another classification. This time it will be the organized and the unorganized, or those bodies which have organs by which particular actions or functions are performed and those bodies which do not have these organs. An illustration of the unorganized would be a stone, and of the organized a plant. Observing again more closely and discovering a difference in the nature of the immaterial we may make another classification as the animate and the inanimate, or those bodies wherein is life and those where life is missing. And by another yet deeper observation of life we have yet another classification, i. e., the vegetable and the animal. We are accustomed to speaking of these last as kingdoms and from this viewpoint we have a three fold division. First is the mineral kingdom which includes all matter, the unorganized and the inanimate; second is the vegetable kingdom, and third is the animal kingdom. Science universally accepts these kingdoms and seems to consider them all-sufficient. If these are sufficient then man must be placed as an animal in that kingdom, one of the 3,500 groups classified by science as mammals, placed along with the cattle and elephants and monkeys, and Mr. Bryan, with all of us, is a mammal as Mr. Malone asserted. But we are not inclined to so easily accept this conclusion. The facts are not yet all in. By yet closer study and observation it may appear that there is ground for a further classification, and a fourth kingdom, a kingdom of man; and that man is no more an animal than an animal is a vegetable or a vegetable a mineral.

The ground upon which these kingdom divisions are made is that of similarity and difference. There is a similarity existing between all individuals or separate bodies placed in one kingdom sufficient to justify their being classed together, and all others differ from these sufficiently to exclude them from this class and to call for another or other divisions. Our purpose now is to examine the differences that justify the three kingdoms and then ascertain, if we may, whether the phenomena of man is equally different from that of the animal, sufficiently different to necessitate a fourth kingdom, a special kingdom for man. Both source books must be kept dearly in mind as we proceed.

We will begin by noticing the phenomena of the mineral kingdom and its difference from all that is above it, or between the unorganized and the organized being. The first great difference here is the relation of the immaterial to the material, or the difference in the Motive Force. In the mineral or unorganized we have only mechanical force expressed by such terms as gravitation, cohesion and chemical affinity, and this as force from without acting upon, holding, moving and shaping. Beyond this kingdom there is also force from within which controls the organs and directs the action of the different parts with reference to the end of the whole. In the mineral kingdom with its unorganized bodies, there being no inward acting force, all force being without acting upon it, there is within these bodies no end of the whole and no such thing as well-being can be affirmed.

The second difference between the mineral kingdom and all above it, between unorganized and organized bodies, is in their Origin. Organized bodies originate in something that is itself organized, a seed, a germ, a sperm, a cell. This is so clearly demonstrated in nature that there are but few naturalists who do not freely concede the fact that there is no such thing as spontaneous generation. It is claimed by a small number that there is living matter that is not organized. This, however, is but an assumption and nothing in nature can demonstrate it. When we consult the Bible we are definitely informed that there is no unorganized living matter. The story of creation makes this clear and everywhere life is differentiated from matter. We are told that God first created both unorganized and the organized bodies, and that He established a law of reproduction for all organized bodies, that both plant and animal should produce "after their kind" (Gen. 1:11, 24). It requires organization to produce organization. Life begets life. Inner force and life and organization are in the present world arrangement interdependent, they imply each other in a way that calls for a simultaneous origin. Organization could not be without inner force, and life must have organization as a means of manifestation, when life is not present the body is but a collection of parts and subject to decay, there is really no organization, only aggregation.

The third difference between unorganized and organized bodies is in their Composition. In organized bodies we always find three elements, one of which is carbon, but unorganized bodies may have but one simple element.

The fourth difference between these two classes of bodies is in their Structure. In organized bodies we discover cellular and vascular tissues and mutually related parts, each part related to each other part and to the whole. In unorganized bodies this is not the case. For example, if we take the body of either a man or a beast and sever a part of it from the whole, as a finger or an ear, that finger or ear is in no sense a whole as would be the case when a large lump of metal was broken into pieces. Each piece of metal would be a whole piece of metal, but neither the finger nor ear would be a whole in this same sense.

The fifth, and last, difference which we will here notice is in their Mode of Preservation relative to the present order. In organized bodies the individual and the species alike are preserved but in the unorganized the individual perishes and the species only is preserved. In the organized there is growth and decay from activities from within. In the unorganized there is nothing that can be properly termed growth or decay, all changes are brought about by outside

agencies, these changes simply being aggregations and disintegration. In the organized there is health and disease, but no such things are possible with the unorganized.

Observing these differences, and noting how radical are the differences, we have no trouble in seeing that there is a distinct mineral kingdom with its own particular nature and phenomena; this classification is clearly justifiable and vegetables, animals and man must be placed in another class, they cannot be classified as mineral or material. With this classification justified we next inquire as to the difference between the vegetable and the animal to discover whether or not the difference is sufficient to justify the further classification and prove that the animal is not vegetable.

The first great difference between the vegetable and the animal is in the Character of the Inward Force or life belonging to each. In the vegetable kingdom we have force manifesting itself only in mechanical action. Because it is force acting from within and calling for organization this has been called life. Wherein its nature differs from the mechanical force acting upon matter in the mineral kingdom we cannot tell, but we know that the vegetable has a seed wherein there is a power to reproduce which is absent in the unorganized. Just what this is we do not know. The Bible at no time calls this life. We are accustomed to calling it vegetable life, but we know that it is not life as we find it when we reach the animal kingdom. That which we call life in the vegetable seems to be but a high form of mechanical force or automatic activity operating from within the body. The vegetable is entirely without sensation, volition and consciousness. There is a plant called the sensitive plant, but it does not have sensation, it simply has that which resembles sensation. That which appears to be sensation in a plant is simply the result of irritation and is without feeling or volition. We can no more call it sensation than we can call the movement of the leaves of the tree when the wind blows, or the movement of the clouds in the air, sensation. There is a marked difference between the action of a sensitive plant when irritated, and between all plant activity, and the sensation and volition in the animal. All organized bodies without sensation and volition belong to the vegetable kingdom and those having sensation and volition belong to the animal kingdom.

The second point of difference between the vegetable and animal kingdoms is in the manner of their getting Nourishment. Vegetables can subsist upon unorganized substance but animals always depend upon organized substance. We find a few parasite varieties of plants which subsist upon other plants, but with this exception all vegetables subsist upon unorganized substances. They get nourishment from the soil, moisture and air from the mineral kingdom. There is no well established case of any animal getting its substance from the unorganized.

A third difference between these two great kingdoms is their Composition. And here, while we mark a difference, there are some exceptions to the rule. Animals generally have the greater number of elements. In the vegetable there is little nitrogen, but always there is oxygen, hydrogen and carbon. In the animal we find more nitrogen.

The last difference which we will mention between these two kingdoms is in their Structure. Both being organized, both must have organs, but in the animal we have more and very different organs. In all animals we find muscles, nerves and nerve tissues, all of which are

missing in the vegetable. Since these organs are the instruments of life's activity this difference would suggest a difference in the life of the vegetable and the life of the animal.

Again we have discovered difference sufficient to justify the separate classification of the vegetable and the animal and to see clearly that animal is not vegetable. Man does not belong to the vegetable kingdom. He meets all of the requirements of the animal kingdom and he must be an animal, if he is not something more. Is man then an animal? He has been quite generally classified as such by those who have written or spoken upon the subject. And this conclusion must be conceded to be right unless there can be found in man phenomena beyond and sufficiently different from that of animal to justify the placing him in a kingdom by himself above and apart from the animal. Before we are finally ready to place man we must then make a careful study of the differences that may be discovered between man and animal that we may by these determine whether he is just a superior animal or whether he belongs to another kingdom. And it should be freely granted by all that if we find differences as radical as have been discovered in the other cases studied we will be equally justified in making another kingdom. Let us be open to the truth as we proceed.

The first difference between man and the animal which we will notice is the Physical Features. This may not be of so great consequence as that which follows but it is well enough to note it in passing. Man alone has a chin, and has the forearm entirely released from locomotion. He is clearly both two-handed and two-footed and is fitted for an upright position. This erect position and freedom of the forearm gives him the advantage over the animal as the conqueror of nature, even the animal, and enables him to be a student of the heavens. Then we have in man an excess in gray matter in the brain and a reversal of the relative size of the cerebrum and cerebellum, in the animal the cerebellum is the largest but in man the cerebrum. We are also told that man's blood is different so that one who knows how can tell a drop of human blood from that of an animal at any time and place and under any conditions.

A second difference between man and animal will be seen in certain Intellectual Characteristics, or the power of knowing. That there is a difference here no one will deny, but as we consult the different students of Psychology there seems to be no clearness of thought as to just what this difference is. While they do differentiate between the mental states of man and animal they usually see no more than a difference in degree. There is no question but that in the realm where animal intellect may operate man is greatly superior to the animal, he is superior in reason, in power of communication and in consciousness, but there is much more difference between man and animal than that of degree. Man has the power of knowledge in a sphere where no mere animal can ever reach, thus indicating that he is in possession of a larger and different life, a nature that the animal does not possess. Man has the power to know right and wrong, sin and righteousness, which the animal does not have; man alone is moral, hence he must possess a moral faculty which is no part of the animal. Animals have no power of moral perception. That which sometimes seems to indicate shame and guilt in animals springs entirely from fear and has not the slightest consciousness of right or wrong in it. Animals having no moral nature, are subject only to natural law, they have no responsibility to moral law. Man has a moral nature, and is responsible to moral law. More than this, man has the power to know in the realm of the supernatural, to know God, angels and Satan. Man alone is religious. Wherever there is a man, and only where there is a man, there is the idea of God and of spirit, there is religion.

A third difference between man and the animals is in certain Sensational Characteristics. Animals may feel deeply and in some cases manifest great affection, especially toward their young, but animals are incapable of love. In common speech affection and love are confused, but in strict speech there is a difference. God is love and love is a spirit sensation or condition, it is beyond the animal capacity. Animals may have a pleasant sensation but they have no capacity for joy. And so it is with many other sensations. Also man alone is capable of worship. Worship is absolutely foreign to the animal realm. To speak of a religious animal is to bring two words together in such a way as to imply an impossibility, the animal is incapable of religion. But the disposition to worship belongs to man, man is religious.

A fourth difference between man and animal is in certain Volitional Characteristics. The animal has will, has some power of choice; but the animal will is bound, it must follow the strongest motive. But man's will is free, he may choose among motives as he will. Man alone has responsibility and obligation, and by choice can build his own character.

A fifth, and last, difference we will mention between man and animal is, man alone is Immortal. Man die as a dog! Some may talk such nonsense, but all men when they come to their senses resent such a suggestion. Man forecasts immortality by his desire for it, and the Bible clearly declares that man is immortal.

Man differs from the animal in certain physical, intellectual, sensational and volitional characteristics; he is moral, religious, has responsibility and is immortal. None of these characteristics may be attributed to animals. That all of these belong to man may be clearly proven by both source books. Sometimes nature is not clear and does not give assurance, alone it cannot discover some of the characteristics, but it never gives evidence to the contrary. The Bible is very clear and assuring. Now the question is, are these differences sufficiently radical to justify a further division, do they show that man is something that an animal is not, and shall we make a further classification placing man in a separate kingdom? It must certainly be clear to all of us after noting these differences that they are as radical as at either of the other points of classification. If there is any ground of classification it is here. Man is as different from an animal as an animal is from the vegetable and as a vegetable is from the mineral. If there are three kingdoms there must be four. And these differences are such as to show that man is possessed of a nature that does not belong to the animal, and that he is not an animal. Seeing these differences, that eminent scientist, Prof. Dana, says: "There is in man a spiritual element in which the brute has no share, his power of infinite progress, his thought and desires that look onward even beyond time, his recognition of the spiritual existence and of the divine above him, evince a nature that partakes of the infinite and the divine."

The argument here seems to be conclusive and perfectly satisfactory. It is supported by both source books. Man is clearly not an animal, he belongs to a higher kingdom which we may call the kingdom of man. There are four kingdoms. First, is the mineral kingdom where we have unorganized matter acted upon by force from without. Second, is the vegetable kingdom where we have organized matter with force acting from within. Third, we have the animal kingdom where we find organized matter, force acting within and sentient life. Fourth, is the kingdom of man where we have added morality, religion, freedom and immortality, -- personality.

* * * * *

04 -- EVOLUTION NOT NECESSARY TO EXPLAIN ORIGIN OR SERIES

From the standpoint of analysis and classification, and the rules governing the same, we now see that man cannot properly be placed among the animals, that there is as great, if not greater, reason for making a separation between man and animal as there is any place in earthly existences, that man can no more be an animal than an animal can be a vegetable; man clearly belongs to a kingdom above the animal and is not an animal. We now approach and study our question from another standpoint, the standpoint of Origin. Our special question here is, Where did man come from, how did he get here, and what relation does he bear to other existences? In considering this we must use great care, carefulness in the use of terms and in respect of the two source books. Without the Bible we are sure to go astray and be left in great confusion.

The fact of series in nature is clearly seen, and that there is some close relation existing in this series is just as clear. In our discovery of the fourth kingdom we were looking for differences. If we will now go back over the ground and look for likeness we will find much similarity. As we advance in the series we will find that practically all that was in the first is still continued in the second, and all that was in the first and second is still continued in the third, and that all that was in the first, second and third is still continued in the fourth, each time the great difference being that which remains is superior and something new is added. In the mineral kingdom we have matter with force without acting upon it. In the vegetable kingdom we still have matter in the body and outward force acting upon it holding it together, but we have also organization and inward force. In the animal kingdom we still have matter and outward force in the body and automatic, inward force in the digestion of food, the circulation of the blood, etc., but we have also intelligent, sentient and volitional life. In the kingdom of man we still have matter and outward force in the body, the automatic force in digestion, circulation, etc., and the intelligent-sentient-volitional life, but there is added personality with its freedom of choice, morality, religion and immortality.

That there is a vital relation existing between these kingdoms and that the adding of the new thing is in an ascending series needs no proving, and cannot be well denied. But the question as to just what this relation is, and the laws that govern it, and the origin of the new thing, is not so easily disposed of. Is it a relation of evolutionary origin indicating man's descent from some lower form of animal, from the monkey, or man and the monkey both springing from some common origin farther back; or is it a relation that may be explained in some other way, such as dependence? Is the higher, the offspring of the lower, and does the lower produce the new thing in its offspring, or is there a new creation each time and the relation that of condition? And if a creation is it of the whole or just that which is new? The answer to this question will determine our faith as to the origin of man and his nature. If this relation is one of origin then the relation is explained by the law of cause and effect and man's origin is to be found in the animal below him, as is taught by the evolutionary theory, and man must be but a superior animal. If this relation is one of dependence or condition then it is explained by the law of condition and conditioned and we may look elsewhere than the animal for the origin of man.

That there is a law of cause and effect is no more to be denied than the fact of one's own existence. Everything that is, to whatever kingdom it belongs, is the effect of some cause. Practically everybody now admits the impossibility of spontaneous generation. But is there an infinite and eternal series of causes? Such is an absurdity. There must be something that is not caused which is the first great cause. Philosophy has been seeking for a first great cause for centuries and has not been able to find it. This failure has led some to suggest the eternal series theory. But we are not dependent upon nature or reason for the solution of this problem. Our other source book makes it very clear that the first great cause, the uncaused, is God; and that "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made" (John 1:3); and that "In the beginning God created the heavens," probably meaning all of the heavenly bodies, "and the earth" (Gen. 1:1). We begin then with Self-existence, and this Self-existence becomes a first cause and matter an effect. We do not say that matter is the first effect from this Self-existence, but it is at this point that the law of cause and effect begins in our world series. God first made the heavens and the earth and from this beginning this law of cause and effect continues throughout all of nature.

God, then, is ultimate and primal cause, and our source book tells us that His method as to origin was creation, He created. This puts an end to the atheistic evolutionary theory. One cannot be an atheistic evolutionist and believe in the Bible. But what about the theistic evolutionary theory? Is God the immediate cause or Creator of all things; or is He but the cause of a secondary cause, a gaseous mass wherein is some active force, or a cell of life, which in turn is the cause of other things, and these in turn the cause of other things, this secondary cause operating in a perfect series of ascending causes until all is made; or is He the immediate cause of certain things which are the beginning of certain classes or species, and the cause of secondary causes that operate only within the class or species? The evolutionary theory answers, there is a perfect series of causes, each effect being in turn a cause of another effect. A popular science explains all that we see about us, and we ourselves, by this hypothesis. The atheist admits God nowhere having an eternal series of causes and effects; the theist admits God but places Him back at the beginning as the cause of the first cell into which He places the whole of life potentially with the power of reproducing all else in an ascending series of offsprings, and confines Him to this regular series allowing Him no further place of immediate creation. While there may seem to be a few facts of nature that may appear to point in this direction, this is still an unproven, and must ever remain an unproven theory. When the second source book is consulted this theory is seen to be false. One cannot be a consistent believer in the Bible and believe in the evolutionary theory as an explanation of our world. To read such evolution into the Bible is to change its meaning; it is not interpretation, it is change. Were this theory true then the mineral kingdom would be the cause of the vegetable kingdom, and the vegetable kingdom be in turn the cause of the animal kingdom, and the animal kingdom be in turn the cause of man. And to say that this process is God at work does not help the matter much. The Bible says, "God created" (Gen. 1:21), not evolved or formed, but created the animals, and that He "created man" (Gen. 1:27), as well as matter (Gen. 1:1). Whatever the divine method was in bringing matter into existence was also His method with man and animal, and this method was creation. God, then, is the immediate cause of at least matter, animal and man, the word create can be given no other correct interpretation. It must follow then that one kingdom cannot be the cause of another, the relation between them cannot be that of origin. Matter, vegetable, animal and man are separate acts of creation, they are not the offspring one from another. And the Bible teaches also

that there are some acts of creation within some of the kingdoms which are the beginnings of species, and that each of these shall bring forth "only after their kind." Whatever of evolution there may be within the species there can be no evolution of kingdoms and species. William Jennings Bryan in his undelivered message, his last message, calls attention to the fact that less than four years ago Prof. Batson came all the way from London to Canada to tell the American scientists that every effort to trace one species to another had failed. The evolutionary theory as an explanation of existing things is a failure. There is a place for secondary causes, for procreation and development, within certain limited bounds, entirely within the species, but God is primal and immediate cause of the species and is the author of the secondary cause within the species.

The advocates of the evolutionary theory have made much of similarity. They have called attention to certain traits of character and physical likenesses between man and animal and have argued from this that man is the offspring of an animal. J. Arthur Thomas, M. A., LL.D., in his book, "Concerning Evolution," speaking of "Man's affiliation to an extinct stock common to him and to the anthropoid apes," says: "The evidence of this may be found in the close anatomical similitude, in Man's numerous vestigial structure, in Man's individual development, for a time so like that of the higher Primates, in the similarity of humanoid and anthropoid functions, and in the existence of 'tentative man' who came before Homo." Now if this argument be correct, if such similarity, mostly physical, proves an evolutionary origin, to be consistent we must then conclude when we see that there is more likeness between a Ford automobile and a Packard, likeness of material, form, parts and motive power, and that there is less missing links between them than there is between man and animal, that the Packard automobile is the offspring of the Ford automobile. And it might be argued that they all came from the wheelbarrow. If one would take the time to do so he could begin with the wheelbarrow and collect specimens, and pictures of some types that have disappeared and have a remarkable ascending series up to the most perfect vehicle of today, but no one would think of explaining this by such evolution. But similarity does not argue origin, especially where there is also such radical difference. The very most that could be suggested by such an argument from similarity would be the passing forward of that which already existed, it can offer no solution as to the origin of the new. Whatever there may be of likeness between man and animal in physical form and development and traits of character man is radically different and can no more be the offspring from an animal than a Packard car is an offspring from a Ford or a wheelbarrow.

Having found the evolutionary hypothesis as an explanation of our universe incorrect, we now turn to the law of condition and conditioned to see if it is a sufficient explanation of this series and the relations, and whether it leaves man as an animal or places him in another class. This law may be stated as follows: There are forms of being, forces, faculties and products that are the necessary condition of others, and those that are conditioned are higher than those conditioning them. At first glance some may think that we have but stated the law of cause and effect in another form. This comes from a failure to recognize the difference between a cause and a condition. A cause suggests origin but a condition does not. A condition is not a cause. If cause and condition ever are the same, that which is both cause and condition bears two different relations to the same thing at the same time. In the building of a house there must first be a foundation of some kind. If the building is to have two stories the first story must be built before there can be a second. Is then the foundation the cause of the building and the first story, the

cause of the second story? The answer is very clear. Of course there is a cause for the building but this is to be found in the builder or owner. The foundation is necessary to the building but that necessity is not cause, it is: rather a necessity of condition, the foundation is the condition upon which the building of the first and the second or more stories are conditioned.

Careless thinking may also lead one to question the truth of the second part of this law. At first thought it might seem that a conditioning thing must be greater than the thing conditioned for a conditioned thing is to some extent dependent upon the conditioning thing. This error grows out of the false notion that all dependence implies inferiority. But, the fact is that the more universal a conditioning law may be the more must that law be overcome by other laws in order that advancement may be made. And that which overcomes must be stronger than that which is overcome. The higher one ascends the greater is the dependence and the more there is to be overcome, hence the stronger it must be, the more a thing is thus dependent the greater its power must be if it is to succeed.

The most universal law of nature is gravitation, that power which draws matter and bodies toward each other. This is the foundation for all other of nature's laws, that, upon which they build, without which they could not be. Gravitation is then the condition upon which all other natural laws are conditioned. But it is the law which all other laws must overcome to some extent if they do their work. If there were no law of power but that of gravitation all would be one mass. For there to be two or more separate bodies other laws must prevent gravitation from bringing these together. Also for an apple to hang on a tree, or for a stone to be thrown into the air, gravitation must be overcome. That which overcomes gravitation cannot be as universal, but it must be more powerful, hence it is higher.

With the law of condition and conditioned thus defined we note first its application within the mineral kingdom. The three manifestations of power here are gravitation, cohesion and chemical affinity. Gravitation, we have said, is that power which draws all bodies or particles of matter toward each other. Cohesion is that power which attracts and cements homogeneous matter. Cohesion must overcome gravitation in its selection of the homogeneous and bringing it together without other material. Cohesion gives us simple elements. Chemical affinity unites the simple elements and gives us compounds. Here is an ascending series. At the base is gravitation, next above it is cohesion, and next above cohesion is chemical affinity. What is the relation existing between these three forces? That they each are a cause, we freely admit, but what are the effects? Is the higher the effect of the lower and the lower the cause of the higher? There can be but one sane answer. Whatever their effects may be, it is certainly clear that gravitation, while it makes cohesion possible, does not produce cohesion, it is not the cause of cohesion; cohesion is not the result, the child, the offspring of gravitation. But gravitation is the condition of cohesion, and cohesion is in turn the condition of chemical affinity; cohesion is conditioned upon gravitation and chemical affinity is conditioned upon cohesion and gravitation. This is to say that if there was not first gravitation there could be no law of cohesion for there must first be the general and universal law of attraction before there can be any law of homogeneous attraction. Not cause and effect, not evolution, but condition and conditioned is the explanation of the relation here. This makes it clear that series does not prove origin. Cohesion and chemical affinity are just as directly from God as is gravitation. All power is from God and these are but three forms of the manifestation of His power, three methods of carrying on His

work in this kingdom of matter related to each other in ascending series according to the law of condition and conditioned.

We have found that there are four kingdoms and that these are in an ascending series: at the base is the mineral kingdom, next above it comes the vegetable kingdom, next comes the animal kingdom, and at top is the kingdom of man. What is the relation here? First, is the mineral the cause of the vegetable, is the vegetable an evolution from the mineral? There may be a few favorable suggestions to this in nature but there is no clear proof, and there are many suggestions to the contrary. It is clear that the mineral kingdom is a condition of the vegetable kingdom. Without matter we could not have vegetable. A necessary part of the vegetable is the body of matter, and the vegetable is sustained by matter, -- feeds upon matter. The law of condition and conditioned is a sufficient explanation of the relation here, there is no need of any evolutionary explanation. And our second source book makes it very clear that there is no evolutionary relation between these. In this source we are plainly told that it was at the command of God that the earth began to bring forth its vegetation (Gen. 1:11, 12.) And note carefully what it says, "whose seed is in itself upon the earth," each species of vegetable had, and has, its own distinctive seed and that seed created and placed upon the earth and commanded to bring forth after its kind. We conclude then upon the authority of both source books that there is no evolutionary relation between the mineral and vegetable kingdoms, that God is the creator in each case and the relation is one of condition and conditioned.

Next above the vegetable is the animal, what is the relation between these? It cannot be one of origin, sentient life could not have sprung from mechanical force. The Bible speaks with no uncertain voice and tells us that animals did not evolve from the vegetable but that God created sentient life (Gen. 1:21). But the vegetable kingdom is a necessary condition of the animal kingdom, animal existence is conditioned upon vegetable existence. Except the vegetable kingdom and its laws exist there can be no animal. The animal requires the material body and the mechanical laws or automatic force for digestion and circulation, and the animal is sustained largely by vegetable food. Here again the law of condition and conditioned is sufficient explanation for the existing relation.

Next above the animal is man; and what shall we say of man in his relation to all that is below him? Man is, or is in possession of all that belongs to the animal as the animal is in possession of all that belongs to the vegetable and as the vegetable is in possession of all that belongs to the mineral, is man then the offspring of the animal and that which he is more than the animal a result of his evolution from the animal? Is the relation between these two kingdoms that of origin or is the law of condition and conditioned again a sufficient explanation of this relation? The evolutionary theory may be about as good a theory as any if all we can have is theory. But in the light of the facts relative to man and animal, and especially when we consult our second source book, this theory becomes but the mistaken guess of a wise folly. The law of condition and conditioned is all that is needed to explain the relation and the Bible very clearly tells us that man's origin is by direct creation from God (Gen. 1:27). By no sane method of interpretation can this word create be made to mean any form of evolution, the evolutionary explanation of man's origin is clearly unBiblical. God used previously existing matter, the dust of the earth, in forming his body thus relating him to the mineral kingdom, but man did not spring out of this mineral kingdom as an evolution from matter. God gave him inward automatic force

to digest his food and to circulate his blood thus relating him to the vegetable kingdom, but man in no sense sprang from the vegetable. God gave him intelligent, sentient, volitional life to respond to the temporal earthy in the midst of which he is to live for a time, thus relating him to the animal kingdom, but he is in no sense an evolution, an offspring from the animal. This similarity is all a similarity through divine creation and not a result of evolution or common origin in the lower order. And God not only created man with that which bears this similarity to that below him, but He also breathed into him a Godlike, moral, immortal life that is entirely different, and it is this that makes him man (Gen. 2:7). Man is not the offspring of, he is only conditioned upon the animal and that which is below him; and this is not forever, only for the time of his sojourn here in his present relation to temporal things and life.

What shall be the conclusion from our study thus far? There are four distinct kingdoms of being in our earth and these are related to each other in an ascending series. The present existence of all things and their relation is explained by divine creation as primal cause, and this cause acting immediately and directly at certain points and indirectly through forces which He has created with certain power within limited bounds. He has created certain species or types of being directly and given to them procreative power to bring forth after their kind and to grow and develop within the species. According to the law of condition and conditioned, which is the law of the relation between the classes, man is the highest of the types, the highest kingdom; he is the crowning act of this creation which belongs to the earth. He is not an animal. Though related to the animal kingdom for the present through the law of condition and conditioned, being subject to certain of the same laws and a partaker of similar physical and sentient existence, he is a new and a higher creation. He was created but a little lower than the angels, or, as the original seems to indicate, a little lower than God (Psa. 8:50), -- a finite god.

* * * * *

05 -- MAN IS SPIRIT

We have now found from two different lines of study that man is not an animal but that he belongs to a kingdom above the animal and that he is not the offspring by some process of evolution from the animal but is a direct creation from God. Having discovered that man is something that an animal is not it will next be our task to discover just what that is that man is that animals are not and assure ourselves that this something new is sufficiently different for this difference in classification and to justify us in our conclusion that man is not an animal. For this study the Bible must be very largely consulted if we hope for any satisfactory conclusion.

Israel's great poet king brings nature and man and God together in one great question. His form of asking this question is as follows: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him?" No doubt David had often considered God's heavens. He had spent many nights observing and studying the heavenly bodies while the sheep were quietly feeding or sleeping. He may have had some conception of their vastness and distance and permanence. Just how much he knew about these heavenly bodies and their laws we cannot tell. That all intelligence and wisdom was born with modern science, and that the strongest minds that have ever lived are those possessed by the modern professed scholar, is not at all certain. It

yet remains to be proven whether any of our modern people, under the conditions of the ancients, would have discovered and invented as much and have held as correct theories as they did. The writings in Genesis and Job and other Bible books and some of the findings of Archaeology relative to the condition of certain ancient nations reveal no mean knowledge relative to science and art, especially geology, astronomy and mechanics. There is evidence that some knowledge and art may have once been possessed that the world may now have lost. To assert that the Bible teaches that the world is flat or other scientific errors of this nature, is a criminal reflection. Whatever may have been the current thought of the times, the Bible teaches no such thing. The ancients and peoples of a generation or so back were not all ignoramuses and superstitious as some of the "modernists" would have us think.

As David looked at the different shining orbs he may have thought of them as being the same bodies that his Grandfather Boaz and his Grandmother Ruth had looked upon, from the very field where he is now tending the sheep and that Moses and Jacob and Abraham and Enoch and Adam had also looked upon. Then he may have thought of how all of these his ancestors had passed away, one generation quickly giving way to another, but the sun, moon and stars remain. But it is man of whom God is especially mindful and that He visiteth. Man may seem to be very small and passing when compared with the heavenly bodies but he is something that attracts the special attention and calls for the special care of God. It is this that makes David ask, What is man that thou art mindful of him?

In studying man's position in the universe and finding him in a kingdom above all matter, vegetable and animal, made in the likeness of God, we have already partially answered this question. But it is quite essential to our further study that we get a fuller answer. Especially must we look deeper into the nature of man and discover whether he is dual or tripart and define as dearly as we may these parts. Science and philosophy have freely acknowledged the duality of man's being. Some times they have hinted that he might be a trichotomy, a few have gone so far as to assert his trinity of being. But even with the boldest of these there has been such indefiniteness and confusion that when their position is carefully analyzed it will be seen that they really have but a dual being. But in the Bible man is referred to in terms of trinity. With the two source books we may with much certainty know what man is.

That man is a dichotomy, certainly no one will deny. Man is in the class of organized being. All organized being consists of the organized machine and the inward force called life which uses the machine, the body; it is both material and immaterial. As we have already said, the ancient philosophers experienced some difficulty in separating between the material and the immaterial with any clearness, but they recognized the double phenomena. Man is a physical organization, a material body. But this matter, though so perfectly organized, is an entirely powerless and motionless mass. To be useful it must have some immaterial force within it to move it and to work in and through it. Man is not living matter as he has sometimes been described to be. There is no such thing as living matter. Life and matter are very different phenomena. Existence but not life is an attribute of matter. Life may reside in and work through matter, but matter is in no sense life, there is no living matter. Man is two, he is both material and immaterial, both body and life. In this sense man is clearly dual.

We next ask, is this immaterial part of man, is life in man, single or is it multiple, and if multiple, how many parts are there? Psychology speaks freely of the outer and inner self, and of the divided self. But while Psychology recognizes this double life and speaks at times in terms of trinity it has almost universally considered this double life as but two manifestations of the one life thus leaving man but a dichotomy. At this we should probably not be surprised since Psychology, as we have it, takes no account of but one of our source books. Nature can go no farther, it can offer no better explanation of the double self; nature cannot further analyze life, unaided it must leave man a dichotomy. Nature does not deny, nor does it contradict the trichotomy of man. It does reveal something of the further phenomena but it has no voice that can distinguish this clearly as springing from a different part. The Bible, however, has no uncertain witness, makes no uncertain revelation as to man's three part nature.

The virgin Mary, in response to the salutation of Elizabeth, the coming mother of the Baptist, spoke of a dual human life as soul and spirit. She said, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoicing in God my salvation" (Luke 46:47). That this is more than the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, that soul and spirit are not used as synonymous terms in the Bible, is clear from the declaration that the powerful word of God as a two-edged sword may divide soul and spirit asunder (Heb. 4:12); they may be united and they may be separated. The Apostle Paul speaks of a dual nature or life in man as flesh and spirit. He says, "The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh" (Gal. 5:17). Jesus uses these same terms when He says, "The spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak" (Matt. 26:41). In another place Paul speaks of man as tripart. He says, "I pray God your whole spirit, soul and body be preserved blameless" (1 Thess. 5:23). We know what the body is, but what do these other words, the flesh, the soul, the spirit, stand for?

First, we will ask, what is meant by flesh? This is a very mooted question. But much of the difficulty is the result of careless and hasty thinking. Careful reading will make it clear that the word flesh as used by Jesus and Paul does not have its modern meaning of meat. Meat is only matter and has no power to lust, and it is not weak in the sense referred to by Jesus. The original Greek word translated flesh is "sarx," and this word probably is never used to mean meat in the New Testament. It is this word that both Jesus and Paul use when quoting from the Old Testament relative to the union of husband and wife. Here is the quotation, "They two shall be one flesh" (Matt. 19:5; Eph. 5:31). It would be absurd to say that in the married covenant two separate bodies became one meat, one physical body. The New Testament word does not mean the body as meat or as material. The Greek word for meat is "kreas," never "sarx."

While the Bible is not a lexicon, there are occasional sentences that approach a definition. One of these is a sentence of Jesus in which He uses this word flesh. He says, "That which is born of flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6). According to this the flesh is that which is born of the flesh in contrast to that which is born of the Spirit. That which is born of the Spirit is spirit. That which is born of the flesh then must be that part of life which is not spirit. It seems very clear that Jesus is here comparing the natural and the spiritual birth hence by the flesh birth He must refer to the natural, temporal, earth birth, the human birth, the result of the birth of woman. Now that which is born of woman is body, is material, is physical; but is it no more than this? We all know that it is more. Every organism must have its accompanying life or it will at once decay or become disorganized. What does nature show us

here? Cow flesh brings forth cow flesh, i. e., cow body and cow nature in it, and the calf naturally bawls and eats grass. So also dog flesh brings forth dog body with accompanying dog nature and the puppy naturally barks. But what about man? It is just as true that the flesh birth of man is man body and man nature and the babe will naturally cry and laugh. This difference between the calf, puppy and the babe comes through the natural birth hence the natural birth gives more than the material body, it gives also a natural life, a particular life accompanying each organism. This word flesh, then, when used of man would mean that natural inheritance of child from parent as operative from Adam down through all the different generations, and this includes both the material organism and the immaterial life. But it does not seem to refer to all of the immaterial life of man for, as already suggested, in this very expression Jesus places the word flesh in contrast with the word spirit showing that the spirit is something different from the flesh. And Paul's contrast already quoted where the flesh lusts against the spirit also shows they are different. The flesh, then, must be that lower form of human life, the temporal, carnal, earth life on the plane of the animal and responds to the temporal material things of earth, that which is often called the physical life because of its close connection with the body. This life, for the present in its earth activity, implies the body, and the word flesh carries the meaning of this life functioning in the body, it is the natural life resident in and working through the body. The flesh is the body and natural life together, and the word is used occasionally to refer to one or the other separately but always to some extent implying the other. The expression "all flesh," or "no flesh" is sometimes used to refer to all who are alive in the body, living upon the earth.

We will next examine the word soul. There are no two words in the English language more confused in the popular thought, and often as badly confused in scientific expression, as soul and spirit. Usually they are considered synonymous, but their meaning is very distinct and quite different. The one source book, nature, taken alone gives us but little help at this point, and if we are not very careful it may add confusion; we must turn to the Bible for clearness. The word soul first appears in our English Bible in a reference to man in Genesis 2:7. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." But this is not the first time this word occurs in the original Hebrew text of the Bible. The Hebrew word here translated soul is "nephesh," and it is several times applied to animals before it is applied to man. We will note these places. "And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly" (Gen. 1:21). The English word creature here is in the Hebrew this same word "nephesh," and soul is thus attributed to the water animals. "And God said, let the earth bring forth the living creatures after their kind, cattle and creeping things" (Gen. 1:24). The word creature in this verse is also a translation from the word "nephesh." "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof" (Gen. 2:19). Here again the word creature is translated from "nephesh." In these two verses soul is thus attributed to the land animals and the fowls. "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures... And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life" (Gen. 1:29, 30). The words moving creature and life here are in the original Hebrew "nephesh chey" and mean soul life. The marginal reading in the Revised Version for this thirtieth verse, instead of "wherein there is life" has it "wherein there is living soul." In these two verses soul is attributed to all animals.

What then is soul? The soul is the "nephesh," in the New Testament the original Greek word is "psyche", -- a life common to both beast, fowl and fish, if we accept the Bible. The meaning of "nephesh" is, animal life or breathing creature: it refers to the natural life which knows, feels and wills relative to earth things in either animal or man. It is the same life referred to elsewhere as "the flesh," soul and flesh are synonymous so far as the life is concerned, the flesh meaning this life in and functioning through the body and soul meaning the life not including the body. With man, of course, this is human soul, not animal soul; both have soul but it is soul in a different kingdom. Soul is the second part in the trinity of man, the body being the first part. Animals are also body and soul, animals are dual.

Let us make this a bit clearer by an imaginary illustration. We will suppose that before us there are three objects. We examine them carefully and find they are quite different in shape and some different in texture but much alike in many respects Each consists of meat, bones, blood, lungs, heart, nerves, brain, etc.; and they are all powerless to act and will decompose and turn to dust. Each is a material organism called body. One is the body of a bird, one the body of a dog and one the body of a man, but each is body only. Body is common to both man and animal. Now let us turn around and look behind us. Here again we find three objects. This time it is a living bird, a living dog and a living man. Again we examine them carefully and in each case we find the body consisting of meat, bones, blood, lungs, heart, nerves, brain, etc., just as before. But now, though we cannot see it, we know that each is in possession of a new element which is an active force, a life resident in the body moving, using and working through it, and which knows, feels and wills relative to earth things. This life is common to all three of these bodies. It is somewhat different in its manifestation through the different bodies, but however different in manifestation it is still the natural earth life. There is natural earth life common both to man and animal, an earth life which has to do especially with earth things. This is soul. It is greatly superior in some animals to what it is in others, and is very much superior in man to that in the highest animal, but it is soul in all.

It remains for us now to discover the meaning of the word spirit. Job says, "There is a spirit in man" (Job 32:8). In our English Bible the word spirit is a translation from the Hebrew word "ruach" and the Greek word "pneuma." The meaning is wind, breath, spirit. The word spirit is sometimes given a broad meaning and is made to comprehend all that is immaterial in contrast to that which is material. In this broad sense it is a very few times applied to animals. Science uses it largely in this broad sense, and sometimes it is given this meaning in an incorrect theology, especially in the present day modernist theology, but the Bible uses it very rarely with this meaning. It has a narrower and more definite meaning in the Bible, and in correct Anthropology and Theology, a meaning which belongs alone to personality, to man, angel and God. "God is a Spirit" (John 4:24). Of the angels it is said, "Are they not all ministering spirits?" (Heb. 1:14). And we have already quoted Job as saying "There is a spirit in man." In this use of the word spirit, which is its almost universal use in the Bible, its meaning is more than immaterial. It is synonymous with personality. This separates it from the animal, for, while the animal is an individual, it is not a personality. In Anthropology and Theology spirit means personality.

In the eternal councils of God it was determined to make man in the divine image, after the divine likeness (Gen. 1:26). God being a Spirit, it must then needs be that man be made a

spirit. The statement relative to man's creation is that God not only made a body out of the dust of the ground, and that man became a living soul, but that He breathed into him the breath of life (Gen. 2:7). This inbreathed life from God is the spirit. Into nothing else of earth did God breathe this life. Man is that which nothing else of earth is or can be, he is spirit. In that man is spirit he has somewhat like the divine nature in him and attributes like the divine belonging to him, and in his normal condition character like the divine. This is not just superior intellect, it is something new and different, it is spirit, it is life that is moral and gives the capacity to know God, to know the eternal and heavenly, and to have fellowship with God or Satan. Spirit in God is eternal. In man, spirit being created has a beginning, but once begun it is unending, it is immortal, In God spirit is holy (Isa. 6:3), hence spirit is moral, it is capable of the knowledge of good and evil and the performance of right and wrong, and the possession of moral character.

Spirit, then, is that life of man which is moral, immortal and the image of God; that life which has the power of knowing in the realm of God and the heavenly and is capable of worship; that life which makes salvation possible when sin has brought death; that life which lifts man above the animal and makes him a person. None of these things are attributes of soul, spirit is something different from soul. Animals being only soul are incapacitated for that which belongs distinctively to the spirit. Man is spirit, hence is capacitated for that which belongs to spirit. G., Campbell Morgan says, "We have too long been misusing a word by talking about saving the soul. Now what a man needs to have saved in that evangelical sense of the word, is not the soul, but the spirit. Let the spirit be regenerated, and then soul and body alike are saved. This word soul, the Greek word, is a word that, always refers to the human, earthy life of man. Spirit is that which is moral and eternal, the image of God."

When we thus consult the two source books man is clearly seen to be a trichotomy consisting of body, soul and spirit. But it must now be clearly noted that while a trichotomy he is a triunity, that while he is three he is also one. He is not three separate parts, nor even two, in some mysterious way associated together. He is just one man, but that one is made up of three parts. Man is not body, is not soul, is not spirit, he is body-soul-spirit. While it is spirit that especially differentiates him as man the spirit is so united with the soul and body that they are a part of man and all are more or less involved in every issue of life. God created the one whole man, body, soul and spirit. He is a human rather than an animal body and soul, and a human spirit, he is one human being.

One of the most recent theories of evolution, one that is being taught by certain scientists who try to hold with some loyalty to the Bible, a theory far removed from the original theory of Darwin, called the mutation theory by some, admits there can be no evolution of the species in that which differentiates the one species from the other. This theory admits God at the beginning of every species as the creator of the new thing but leaves the rest as an evolution. Applied to man this would mean that man as body and soul is the offspring of the animal, an evolution from and through the lower forms of life, and to this God by creation adds something new, which the Bible calls spirit, thus making a new species. This is much ahead of the old Darwinian theory since it gives a much larger place for God and does not remove Him so far back. But this still does not meet the Bible teaching, and is not a necessary inference from nature. The Bible teaches the creation of man, body, soul and spirit, not just a part of man.

That man is spirit, as we have now shown, as well as soul and body, and that God created man in the divine image, forever settles the question as to man being an animal. Bryan is dead, died as a hero of the faith with his face to the foe fighting royally, and Bryan was right when he refused to acknowledge to his opponents that, he was a mammal. Man has fallen and lost the moral character of the image in which he was created, but he is still in that image so far as being spirit is concerned, and he is capable of salvation and restoration to the moral character of holiness. Let us not degrade the work of God by calling man an animal. With Mr. Bryan we say, "He shall not be taken down from his high plane with God, detached from the throne of God and put in the jungles with beasts." Man is man.

* * * * *

06 -- SPIRITUAL CONSCIOUSNESS

There was a time when Psychology tried to define consciousness, but the more men have studied consciousness and come to know about it the more wonderful and the more mysterious it has become to them and now there is but little attempt at definition. While it may not be satisfactorily defined, some descriptive things may be said about it that will point the way to something of an understanding as to what it is. Whatever it is, it is a somewhat that belongs to personality, and to much, at least, of lower sentient life. It is human consciousness in which we are now interested. In speaking of man we say he is conscious or unconscious and that he has a subconscious nature. That consciousness belongs to man is dear.

To be conscious is to know that you know, to realize or be aware of experiences. That man has consciousness of physical facts but few will question. And this consciousness is the evidence to him of the reality of these facts and the certainty of knowledge relative to the outside physical world. Man's soul resides within the body and is reached from the outside through the little, threadlike nerves, the sensitive ends of which are everywhere on the surface of the body, and which, while life is in the body, are capable of transmitting, as a result of the irritation of their outer ends by stimuli, sensations which when received within give experiences that are interpreted by the soul. Thus one receives knowledge and becomes conscious of outside reality. These sensations are classified as those of touch, taste, smell, sound, and sight; we call them the natural senses. These supplement each other in their work and the cumulative evidence from the different senses increases the certainty of the knowledge. The fact that one has this experience in consciousness is certain proof of his soul existence, the soul must be in order to have the experience; and the fact that the experience in consciousness is of outward things is certain proof of the reality of outward existences, they must exist in order to produce the sensation. Thus we have certainty as to the physical existences all about us and of our own soul existence. Animals also have this same knowledge to some extent.

These are not the only facts of consciousness that man experiences. Man has experiences in consciousness that are not the result of outward stimuli, that do not come to him through the nerves that come to the outer surface of the body, that are not occasioned by any outward substance. All men have the consciousness of right and wrong, of motives that are deeper than those springing from the soul functions, and of ideas that are beyond soul powers. These do not come from the physical universe without and are not the creation of the soul within, no human

soul of itself is able to reach the idea of moral right or wrong or the idea of God. But these facts are at times apparent in all human consciousness. The presence of these experiences in consciousness proves man's moral nature, that he is spirit, and the fact that he has consciousness of right and wrong and of God proves the reality of the existence of moral government and of God. If this is not true then how do we make out the case of physical and soul reality? One position is just as scientific as the other. The present scientific attitude is very narrow and is bigoted in that it attempts to rule out all beyond that with a material basis, or insists that there must be a material basis for all conscious sensation.

But yesterday a young man was standing on the street corner waiting for a street car when he became deeply impressed that he should cross the street and go up to a certain real estate agent's office. He could think of no excuse for going but the impression was so strong that he went. All the way across the street and up the elevator he was wondering what reason he should give for coming. But he needed no excuse. When he entered the office he found the man busily engaged conversing with another man concerning some business deal; but looking up and recognizing the newcomer he immediately dismissed the man with whom he was conversing with the words, "I will see you later about this business." He then turned to this newcomer and said, "Arthur, I have been reading my Bible lately," and for the next hour he turned everything else aside and the two engaged in a most profitable religious conversation. From whence came that impression in the consciousness of this young man standing on the street corner? General Superintendent Reynolds in his world missionary tour was standing at the ticket window at Buenos Aires counting out his money for passage on a certain boat for New York when a voice in his inner consciousness said, Do not go on this boat. He hesitated a second, looked around, and then resumed his counting. Again the voice came with the same words, and again he hesitated, and then resumed his counting. A third time the voice spoke and he stopped counting, placed his money back in his pocket, made explanation to the agent and went to another office and purchased his passage on another boat. Three days later the first boat went down without chance of rescue. From whence came this voice of warning? These are not isolated cases. Men everywhere are having experiences in consciousness of various kinds, experiences of moral and religious facts, good and evil, that cannot be traced to outward stimuli or explained by animal instinct, or even to higher soul activities; they indicate a yet higher power and a larger capacity in man.

Why should science neglect the facts of spirit any more than the facts of soul and matter? Spiritual phenomena are just as real and apparent as other phenomena. There is physical science relative to man, -- Physiology; there is a mental science relative to man, -- Psychology; but there is also a spiritual science relative to man, -- Pneumatology; man is body, soul and spirit and has consciousness of matter, mind and spirit. But science cannot get on much in Pneumatology without the Bible. There is no clearer revelation in the Bible than this fact of spirit existence and the communion of spirits. There is, however, no justification in the Bible for what is now known as Spiritualism, which largely ignores God and professes communication with departed human spirits, more than that this may be a deceptive play with evil spirits. But God has, and does, consciously deal with men. And so does Satan. And so do angels, both good and evil. 'Tis true that there is need for very great care in this study in order to avoid unreality and a fanciful mysticism, but this danger is no reason for entirely neglecting the subject; by care we may have sanity here as well as in the study of Physics and Physiology and Psychology.

Everywhere in the Bible is the fact of man's spiritual consciousness. In the Garden of Eden God walked and talked with man. After the fall He still continued to talk with men, especially to and through the prophets. Also Satan's communication with man is dear, as is man's experiences of right and wrong. In the New Testament we find the same facts. Jesus promised that after His resurrection He would manifest Himself unto men (John 14:21), and that the Holy Spirit would guide and indwell men (John 14:16, 17, 26). Paul records frequent personal experiences of this presence and communion in consciousness. And all through these Christian centuries multitudes have had similar experiences. Science has no more right to interpret these spiritual experiences in consciousness as hallucination and error than has so called Christian Science to call the experiences of physical phenomena in consciousness an hallucination. Physical, mental and spiritual facts are a reality.

While there is a kinship between man and God through creation, while all men are in some degree religious, having the idea of God and a tendency to worship, while all men are possessed of conscience and have a sense of right and wrong and a feeling of guilt because of sin, while there is a nature in man that can only be satisfied by righteousness and fellowship with God, yet there is within all men also a proneness to evil, a tendency to self-worship or idol worship, an enmity toward God. These are facts of human consciousness just as apparent as the facts of physics. But nature can give no satisfactory explanation of this double disposition. The Bible again comes to our aid and tells us that the first described state is the natural normal disposition of man and the second is the result of the entrance of sin into the human nature through a moral fall since the creation. Science can observe the facts of sin and righteousness but it cannot tell that they are sin and righteousness, neither can it determine their source, but when the explanation is given in the Bible that explanation is seen to be reasonable and sufficient and nothing in nature contradicts it. The mystery is, why science is so unwilling to accept, this source book which can give these explanations and there is no other source that can.

There is a laboratory of Pneumatology, of the spirit, as well as of Physics, Chemistry and Psychology, the laboratory of spiritual experience. Not the foolishness of that which is called Spiritualism or Christian Science, but a real science pertaining to man's spirit nature, its experiences and nature. One may go into this laboratory and obtain experiences in consciousness and knowledge as real and certain as that obtained in the other laboratories. And the findings in all of these laboratories will harmonize when they are correct and understood, the two source books always agree and all true science harmonizes. But not many men comparatively are entering much into this laboratory that we are calling the laboratory of Pneumatology, or spirit, with any seriousness and carefulness of study and too small progress has been made in this field. And often those who do enter here are not of the stronger personalities, endued with that strength of vision and comprehension to fortify them against the fanciful and unreal. But this is all stated in the source book when it says, "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called" (1 Cor. 1:26). The expression "not many," however, infers that there are some, though these, are few compared with those who work in the other laboratories.

There are several reasons for this neglect of these higher spiritual realities, for the refusal to work in this laboratory and discover these greater facts. First, is the presence of that enmity against God referred to above. Sin has weakened man's powers, broken his connection with God,

filled him with doubt and put within him something of aversion, and has somewhat closed the moral faculty against spiritual truth. Great opposition from Satan and from one's fallen nature must be overcome. To begin work in this laboratory with any chance of correct results it is necessary for one to first have his own spirit awakened from its death in trespasses and sins, -- be converted, and men draw back from real conversion. Second, the laboratory methods are different here. They are prayer, fasting, consecration, sacrifice, meditation, unselfishness, worship, and Bible study as well as nature study; also the careful practice of righteousness and the use of that most wonderful spiritual sense, faith. These are methods which men shrink from using and which sinful man values lightly. Third, in this laboratory there is the necessity of the Holy Spirit's teaching, which calls for an acknowledgment on the part of man of his inability and weakness to discover the truths of himself, This dependence proud man does not like to confess. But if man will sanely, sincerely and persistently make experiments in this laboratory using its correct methods according to its laws, as men do in other laboratories, he may enter into real spirit experiences and become the discoverer of wonderful spiritual facts that are as certain, and even more valuable, than those of physics, chemistry and psychology. There is a spiritual consciousness in man where spiritual realities may be manifest and demonstrated. Our second source book tells us that God, that Christ, will manifest Himself to man (John 14:21), that man may have a new spiritual birth (John 3:3-7), that he may be made holy (Luke 1:74, 75), that man may have fellowship with God (1 John 1:3), that by the method of prayer and faith great things may be accomplished (James 5:16); and all of these facts are capable of demonstration to man, he may know them as experiences in consciousness. It is the shame of our humanity that, while we have come to know so much about the powers of nature we still know so little about the power and possibility of prayer and faith, that while we have come to know so much about human fellowships we have so little fellowship with God, and that the spirit consciousness of the great mass of humanity has been given over so much to unbelief and evil. But however weakened and abused by sin, man still has these powers of the spirit.

Man an animal! No indeed, rather man a finite god. With such consciousness and such powers man cannot be an animal. God is a spirit, infinite spirit; man is spirit, finite spirit, the lowest order of spirits. God is omnipotent, man is potent and the only approach to omnipotence on earth. God is omniscient, man is "niscient" and the only approach to omniscience on earth. God is omnipresent, man is presence and the only approach to omnipresence, through his power of thought, memory and imagination, on earth. God is holy, man is moral and may be made holy and is the only being on earth that can be made holy. God is eternal, man is immortal and the only immortal being on earth. Mercy, love, joy, peace, and such like things are attributes of God, and the same may be attributed to man as to no other being on earth. And man has, or may have, conscious experience of all of these things. Man an animal! Who could think of calling one so endowed, and possessed of much consciousness, an animal? Such an one, with such powers, could not have sprung from the ground, could not have evolved from the animal. There is no power in sea or land, or sky, in the plant or beast, to in any way account for or produce such as man is. Man is man, created by God in the divine image. It is the shame of man that he has lost the moral character of that image, that he fell from holiness to sin, but it is the glory of Christianity that it provides the way to restore that character. It is even the greater shame that man remains in that state of sin and refuses or neglects this restoration when it has been provided, and that he uses and develops his lower powers so exclusively as to neglect his higher spirit powers. Man generally insists on classifying himself as an animal and lives too close to the

animal. Instead he should recognize his kinship to God and live close to God. The life that very many are living seems to be but little more than that of a superior animal, but this is because he has failed to find his place as a man. Man is the natural child of God. Through sin he has lost his inheritance and become the child of Satan. But he may be restored to divine sonship through Jesus Christ. What a crime that man does not accept this sonship, and live the normal life.

Here is man: "For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet: all sheep and oxen, yea, all the beasts of the field; the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea" (Psa. 8:4-8). Such spoken of an animal! No never. This is man, and man is not an animal. Man is man.

* * * * *

07 -- WHAT IS MAN?

We have now proven, to our own satisfaction at least, and we shall hope to that of many of our readers also, that man is not an animal, that he is more than an animal, that he is a human personality. Before we close we would gather up some of the things we have already said, with some additions, in a brief consideration from the more positive side of our question and answer more directly the question, What is man?

1. Man is one in a series of divine creations pertaining to the planet called Earth. He is the highest of these earth creations, created in the image of God, the Creator; and to him was given dominion over all other of these creations (Gen. 1:26). His is not a superiority of development or of attainment but of creation, he was created the superior one of Earth. Fresh from the hand of the Creator he was the glory of, the crowning act of, this series of creations, and the world master. He was not a wild savage and an ignoramus, he could dress and keep the garden where he was placed and name all of the animals (Gen. 2:15, 20), and God intelligently communicated with him and he comprehended and became responsible for obedience (Gen. 2:16, 17). The barbarisms that have been, and some yet continue, have been the result of a descent following a moral fall (Rom. 1:18-25) and not the original, normal condition of all out of which there has been a gradual ascent to the present civilizations. Some barbarisms have been transformed into civilizations during historic times, but there has never been a time since the creation of man that there has not been some civilization somewhere upon the earth, and some of these have been no mean civilization; in some points some of them have been the equal, if not the superior, of what we have now. When the facts of nature, even the buried facts that are being slowly uncovered by the pick and spade of the scientist, all are in, understood and correctly interpreted they will testify to this truth which the Bible now so clearly reveals. There is no trouble with the facts of nature, even the Neanderthal and other skulls that have been found, the trouble is in the erroneous conclusions and interpretations of men. It is much easier for us to believe that there is a God and that He created just as recorded in the Bible than it is to believe many of the changing guesses, called findings, of science. The history of science reminds us of the drowning man grabbing at straws. One grabs at the straw of spontaneous generation and it gives way. Another grabs at a theory of eternal series of cause and effect with the same results. Others grab at different theories of evolution but these all break. Now we are beginning to hear

of the possibility that life in the form of a germ or germs may have floated through the air from some other sphere to our earth. Men are still grabbing at theories but finding nothing that will bring them to safety. Why not stop all of this grabbing at straws and take the life boat that is close at hand, the Bible, and receive its revelation that God created, and that He created man in His own image and gave him dominion; that man was a superior, intelligent person from the first?

2. Man was created a tripart being, he is body, soul and spirit. His body now connects him with the material world and is the agent of his service in relation to the world, "a medium of our education and a field of our creative labor." It is a superior organism among the organisms of the world. His soul connects him with the life of the world, gives him knowledge of the world and its laws, a response to world facts, and power to somewhat master world conditions. It also gives him some power to know beyond the world in other parts of the great natural universe. His spirit connects him with heaven or hell, gives him fellowship with God or Satan, gives him moral character and immortal existence. Man is soul and spirit life now materially embodied with power of response to material and mental phenomena, moral law and religion. Man is a wonderful being, lives in a wonderful realm and is wonderfully endowed.

3. Man is a finite personality, he is limited in degree and power. When we look backward, or downward, man being a person is in nature and capacity very far superior to the animal. He is endowed with the highest powers and greatest life of earth. Oh no, he is not an animal. But yet he is limited, he is finite. When we look upward man is the lowest in the realm of spirit, the most finite of all personalities. What, or how many, classes of personalities there may be between man and God we do not know. We read of Angels, and have slight mention of Cherubim and Seraphim; and there may be many others. However many or few there may be, we know that man is the lowest, the most finite, "for thou hast made him a little lower than the angels." Man is but a beginning in this realm where the possibilities are infinite. But though he be the lowest in the scale the fact that he is in this realm of being gives him in a finite degree the attributes that belong to the realm. Man was created finitely what God is infinitely. What more could be said of God we do not know, but this can be truthfully said of man. What a character this makes man, with what power and ability this endows him! He is intelligent, he is sentient, he is volitionally free and has the power of much activity; he is moral, he is religious. Dr. W. Crosby Bell says:

"Our life can only be described as one of dependent-independence (finite personality). Dependent upon God we are for our world, for the opportunity of life, for the stimuli that would persuade us toward higher and better living. Our life is rooted and grounded in God -- in Him we live and move and have our being! But on the other hand it is the fact that we possess thoughts and feelings and make decisions that are indefeasibly our own that make us persons. Our moral experiences, especially our sense of moral achievement or of moral failure, insist that our acts shall be, in the last analysis, our acts and not those of another. Our dependence and our partial independence are both matters of experience for us, and if our thinking is to be faithful to experience we must take account of both."

4. Man is capable of development; of growth, education, culture; of ascent or descent. If this was what science meant by evolution, development confined to the species, it would then be

a truth in perfect harmony with the Bible and true to nature. Living finite being has the power of change within its species and this is a power of either ascent or descent. The crab apple may be developed into the splendid Baldwin or Winesap, but if left alone and uncared for it will drift back again toward the crab apple; but in ascent or descent it is only apple. Man being in the spirit realm his possibilities reach very much higher or very much lower. Man grows physically and by proper care and exercise may increase his physical strength to a surprising degree. As proof of this one has only to notice the physique of an athlete or physical culturist. Man's soul powers are capable of great development. We know not the possibility of his education and training here. The stronger these powers become the more man comes to know and to feel, and the more and greater things he can do in this field. His present attainments of intellect and skill are very wonderful, and yet there is much room ahead. Man's spiritual powers are also capable of development. He may grow in strength of moral character, increase the moral graces, and approach more and more the divine likeness; he may know and feel more largely spiritual things, may increase in spiritual consciousness; he may become more and more adept in the use of spiritual means and increase in spiritual accomplishments. Man is finite, but his power of development is very great, great beyond all human knowledge.

5. Man is immortal, he is in possession of an endless life. Because he now lives he must live always, having come into existence there is now no end. What we call death is cessation only in a limited sense, it is transfer to new conditions and environment; cessation here but continuance there. The Bible clearly reveals a consciousness after death and a continuance of those faculties that have the power of spiritual response. These, of course, will be greatly changed in the event of death, but they will still remain finite, man may never become infinite. Being finite there will, no doubt, be a continuation of the power of development. When death comes it finds the very best and most advanced of men but just begun, they have the consciousness of but partly developed powers and of great possibilities yet ahead. Having attained to just a little knowledge, strength and skill and having accomplished just a very few things, age, disease or accident comes and man must go. But shall he quit? Will his development cease? Certainly not. Jesus commanded that we lay up treasures in heaven (Matt. 6:20) and several times spoke of eternal rewards. Paul tells us that "in the ages to come" we are to be shown "the exceeding riches of his [God's] grace in his kindness toward us through Jesus Christ" (Eph. 2:7). If this life is all, if what we can learn and do here is all, it is something, yes it is wonderful, yet it is not much when one comes to see what there is ahead, and it is very disappointing if one must stop with this. But death is not a stop, it is but a change; man lives on into eternity.

6. Man is possessed of a free will, is responsible for his actions, determines for himself whether his development shall be ascent or descent by his own choices, and there is moral worth to all of his choices. Evolution would have us believe that all development is ascent, or at least ultimate ascent, that if there be any descent it is but for a moment and the result of an accident that will quickly be recovered. But this is not the teaching of either nature or the Bible, Dr. A. P. Strong says, "We have numberless instances of animal species which have deteriorated and have fully gone out of existence; indeed those which have perished outnumber the survivors a hundred to one." And the descent of man both mentally and morally is a fact that may be observed every day in common life. But with man there is no perishing, there is a going on into continued eternal development in the same direction. There is set before man the heights of heaven and the

depths of hell and his moral and religious choice determines the direction he shall take; the determining choice being made before death. Not the present alone, but the future, yea eternity, is man's in which to be, to become and to serve; the direction of his development being determined by the choices of the present. But in it all whether it be ascent or descent he must ever be only man, there is no absorption into deity or demon; his eternal association will be with one or the other, but he will become neither.

7. Man is now fallen. This is the shame of man, the thing that man shrinks from and often refuses to admit. But there are no facts more evident than this. To deny it is to make God the author of imperfection, not just immaturity but of real fault and of sin. Just what man's physical, mental and moral strength was before the fall we do not know, much less can we tell to what degree he might now have been developed had there been no fall. There is so much in man, not only unlike God, but contrary to the nature of God, that God could not have made him as he is. We only know man as fallen and recovering from the fall, except as we see him in Jesus Christ, and He came in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3). Man's soul response to nature since the fall, the degree of his conquest of land and sea and air, has indeed been wonderful to us. But his original condition and capacity for knowledge, discovery and invention received a set back in the fall, sin has and continues to affect man's development. But for sin we would have been very much farther advanced in science and art today, and much that is error would be missing. Sin has very greatly weakened man's soul powers, and not only weakened them but given them a strong bent in the wrong direction. There is now in men a tendency to indulgence, pride, and misuse. Man's original moral condition was holy, he was possessed of the divine graces and in the similitude of the divine disposition. But his history upon the earth has largely been one of crime, war, bloodshed, -- of sin. He began in fellowship with God but he has lived largely in fellowship with Satan. He might have lived righteously but he has lived largely sinful. If man were but an animal he could be affected by sin but he could not be a sinner. He has within his consciousness the guilt of sin, hence he is a sinner. Man is a fallen personality in his present world state.

8. Man is redeemed; not all men actually, but all men provisionally. If man were but a fallen animal he could have no redemption, there could be no reach of God into such a life sufficient to redeem, there could be no divine-animal incarnation, no divine-animal atonement. But man being spirit is in the realm where God could come, where there could be a God-man incarnation and atonement. And such a coming of God is a clear fact of history and of much experience. The fact of Jesus Christ as the God-man is the unanswerable argument in favor of man's high position as a moral personality and that he is not an animal. Satan having torn man from his position of moral purity, Christ came to restore, and He will restore all who will comply with His terms. Man is fallen but his redemption has been made possible. In response to repentance, surrender and faith Jesus Christ will graciously forgive every sin, remove all guilt and give the new spiritual birth; man may be born again, and must be in order to enter the kingdom of God (John 3:3). In response to complete consecration, or dedication, and faith Jesus Christ will cleanse the soul from all of its pollution (1 John 1:7). As a result of a sincere walk of faith and obedience there will be a strengthening of all the soul powers, an enlargement of the spiritual graces and an increase of divine fellowship. When death comes to such an one there will be an entering into heaven where the larger spiritual life and fellowship with the heavenly family will begin and continue in ever increasing strength. Without this redemption the

development will be descent in the fellowship of evil. How very insane not to take the way of redemption!

* * * * *

08 -- CONCLUSION

Seeing man is what he is, endowed with such wonderful capacities, capable of so great development, let us get away from this animal talk, this animal classification, this living so close to the animal and giving so much attention to that life in the animal sphere; let us find ourselves as men and live as men. Shall we not consult the two source books and develop the truly Christian, scientific spirit, which is really the only true scientific spirit. Not that spirit in theology which neglects the book of nature, that would forbid the teaching of rhetoric and force a Galileo to recant; not that spirit in science that refuses the Bible and the activities of divine personality and the influences of evil, as so much of science is now doing; but a theology and science that travel together on the two-rail track recognizing both rails as having been laid by God. Let us be done with the "I do not know," the agnosticism of a Darrow and his kind, away with the biped mammal classification of man and the evolutionary theory as defended by Malone and his kind, and accept the "I believe" of Bryan and his kind based upon the two source books and a sound scholarship, with prayer, faith and the leading of the Holy Spirit in their proper place. Let us not spend all of our time, nor most of our time, in the laboratories of Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy, Physiology and Psychology developing only the body and soul, but let us find our spirit life and give a proper time to the laboratory of Pneumatology and the development of the higher spiritual and immortal powers. Let us think of ourselves, not as animal offspring and cousins to the Monkey, but as men in the image of God endowed with immortal powers. If we will take our stand where William Jennings Bryan made his last stand, with one foot on the Bible and the other foot on the book of nature and the hands clasping the cross and saying "I believe," we will be safe and attain the best and highest things, here and hereafter.

Dr. Bell again suggests, "A botanist may go all the way to Africa to find a new flower, while his religious neighbor may be unwilling to cross the street to win fresh news from God." But recently certain astronomers crossed ocean and continent to observe and study a total eclipse of the sun, but men will not look within and with sincerity and honesty observe and study their own spiritual experiences. At very great expense and much hard labor an immense telescope was erected on Mt. Wilson in Southern California in the search for a knowledge of the natural heavens, but they will not study the Bible that gives them knowledge of the greater heaven and of the time values of earth. Man is worth more than any new flower, than any eclipse of the sun, than all of the stars; God is "mindful" of man, man should be more mindful of himself -- of his real self. The value of a man's life is not measured by the abundance of his outward possessions, nor the amount of his soulish knowledge; these things may be a great good or they may be his ruin, it is his character that gives him his real value.

We would not thus exalt man as an animal, and he could attain to no such position through any animal inheritance. He is the creation of God, a spirit, in the image of God, with an eternal destiny of ever increasing realization of the good or the evil according to his choice of the one or the other. The choice of the good is the choice of God, and the choice of God is the choice

of Christ and His salvation. It is the tragedy of the world for a man to miss the character of goodness, which is Christ likeness; it is a tragedy of the universe for a man to miss heaven.

We cannot conclude with a better word than that of the great Master Teacher when He said, "But seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Man now must have to do with the kingdom of nature but he belongs in the kingdom of God. If he will seek first the affairs of this kingdom he will fare best relative to the natural. If his relation to the kingdom of God is right he is in line for the realization of his greatest possibilities, -- "a perfect man."

* * * * *

THE END