

ANOTHER THOUSAND  
**RADIO REPLIES**  
*Second Volume*

Given from the Catholic Broadcasting Station 2SM  
Sydney, Australia

*by*

THE REV. DR. LESLIE RUMBLE, M.S.C.

Edited in Collaboration with

REV. CHARLES MORTIMER CARTY

*Diocesan Missionary*

*With a Preface by*

HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN GREGORY MURRAY, D.D.

*Archbishop of St. Paul*

---

1,422 QUESTIONS and ANSWERS  
*on*  
CATHOLICISM AND PROTESTANTISM

These books are now widely used as texts and reference books in Study Clubs, High Schools, Colleges, Universities, Newman Clubs, Novitiates and Seminaries.

Invaluable for the uninformed Catholic—the educated and uneducated lapsed Catholic and Prospective Convert.

WIDE CIRCULATION AT MISSIONS AND RETREATS

TAN Books  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Imprimatur: ✠ John Gregory Murray  
Archbishop of St. Paul, Minnesota  
July 10, 1940

Copyright © 1940 by Fathers Rumble and Carty.

Copyright © 1979 by TAN Books.

Originally published in 1940 by Radio Replies Press Society, St. Paul,  
Minnesota.

Library of Congress Catalog Card No.: 79-51938

ISBN: 978-0-89555-090-3

Complete and unabridged.

Printed and bound in the United States of America.

TAN Books  
Charlotte, North Carolina  
[www.TANBooks.com](http://www.TANBooks.com)  
2012

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
ANALYTICAL INDEX . . . . .	5
INTRODUCTION by <i>Rev. Charles M. Carty</i> . . . . .	7
PREFACE by <i>Archbishop J. G. Murray, D.D.</i> . . . . .	9
FOREWORD by <i>Dr. Rumble, M.S.C.</i> . . . . .	11
I. GOD . . . . .	13
II. MAN . . . . .	20
III. RELIGION . . . . .	23
IV. THE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE . . . . .	35
V. THE CHRISTIAN FAITH . . . . .	43
VI. A DEFINITE CHRISTIAN FAITH . . . . .	55
VII. THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION . . . . .	63
VIII. THE TRUTH OF CATHOLICISM . . . . .	73
IX. THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE . . . . .	116
X. THE DOGMAS OF THE CHURCH . . . . .	124
XI. THE CHURCH IN HER MORAL TEACHINGS . . . . .	220
XII. THE CHURCH IN HER WORSHIP . . . . .	254
XIII. THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL WELFARE . . . . .	268
XIV. COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NON-CATHOLIC DENOMINATIONS . . . . .	303
XV. TO AND FROM ROME . . . . .	341
ALPHABETICAL INDEX . . . . .	351

FOR COMPLETE ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF ALL THREE  
VOLUMES, SEE VOLUME ONE.



## ANALYTICAL INDEX

*(Numbers refer to paragraphs)*

### CHAPTER ONE—GOD

Proof of God's existence, 1-7; God's nature, 8-11; Supreme control over all things and the problem of suffering and evil, 12-24.

### CHAPTER TWO—MAN

Destiny of man, 25-26; Death, 27-30; Immortality of man's soul, 31-36; Pre-existence denied, 37; The human free will, 38-44; Determinism absurd, 45-56.

### CHAPTER THREE—RELIGION

Necessity of religion, 57-64; Salvation of the soul, 65-66; Voice of science, 67-69; Religious racketeers, 70-73; Divine revelation, 74-77; Revealed mysteries, 78-81; Existence of miracles, 82-90.

### CHAPTER FOUR—THE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE

Gospels historical, 91-95; Missing Books of the Bible, 96-104; The Bible inspired, 105-119; Biblical account of creation, 120-131; New Testament problems, 132-143; Supposed contradictions in Sacred Scripture, 144-149.

### CHAPTER FIVE—THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

Source of Christian teaching, 150-151; Jewish rejection of Christ, 152-162; Christianity a new religion, 163-165; Rational foundation for belief, 166-170; Causes of unbelief, 171-175.

### CHAPTER SIX—A DEFINITE CHRISTIAN FAITH

Divisions amongst Christians, 176-178; Schisms unjustified, 179-181; Facing the problem, 182-186; The wrong approach, 187-193; Is one religion as good as another?, 194-200; Obligation of inquiry, 201-204; Charity and tolerance, 205-213.

### CHAPTER SEVEN—THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

Meaning of "Protestant," 214-220; Causes of the Reformation, 221-237; Catholic reaction, 238-241; Reformers mistaken, 242-245; The idealization of Protestantism, 246-265; The Catholic estimate, 266-279.

### CHAPTER EIGHT—THE TRUTH OF CATHOLICISM

Meaning of the word "Church," 280-282; Origin of the Church, 283-286; The Catholic claim, 287-288; The Roman hierarchy, 289-296; The Pope, 297-315; The Petrine text, 316-328; St. Peter's supremacy, 329-347; St. Peter in Rome, 348-351; Temporal power, 352-360; Infallibility, 361-385; Unity of the Church, 386-387; Holiness of the Church, 388-414; Catholicity of the Church, 415-427; Apostolicity of the Church, 428-434; Indefectibility of the Church, 435-443; Obligation to be a Catholic, 444-451.

### CHAPTER NINE—THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE

Catholic attitude towards the Bible, 452-453; Is Bible reading forbidden to Catholics?, 454-456; Protestant Bibles, 457-463; The Catholic Douay Version, 464-465; Principle of private interpretation, 466-470; Need of Tradition, 471-476; The teaching authority of the Catholic Church, 477-483.

## CHAPTER TEN—THE DOGMAS OF THE CHURCH

Revolt against dogma, 484-488; Value of a Creed, 489-490; The divine gift of Faith, 491-494; Faith and reason, 495-511; The "Dark Ages," 512-513; The claims of science, 514-518; The Holy Trinity, 519-533; Creation and evolution, 534-546; Angels, 547-554; Devils, 555-566; Man, 567-591; Reincarnation, 592-595; Sin, 596-621; Christ, 622-667; Mary, 668-696; Grace and salvation, 697-714; The Sacraments, 715; Baptism, 716-735; Confession, 736-760; Holy Eucharist, 761-780; The Sacrifice of the Mass, 781-783; Holy Communion, 784-790; The Catholic Priesthood, 791-792; Marriage and divorce, 793-822; Extreme Unction, 823-828; Judgment, 829-833; Hell, 834-850; Purgatory, 851-862; Indulgences, 863-866; Heaven, 867-876; The resurrection of the body, 877-882; The end of the world, 883-900.

## CHAPTER ELEVEN—THE CHURCH IN HER MORAL TEACHINGS

Conscience, 901-902; Truth, 903-904; Charity, 905-908; Scandal, 909-914; Tolerance, 915-916; Censorship, 917-928; The Inquisition, 929-933; Astrology, 934-950; Other superstitions, 951-963; Attendance at Mass, 964-968; Sex education, 969-978; Attitude to "Free Love," 979-999; Abortion, 1000-1033; Suicide, 1034-1040.

## CHAPTER TWELVE—THE CHURCH IN HER WORSHIP

Magnificent edifices, 1041-1046; Lavish ritual, 1047-1052; Women in Church, 1053; Catholics and "Mother's Day," 1054-1061; Liturgical Days, 1062-1069; Burial rites, 1070-1073; Candles and votive lamps, 1074-1075; The rosary, 1076-1080; Lourdes water, 1081; The Scapular, 1082-1089.

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN—THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL WELFARE.

Social influence of the Church, 1090-1091; The education question, 1092-1095; The Church and world distress, 1096-1112; Catholic attitude towards Capitalism, 1113-1130; The remedy for social ills, 1131-1138; Communism condemned, 1139-1162; The Fascist State, 1163-1177; Morality of war, 1178-1183; May individuals become soldiers?, 1184-1203; The Church and peace, 1204-1230; Capital punishment, 1231-1236; Catholic Action, 1237-1242.

## CHAPTER FOURTEEN—COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NON-CATHOLIC DENOMINATIONS

Defections from the Catholic Church, 1243-1244; Gnosticism, 1245; Manichaeism, 1246; Arianism, 1247; Nestorianism, 1248; Eutychianism, 1249; Coptic Church, 1251-1253; Greek Orthodox Church, 1254-1268; Anglican Episcopal Church, 1269-1288; The "Free" or "Nonconformist" Churches, 1289-1290; Presbyterianism, 1291; Methodism, 1292; "Church of Christ," 1293-1296; Baptists, 1297-1300; Seventh Day Adventists, 1301-1304; Plymouth Brethren, 1305-1307; "Catholic Apostolic Church" or Irvingites, 1308-1311; Salvation Army, 1312-1317; Spiritualism, 1318-1327; Christian Science, 1328-1334; Christadelphians, 1335; British Israelism, 1336-1345; "Liberal Catholics," 1346-1350; Witnesses of Jehovah, 1351-1374; Buchmanism or the "Oxford Group Movement," 1375-1387; From Protestantism to Catholicism, 1388-1390.

## CHAPTER FIFTEEN—TO AND FROM ROME

Conversion of Cardinal Newman, 1391; Why Gladstone refrained, 1392; The peculiar case of Lord Halifax, 1393-1395; Gibbon the historian, 1396-1398; Secession of Father Chiniquy, 1399-1401; Father Tyrrell, the modernist, 1402-1406; Bishop Garrett's departure, 1407-1409; Judgment on lapsed Catholics, 1410-1413; Protestant apathy towards conversion of Catholics, 1414-1416; Principles for converts to Catholicism, 1417-1421; God's will that all should become Catholics, 1422.

# INTRODUCTION TO SECOND VOLUME

The avalanche of letters pouring into my office from every nook and corner of the United States speak in high praise of the valuable and much needed book, *Radio Replies*, which has been the medium of bringing lapsed Catholics back to the Church and of enlightening those who still remain out of the Church or those who have become converts to Catholicism. Many Protestant Publishing Houses have written in for copies for distribution to Protestant Seminaries.

## ITS VALUE FOR MIXED MARRIAGE CASES

The **First Volume** of *Radio Replies* has cleared away many misconceptions of Catholic claims, especially in so many cases of Mixed Marriages, where the non-Catholic party holds strong grievances against living up to the signed promises. Where religious animosity reigned in the home of the Catholic and non-Catholic parties, many have written in stating that the accidental picking up of a copy of *Radio Replies* lying around the house and the reading of but a few questions and answers changed the atmosphere of misunderstanding and prejudice towards things Catholic. Wherever religious discussions became nigh intolerable in some Mixed Marriage cases the silent use of the printed word brought about the desired conversion. Converts are made today more through what they **read** than through what they **hear**.

## TEACHERS AND PROFESSORS

Teachers and Professors throughout the nation have found this volume of apologetics invaluable as a stimulus to religious study on the part of the high school or university student in the classroom where *Radio Replies* has been used to divert the student from the monotony of the usually dry Christian Doctrine textbook. In order to equip Seminarians with an understanding of the Protestant mind, many Seminaries have adopted *Radio Replies* as an official textbook for apologetics. The reading interest of the student or the man in the street in many cases was so aroused that the book was read in one sitting because of the startling sharpness of the quizzes and the clear-cut logical brevity of the replies.

## ITS POPULARITY ENCOURAGES PUBLISHING A SECOND AND THIRD VOLUME

The widespread use of the **First Volume** in hospitals, study clubs, novitiates, retreat houses, seminaries, high schools, academies, colleges and homes throughout the nation has encouraged us to give to the public a **Second Volume** which amplifies the **First Volume** by another thousand new and more instructive replies. In **Street Preaching** for the past three summers throughout Minnesota and Wisconsin I have found very few inquiries which are not contained in this handy text and source book. The material presented to me and not found in the **First Volume** has been embodied in this **Second Volume** of Replies, which will **soon** be followed by a **Third Volume**. These Three Volumes of five thousand and more replies will serve as a ready encyclopedia for Catholic Apologetics.

## IMITATING OUR ENEMIES

I have been campaigning in the spreading of literature in the parish churches through the Archdiocese of St. Paul, speaking at all the Sunday Masses wherever

I go. Getting apologetic literature into the hands of our own Catholic people has reaped great spiritual benefits in bringing many back to the Sacraments and into the Church. This campaign has brought more results for good than I have observed in the years spent in Radio work, Street Preaching and in preaching missions to Catholics and non-Catholics. The printed word has been the weapon of those attacking Catholic claims and it is my conviction that the Apostolate of **Spreading Literature** in imitation of our enemies is very vital today more than ever in brushing aside the false notions about Catholicism and in stimulating Catholics to equip themselves with the proper literature to reply to the questions and charges proposed in the Office, the Shop, the Club, the Street and the Home.

### NON-CATHOLIC TRIBUTES

Professors, rabbis, and ministers have personally discussed with me points brought forth in Radio Replies and they after careful perusal of the book confided to me before leaving their locality after a week of street preaching that Radio Replies was the strongest and clearest presentation of Catholic claims they ever studied. It is strange that in spite of open air campaigning in the cause of Catholicism no noteworthy intellectual charge or refutation of any statement in the First Volume has been made by anyone of its readers within or without the Church, and this observation shows that the Catholic Church the world over is suffering most from the great lack of intellectual opposition, and is facing the growing, gnawing cancer of Religious Indifference rather than Differences of Religion.

### BEING BOUGHT OVER

Were Dr. Rumble and I offered funds beyond counting to go out and deny the content of these books, we would both be acting against our own consciences in a most dishonest way, did we accept. Only by indulging in a campaign of deliberate lies could we undertake to refute what we have written; and in conscience, therefore, we could take no step but defend the position upheld by these books.

### GRATEFUL CONVERTS

Since many readers of Radio Replies who have not even heard Dr. Rumble or myself in the pulpit or on the public platform have come into the Church as a result of studying and debating this work in apologetics, it would be greatly appreciated if these converts would join the long list of those who are sending in a few words of acknowledgment to my office.

### WE MEET AT LAST

For many months Dr. Rumble and myself have been corresponding from the extreme ends of the earth concerning the American publication of the First Volume. It is a deeply appreciated privilege to meet at last and to be associated in person with him in getting before the public this Second Volume, and the Third Volume which will be published in the nigh future to complete the series on apologetics.

REV. CHARLES MORTIMER CARTY



# PREFACE



**T**HE present volume is a continuation of the fascinating study of problems in religion that engage the attention of all thinking men. Those who have had the privilege of reading the first volume of *Radio Replies*, which proved so stimulating to Catholic and non-Catholic alike, will find in the present book a more comprehensive study and explanation of subjects that were presented in essential outline in the first volume.

The high motive that has dominated the author is the desire to share with others the treasure of truth that he himself has discovered from personal experience in the process of research in finding his way to the source of truth. Having sought to develop within himself those principles of religion that he had cherished in youth outside the Catholic Church, and finding them inadequate to satisfy all the promptings of his soul, he went through the bypaths that finally led him to the full vision of the personality, the truth and the love of the God-Man, a full vision to be found only in the Catholic Church.

While the topics discussed in his work are necessarily controversial because they were suggested by inquiries from millions of radio listeners all over the world during a period of more than ten years, the method of treatment is not controversial but expository with a view to presenting truth and principle in that objective and inherent value that will bring conviction to an open mind.

Only when men know all the truth that is to be known will they attain that consummate freedom that is based on the possession of all that the mind of man can and should know. While the soul of man instinctively longs for liberty he can never possess it unless he first acquires the knowledge that will enable him to recognize and cherish liberty. The limitation of the human mind that makes it possible

for man to indulge in a thousand and one hypotheses concerning essential scientific facts does not permit him to doubt, and continue speculating as to the facts when they are already well established beyond question. When man has developed his knowledge to the point where he is conscious of the possession of truth he experiences a sense of achievement and security in the attainment of the objective that he has sought, and he is no longer disposed to wander afield in the futile adventure of learning whether there may be an order in which the contrary to truth may be acceptable.

In the field of religion the uncertainty and consequent liberty to speculate is due to the limitation of the knowledge of established facts; and only when man has sincerely considered the established facts will he cease from speculation and, by the elimination of his hypotheses in face of scientific facts, accept and enjoy the possession of the truth. There is nothing unscientific in the process by which a man adheres with profound conviction to the truth revealed by the Son of God and preserved in His Church for the temporal and eternal welfare of all humanity.

The exposition of the fundamentals that were involved in the inquiries sent to the author of this volume appeals to the sincerity of all who may find similar problems in their own soul. If the statement of facts may seem to hurt it cannot be attributed to any cause other than the sentiment of those who, in all sincerity, have continued to cherish the conviction that all was well until the physician announces the need of a major operation to save not the body but the soul of the patient.

The unity of the world in the field of human welfare will come only through the unity of the world in the recognition of truth that is basic in the development of human welfare, not only in terms of terrestrial happiness but in the intellectual and spiritual development that is essential to eternal happiness.

**JOHN GREGORY MURRAY,**  
*Archbishop of Saint Paul*

# FOREWORD

This second volume of Radio Replies is new, complete in itself, and quite different in its contents from the first volume which is already so well known and widely distributed. And it has been published in response to innumerable appeals from readers of the first book.

## THE FIRST VOLUME

From those readers of the first collection of Radio Replies, bishops, priests, and members of the laity, many of these latter grateful converts, have come very remarkable tributes to the value of the book, both as regards the matters dealt with, and the manner of their presentation. The advantages of such a work of reference should be obvious. When, in 1928, on the occasion of the Eucharistic Congress in Sydney, I commenced a Question Box Radio Session for the purpose of explaining Catholic teaching to non-Catholics, I began by stating two basic principles. Firstly, since God is the Author of all truth, nothing that is definitely true can ever really contradict anything else that is definitely true. Secondly, the Catholic Church is definitely true. It therefore follows that no objection or difficulty, whether drawn from history, Scripture, science, or philosophy, can provide a valid argument against the truth of the Catholic religion.

Stimulated by this clear-cut issue, non-Catholic listeners at once began to submit their difficulties from all points of view. And the fact that the questions are from non-Catholics themselves, and not merely Catholic suppositions as to what they might be expected to think, cannot but prove most useful to all who are called upon to enter into discussion with them.

As to the value of the replies which the Catholic Church can offer to all difficulties proposed against herself or her doctrines, I will let one prominent convert speak. After reading the first volume of Radio Replies he declared: "There is but one answer to the book—to become a Catholic. The only alternative is silence, and the dismissal of the problem of God and of religion altogether from one's thoughts."

The first book, however, summed up the results of my answering over Radio Station 2SM, Sydney, N.S.W., questions from non-Catholic listeners throughout Australia and New Zealand during the first five years only. Since then, seven further years have elapsed, with an increasing interest amongst listeners, and a continued series of inquiries opening up ever new lines of approach to the problem of religion.

## A MORE SEARCHING CHALLENGE

In the first five years I had to deal chiefly with the difficulties of the average man, many of them based on misconceptions of Catholic doctrine and, as often as not, inspired by prejudice. But interest was intensified. Wrong notions were cleared away. The contrast between the actual teachings of the Church and the prevailing sentiments of the secularists, above all in modern non-Catholic Colleges and Universities, became increasingly evident. This was noted by professional men who had sat under the professors in those Colleges and Universities. And there resulted a flood of challenging inquiries, probing far more deeply into the nature, foundations, and consequences of Catholic doctrine.

## THIS PRESENT BOOK

From this new material the present volume of Radio Replies has been compiled. For its production, at the invitation of His Excellency the Most Rev. John Gregory Murray, D.D., Archbishop of St. Paul, Minn., U. S. A., I came to America in order to have the personal co-operation of the Rev. Charles Mortimer Carty, Diocesan Missioner, who is so well known throughout the United States as a Catholic Campaigner for Christ, engaging in Street Preaching and a nation-wide distribution of Catholic literature.

As a member of the Australian Province of the Society of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart—the American Province of which has its headquarters at Geneva, Illinois, U. S. A.—I have for years been engaged throughout Australia in work somewhat similar to that of Father Carty in America. By Radio, by missions in Public Halls, and by instruction classes for converts, my interest has been almost entirely centered in the conversion of non-Catholics whose outlook is very similar to that prevailing amongst the non-Catholics here in America. My being a convert myself of its very nature seemed to indicate such a field of activity.

The selection of the questions and answers in this book, therefore, is the fruit of Father Carty's and my own experience of the needs of today with its denial of the supernatural, its driftage from religion, its adoption of a purely secular basis of life, and its widespread repudiation of those Christian standards of morality which, if not always observed in practice, have at least not hitherto been seriously challenged and denied.

### FOR STUDY CLUBS

As far as possible the division of the matter in this second book has been made to correspond with that of the first volume for purposes of reference and comparison. Although this book is complete in itself, it will be found complementary to the first, throwing new light on problems there introduced, and meeting the further angles of approach adopted by those outside the Church who have sought more detailed explanations of her teachings, or have wished to dispute their validity.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It remains for me to thank His Excellency Archbishop Murray for his interest, encouragement, and hospitality during my stay in America; and Father Carty for his valued advice, and a generous co-operation which amounts to blending our labors into a mutual apostolate of the printed word on behalf of the Catholic Faith to those who have not yet attained this greatest of God's blessings. Nor must I forget to thank the many readers of the first volume of Radio Replies who have written gratefully of their indebtedness to it—readers writing, not only from America, Australia, and New Zealand, but from England and Ireland, from India, and Africa, and Canada—and wherever the English language is spoken.

If this second volume accomplishes half the good that has already resulted from the first, it will more than justify its publication, together with the time and labor we have devoted to it.

LESLIE RUMBLE, M.S.C.



## CHAPTER ONE

### GOD

#### **1. *I am an atheist who wants his difficulties answered without being accused of moral depravity.***

I believe, in the ultimate analysis, with Pascal, that there are two classes of men, those who are afraid to find God, and those who are afraid to lose God. But, to spare you, I will admit that your fear that there might be a God may be perhaps unconscious. Of those who say that they are atheists some are merely unintelligent and do not think; others do think, but merely reject false ideas of God, without knowing how to replace them with the right idea. Since you are not unintelligent I rank you amongst the latter class. Will I accuse you of being morally evil? Of course, I maintain that atheism cannot exist without sin of some kind. If you do not deny God in order to be free from moral restraints, I would have to accuse you at least of a guilty neglect to examine the question as you should. That God exists is certain for everyone with a right conscience.

#### **2. *I have been told that the universe itself is proof of God, on the score that it must have had a Creator.***

That is a sound argument, for as no individual thing in this universe is self-sufficient, the whole collection of individual things cannot be self-sufficient. If each separate atom is unable to explain itself, all together will be as inexplicable as each. Multiplication does not change the nature of things.

#### **3. *Is it not possible that matter itself is eternal?***

I admit that it would be possible for an Eternal Cause to produce eternally some basic created reality. We know from revelation that God did not create from eternity. But it would have been possible for Him to do so. However, you must note this. The appeal to the eternity of matter, which cannot be proved, does not exclude the necessity of an outside Cause. The mere duration of a thing does not explain its existence. You cannot explain a running train by saying innocently, "Why it was always running." In the universe we see a succession of causal mutations, each succeeding stage being caused by a preceding stage, and in turn causing a subsequent stage. Every element is dependent, and no one element can explain itself independently of the rest. And if each link in a chain is dependent, the whole chain is dependent. An eternal series of dependent and caused things can be reasonably explained only by One who is independent and uncaused, who exists with a complete self-sufficiency not to be found in finite things.

In passing, let me call your attention to the problem of life. Even if matter be eternal, there was certainly a time when life did not exist on this earth, and certainly a time when it began to exist. Any belief that it began spontaneously, and without the creative power of God, is credulity, and unworthy of a reasonable man.

#### **4. *Were you to request God to put in an appearance, or manifest His presence beyond doubt to the satisfaction of experimental science, the result would be nil.***

Such a request would be absurd. God, as He is in Himself, is immaterial, and experimental science deals with material things. You might as well offer to believe in the Archangel Gabriel provided I dig up his bones. Experimental science does

not cover the whole field of reality. It abstracts from the spiritual field altogether, save indirectly at most.

**5. *People may believe that there is a God, but they cannot know it.***

By the use of their reason they can attain to a certain knowledge that God exists. The Vatican Council rightly defined as a dogma of Catholic Faith that natural human reason can know with certainty from the things which He has made that God exists.

**6. *Unlike intrinsic evidence, extrinsic evidence is not conclusive.***

Extrinsic evidence is certainly conclusive. I have no intrinsic evidence that Napoleon ever lived. I have the extrinsic evidence of a multitude of documents, and I am historically certain that he did live. Again, if I see the last car of a train disappearing into a tunnel, I have only extrinsic evidence of the existence of an engine at the other end of the train. Meantime, it is intrinsically evident that a thing which does not contain the ultimate reason of its existence within itself, has that ultimate reason in an outside being. That principle is self-evident, and cannot be refuted. On that principle, a being which obviously is not self-caused is evidence of a cause outside itself, and gives sound and certain knowledge of the fact.

**7. *The variety of philosophies now extant shows that your conclusion as to the existence of God is not beyond all argument.***

That is true, but it is not to the point. I maintain that the conclusion is beyond all valid and reasonable argument, a very different thing. There is not a single argument against the existence of God which cannot be proved fallacious.

**8. *Is not nature itself divine?***

Nature is the effect of a divine creative activity, but it is not itself divine. The word "nature" comes from the Latin "nasci," to be born. It is applied, therefore, to the original character or constitution of some object—a constitution which is the radical principle of all that it is and of all that it does. Thus, by its very "nature" a horse is not a human being. It is not natural to a horse to compose music. That is "natural" which is in accordance with some particular being's nature or constitution. Now we speak of the whole created universe as "Nature" itself. But since it is created—and we speak of it as "Creation"—it cannot be divine in its essential character and constitution.

**9. *You insist, then, that God is distinct from nature?***

Yes. The natural world is full of contradictions, and there can be no contradictions in God. The true and the false, good and evil, all manner of imperfections, ignorance, and knowledge, the conscious and the unconscious, constant movement and change—all these cannot possibly be synthesized into one Being called God. We know how different men desire different things and will different things. Men are obviously distinct from one another. They cannot, therefore, be identical with one and the same God. So if you are God, I am not. If I am God, you are not. And it is impossible to say that all is God. Yet if all is not God, all nature is not divine. The whole of creation may be the effect of divine activity, but the effect certainly is distinct from God.

**10. *If God is present everywhere in the world, is not creation so inseparable from God as to be part of Him?***

God does exist everywhere. He, therefore, co-exists with all created being. Yet He cannot be identified with created beings. He is in a totally different order of existence. The concept is not difficult. Thought and matter are in different orders of being, yet both co-exist in the same head. A man's material brains could

be weighed on a pair of scales; but that would not be weighing the thoughts produced by his soul with the help of those brains. So, too, a current of electricity occupies the same space as solid copper wire; but that mutual presence does not make the copper wire part of the electricity. God's presence everywhere does not make created things part of God. As a matter of fact, God is a purely spiritual Being who cannot have parts. Also, created things are finite or limited, and God is infinite. The finite cannot be part of the infinite. Whilst the universe has its very being "in" God because God is everywhere, God infinitely transcends the universe, differing from it in substance, nature, power, and perfection, and constituting a world of mysterious reality in Himself.

### **11. *What definition accurately conveys to the human mind an idea of the Deity?***

Many human words convey accurately as far as they go, but not adequately, a notion of some aspect of God's perfections. But for a definition, not of an aspect of God, but simply of God, the most accurate of all human expressions, though still inadequate, is "The Self-existent Being." Thus, God described Himself to Moses in the words, "I am who am." Exod. III., 14. There is an immense depth of meaning in those few words.

God alone exists in His own right. Nothing else "is" of itself and apart from God's causality. All else is but a reflection—a shadow of being; and God is the Author of it. God alone "is"; all else "is dependent."

"I am He who is. Do not seek anywhere else," He may be interpreted to say, "to find the cause of My existence. By this I differ from everything else. This Name is proper to Myself, and I cannot give My glory to another."

God, then, is essential Being. And since every perfection must "be" in order to be a perfection, the plenitude of His Being is the plenitude of perfection. He is. He does not become, progressing from less to greater perfection. Eternal, He never ceases to be what He was, nor does He change to what He was not. He alone is undivided, infinite, identical, essential, and eternal Being; uncaused, yet causing all else to receive being and such degrees of perfection as He chooses to bestow.

God, then, is perfection of Being. He is Truth, for truth is that which is. He is Justice, for justice is the conformity of the will to truth. He is omnipotent, for all else is by Him; good, for evil is the destruction of the true; love, giving benefits to others. He has nothing to fear from any greater than Himself; nothing to envy in any better than Himself. He is Beauty, for beauty is but the splendor of Being, and Truth, and Goodness. All this, and much more, is contained in the simple expression, "I am He who is" as distinguishing God from every other being.

### **12. *You insist on the existence of God. Do you believe that He is a benevolent God, and that His providence extends to all things?***

Yes, though I admit that you now introduce a problem which has baffled the keenest intelligences of all the centuries, and one the solution of which goes beyond the limits attainable by limited human reason. However, if reason cannot attain to a full and comprehensive explanation of this problem, it can go a certain distance towards a solution, and it can certainly refute objections against God proposed by human reason in view of the evils in this world.

### **13. *Is everything that happens to man God's will?***

From the negative point of view we can certainly say that those things which happen to men would not happen did God will that they should not happen. But, from the positive point of view, the question arises, "Though nothing can happen against God's will, does God positively will all that does happen?" The answer is—not necessarily.

**14. *When a person dies, is it God's will that he should do so?***

In some cases a death, and all its circumstances, are God's positive will. In other cases, it may be merely God's permissive will. There is a difference between God's positive and God's permissive will. For example, if an employer orders a representative to go from London to Colombo, when the latter goes, he fulfills the positive will of his employer. On the other hand, the employer might express a preference that the representative should go via Capetown rather than via Suez, yet add, "I leave it to yourself to go via Suez if you prefer." If the representative goes via Suez, it is not against the will of his employer. It is at least with the permissive will of that employer, though not a formal command of his positive will. This is merely to show that there is a difference between a positive will and a permissive will; and it is an example which must be kept in mind when dealing with the question of moral and physical evil.

**15. *If a man is murdered, is it God's will that he should die in that manner?***

Since God forbids murder, it cannot be God's positive will that anyone should commit murder. At the same time, whilst people are morally obliged by the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," they are no more physically compelled to keep that commandment than any other. For God has positively willed that man should be capable of a free choice between good and evil. And God's positive will that man should be free to choose the good must carry with it His permissive will of the evil should man abuse his liberty. If, then, a man commits murder, somebody will be murdered, and that also must be included in God's permissive will. So at least we must say that it was God's permissive will that the murdered man should die in that manner. But I could conceive a case where it would even be God's positive will. If a man were bent on murdering somebody despite God's prohibition, God could positively will that his victim should be one man rather than another. Then it would not be His positive will that the murderer should violate the law, yet it would be His positive will that the victim should meet with such a manner of death rather than another.

**16. *In the latter case the murderer would be merely the instrument of God's will. How could he be held responsible?***

The murderer is responsible because he is doing what God forbids, and what he is not in any way compelled to do. Granted that he insists on his guilty action, God will not prevent it because He cannot do so without depriving him of that free will which God will not take back. But he is not the instrument of God's positive will in his violation of the moral law. From the moral point of view he violates God's positive will, and he is responsible for it. On the other hand, whilst there is moral guilt in committing murder, there is no moral guilt in being murdered against one's will. That is why, if God sees a man bent on committing murder, He could positively will that this man rather than that should be the victim. I have personal knowledge of a case in which the wrong man was certainly chosen by a murderer whose vengeance was as ill directed as it was unlawful. And of all the men I have ever met personally, few would be as well prepared to meet God as the innocent victim, and few as quick to express complete forgiveness of his assailant. He immediately accepted it as God's will that he should die then, and that he should die in such a way. But that did not exempt the murderer from guilt.

**17. *Why did God put us in a world whose natural disasters, such as earthquakes, can destroy us?***

St. Paul replied to this difficulty simply by saying, "Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, why hast Thou made me thus?" He stressed the supreme dominion of the Creator, and the limited rights of the creature.



Reason tells us that every created thing by virtue of being created must fall short of infinite perfection. It is bound to be a mixture of perfection and lack of perfection. This world has good features, and bad. We should thank God for the good, and leave to God, without any complaints, the fact that imperfection exists. That is better than forgetting the good, and spending one's life complaining that we do not possess still greater immunity from trials and difficulties.

Let us remember, also, that this life is not all for us. A perfect destiny awaits us after our probation in this world of opportunity.

**18. *The sight of the evils in this world makes me doubt the existence of God.***

Such a doubt is not reasonable. It is because you concentrate on some particular evils, failing to advert to the good, and above all failing to grasp the universal aspect of all creation. The positive evidence for God's existence and of His goodness is certain and solid. If we fail to understand all God's ways, that is evidence, not that God does not exist, but that our human intelligence is finite and limited. To say that we must fully comprehend all God's ways or deny that there is a God is to hold that the human mind is the infinite, ultimate, and infallible criterion of all truth. That is not reasonable.

**19. *I cannot believe in a God who creates human beings only to know all kinds of physical pain and suffering.***

You are not expected to believe in such a God. God did not create men for such a purpose. Two things are certain. There is a God. Pain and suffering are realities. It is foolish to abandon belief in either of these things because we have difficulty in reconciling them. If we find ourselves baffled, the only thing to do is to go on serving God, content to leave the final solution of the problem to Him.

**20. *I get so indignant when I see suffering that I agree with the axiom, "The only excuse for God is that He does not exist."***

Firstly, if there be no God, indignation is absurd. For then suffering is a necessary result of blind material forces. You might just as well get indignant with the sun for rising later in wintertime.

Secondly, the absurdity of the axiom you quote should be evident from the fact that any excusing supposes someone at fault: and if God is at fault, He exists. But let me add that, if He does exist, He cannot be at fault.

Meantime, the only explanation of evil is that God does exist. Evil cannot exist apart from positive beings to experience it. God did not create evil, but He did create all positive beings, permitting them to lack normal perfection at times.

Again, if you say that there is evil, therefore, there is no God; I reply, "There is good, therefore, there is a God." And my reason is stronger than yours, because the good certainly outweighs the evil in this world. And the good cannot be explained without God, whilst the evil can be explained with God. He permitted it only because He was good and powerful enough to draw from it a benefit greater than any harm it can effect.

**21. *The sight of war, so utterly evil, would make any man indignant. I myself have fallen back on reason, and have become an atheist.***

If there be no God, as you now maintain, there would be no men to be at war. And even if there were men, the result of a purely mechanical and necessary evolution, it would not be wrong for them to be at war. If a cog in a machine gets out of place, you are not morally indignant with that cog for its behavior. If there be no God, blind force produced men and produces their conduct. It is as foolish to blame them as to blame an oak tree for not growing straight.

As for the use of reason, take this principle. We must neither belittle nor exaggerate the powers of reason. Reason is powerful enough to prove that there is a God; but it is not powerful enough to understand all God's ways. That reason is not capable of understanding all God's ways does not mean that it is incapable of proving His existence. We cannot argue that, because we neither like nor understand what a fellow human being does, he does not, therefore, exist. You discredit reason even whilst professing to be guided by it.

**22. *Christian Science tells us that you are trying to solve a problem which does not exist, for pain and suffering are not realities at all.***

Both the existence of a good God and of pain and suffering are facts. And since both are facts they are not incompatible. That their complete reconciliation is not possible to the human mind I admit. We, therefore, speak of the mystery of suffering. But it is to behave like a school child to take an answer that pleases one, and then go back and tamper with the facts, adjusting them to fit one's conclusion.

Some people set out with the principle that human reason must be capable of understanding all things. They accept this principle despite the fact that history shows the almost infinite capacity of the human mind to go astray. Working on this unjustified principle they say, "We don't see how to reconcile a good God and suffering." So they go off into two camps, one section with the enthusiastic credulity of atheism, denying that any good God exists, the other section with equally enthusiastic credulity, denying that suffering exists.

The sensible man refuses to deny God or to deny suffering. He has the humility which admits the limitations of human reason, and the faith and trust which continue to serve God in the midst of adversity without tearful protests and moans of despair.

**23. *If pain and suffering are real, God created them; if they are unreal, they are illusory.***

God did not create evil, for evil is the negation of the good. Privations of perfection are not the objective of creative activity. God did create a free will in man capable of failing to do the good dictated by conscience, and positive sense-faculties capable of experiencing pain. Yet pain and moral evil are actual phenomena in this world, and not merely illusions. We do experience an absence of normal health in our bodies, and of moral rectitude in our will. And neither experience is pleasant.

**24. *Does it not seem strange that God, knowing that would happen, should create man free to please or offend Him? If He could not foresee the future it could be more easily understood.***

If God could not foresee the future, instead of being more easily understood, things would be absolutely inexplicable. It is precisely because He foresaw the future, and the greater good He will draw out of these present evils, that He has permitted them.

But, apart from this, why did God, knowing what would happen, create men free to please Him or offend Him?

Firstly, because His foreknowledge in no way makes anyone offend Him. Knowledge does not cause things to happen. Things which happen give rise to the knowledge of them.

Secondly, God gave us free will so that we might have the nobler dignity of being masters of our own destiny, not having to serve Him necessarily and blindly as do trees and inanimate planets and stars. God did not want a forced love from beings capable of an intelligent appreciation of the good. But once God makes man free, man is free either to love God or to reject God; to serve Him, or to rebel

against Him. That is, physically. No man is morally free to reject God. God, therefore, forbids that, warning us of its disastrous results.

At any rate, there is a God, and we are free. If we cannot see a satisfactory explanation of the difficulties that occur to us, then we trust God in such matters. Many speculative questions which human curiosity would like to have solved have been left mysteries, either because our minds could not grasp the solution even if they were explained, or simply because God does not choose to justify Himself to His own creatures yet.

**See also Radio Replies, Vol. I, Nos. 1-24 for further questions on Existence, Nature, Providence of God and Problem of Evil.**