

Dr. Wright predicted, other cases like this are growing in other schools. Here is one thing the Supreme Court has not defined: how can public monies teach religion? Dr. Wright said his purpose in being called was to explain to court and jury how Biblical knowledge is acquired. He said he was asked what it takes to become a Biblical scholar and also about his archaeological expeditions to Jordan and how religious terms can be explained objectively. I don't know how anyone who doesn't know something about the Bible and the whole thing called Christian can really be considered to have a liberal education, he said. Of course such a one as the one being taught in Washington is not trying to make the kids into church members. Dr. Wright said the case ended with five students who had recently taken a course called to the stand. The five included a Methodist, a Jew, a Catholic and a student who said he belonged to no church. He said they were all asked questions about the course. When the Catholic girl was asked whether the course had affected her faith Dr. Wright said she snapped, what do you think I am, a child? She went went on to explain that she had her own convictions and that the course was no effect on it. Young folks at this stage (college age) are adults, said Dr. Wright. The curriculum is a free one. No student has to take it. The issues of the case went beyond what a liberal education can be Dr. Wright said. For example, he said, if you can't teach the Bible or Religion in a state supported school or teach a course on the Koran, the teachings was accepted by the Muslims, doesn't this affect the whole effectiveness of the University? Dr. Wright was here this week for the Baptist pastors conference at the University of Richmond.

Now I've read you an article from the Richmond paper about something that happened out in Seattle Washington. I think that's enough to show it is something of national significance, and national importance. I thought you would be interested in hearing a little of the details of this that I saw.

It began about the turn of the year when Mr. Tom Miller, a a BP minister in Seattle Washington, saw an advertisement that Dr. Fowler who it said teaches a course in the University on the Bible as Literature was going to give an address. He called Dr. Fowler and asked what sort of a course he gave in the University. Fowler said there is for sale in the U. a little booklet called Outlines on the Bible as Literature which I wrote 10 yrs. ago. He said if you'll look through that it will give you a pretty good idea of the nature of the course that I teach in the U. Well, Mr. Miller went to the University bookstore and purchased this little book, and he found that this booklet teaches as fact the teachings of the higher criticism. It said that the early chs. of Gen. were myth, much of it consciously contrived in order to answer such questions as, why does a serpent crawl on his stomach and other questions of that type. It said that much of it was very similar to various myths in the various pagan religions. It said that the Pentateuch, instead of being written by Moses, was came together by various documents being written hundreds of years apart and gave a chart showing when one of these documents was written, several hundred years after the time of Moses. And the next one 100 yrs later than that. And the next one 200 or 300 yrs. later than that, etc. And little lines showing how these had come together and then combined. On the other side of the page there were three columns in which it showed what were supposed to be conflicting stories of the call of Moses from 3 different documents.