

Similarity of the Doctrines of Modern Churches and those of Infidels

Description

Similarity of the Doctrines of Modern Churches and those of Infidels

by [*Daniel.W. Hull*](#)

[taken from [*Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, July 7, 1859*](#)]

I HOPE the intelligent reader will not think for a moment that the following remarks were prompted by any ill feelings whatever towards any church; for it is not the case. While I love many persons now in mind, who belong to churches, which have articles of faith similar to those stated below, I regard them as deeply in error.

The errors which I shall proceed to notice this time, are the views entertained by several different denominations concerning God, and I am sorry that the views entertained by Infidels on this point are so nearly similar to those entertained by orthodox, that there is no contrast between them.

The applicant for membership in one church is required to believe that “God is without body or parts, circumference, center or locality.” The articles of faith of another denomination require us to believe in addition to all this, that God is also “*without passions!*” so that he cannot even be compared to a stone or a block of wood; for while they lack the attribute of passions, they have all, body, parts, circumference, center and locality. In the above description the reader cannot fail to see a full description of nothing. Let us compare.

1. God is without body. Just so with nothing.
2. He is without parts. Exactly so with nothing.
3. He is without circumference. Precisely so with nothing.
4. He is without center. Where is the center of nothing?
5. He is without locality. Just locate nothing!
6. He is not subject to passion! Can you give a more complete description of nothing? I think not. How much then, are you ahead of the heathen? The heathen worship a real, tangible god; you do not! An Atheist can join a church with such articles of faith as these, and not violate his views of God in the least.

Spiritualists and Infidels have nearly as good conceptions of Deity as that given above. That the reader may compare their views with those of the orthodox, I make the following extract from a letter, written by T. P. Wright, published in the “Age of Freedom,” last year:

"My conception of Deity is the aggregate intelligence of the universe,-the all permeating principle of life, motion, change, and consequent progression. The all-perfect-or all of present perfection-yet constantly progressing to still greater perfection. The omnipresent, because all-permeating. The all-powerful,-all-wise,-all-just, all-benevolent; because the aggregate of all power,-wisdom,-justice,-benevolence! Am I degraded by the conception or contemplation of such a Deity? Is not my respect, my reverence called out by the discovery and contemplation of a small degree of these attributes in man,-the atom! How infinitely more then should these feelings be called out and expressed towards Deity,-the aggregate!! I am an atom of his aggregate intelligence,-a spark of Divinity is in me,-I live not by SUFFERANCE,-my right to life is inherent in me, and cannot be taken away,-I cannot be annihilated,-Deity cannot destroy himself, or any part of himself; for, if the minutest particle could be destroyed every particle could, and so the whole could! But why talk of destruction or fear it? Is the general tendency of intelligence good or evil? Is good destructive? no! It destroys (changes) only to save!-I to, like "Voltaire," "esteem my God too highly to fear annihilation or any other ill, that will not be more than repaid by good, to me or to some of the universal family."

No person will fail to see in the above a great many peculiarities of the orthodox church. Very true, he holds that man "is an atom of this aggregate of intelligence," but many of our churches have gone full as far. It is frequently held that God inspired Adam with a part of himself. Hence he was immortal. That the reader may see the legitimate result of this theory, I make an extract from Mr. C. M. Overton, another Spiritualist and Infidel.

"For myself I am a Pantheist; believing in an All-Present, Esoteric, Life Principle; not the Creator, but the sustainer and invigorator of all that is. I sometimes call this power God; but I can see no good cause for that squeamishness which will not hear the question discussed, whether it be proper to call the All Pervasive Spirit of the universe, God."

I am sorry it is the case that notes compare so favorably with the Infidel's. But such is the case, and we must deal with theories as we find them. This theory is not only in opposition to reason but it also arrays itself against scripture.

Moses was permitted to see a part of God as he passed before him, and Stephen saw Jesus standing on the right hand of God. Acts 7:55, 56. If God was without body, parts, etc., it follows that Stephen was mistaken, and did not see Jesus at God's right hand. So of other scriptures which we often meet with of a like import.

If God is without passions, he is insensible to love or anger; yet we read that he is angry with the wicked every day. Psalm 7:11. See also Exodus 32:22; Job 9:13; Deuteronomy 1:37; 9:20; Malachi 1:3; Romans 9:13.

In this last quotation we read of two opposite passions. The Bible is full of expressions of the love of God. He loves his own Son; yet he so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son to die for it, the just for the unjust. The epistles of John abound with the love of God. "God is love," says he, and "love is of God." 1 John 4:7-11. But sufficient has been said on this point.

I had intended to show that the orthodox and Infidel-Spiritualists were at one on other points, but I am already getting too lengthy. I will however make one quotation on the life and death point, and close.

"Our orthodox brethren may thank Spiritualism for the almost total eradication from the public mind, of the once fast-spreading doctrine of annihilation."

The cloven foot is here plainly exhibited. What the Bible failed in establishing, Spiritualism is doing.