

You get its principles. You look carefully at it.

I was connected with a trial out in Seattle recently which I will tell something about in one of our talks, perhaps more than one, throughout the week. I merely refer to it now, the fact that I saw an article in one of our fine religious papers recently in which it said that we were trying to say that the Bible must be accepted as the inerrant word of God instead of being regarded as a proper subject for scholarly research. That's the exact opposite of what we were trying to say. We believe that the best scholarship the most careful accurate interpretation applied to the Bible will inevitably find that it is true, that it stands in its entirety. We believe we must cf. Script. with Script. and interpret it in the most careful and scholarly way.

The attacks upon the Bible are being distributed to an extent we never realize unless you look into it a little bit. We objected to the fact that the U. of Washington, a ~~tax~~ tax supported institution should teach a course that teaches the higher criticism and deny that the Bible is true! The Supreme Court says you cannot advance Christianity by tax money. Well if you can't advance it you certainly should not attack it! You certainly should not advance the doctrines of humanism that are contrary to Christianity by tax money. One of the leading witnesses the University brought there was a head of the Department of Religion that has just been established in the U. of California. He formerly taught at the U. of Iowa. He told how he had been given a leave of absence in order to make a study of the teaching of religion in universities and particularly in State Universities.

The evidence he presented was terrifying, to see how that in our tax supported institutions students are being compelled to take courses which tear the Bible to pieces and teach them it is not dependable at all. If the Bible isn't dependable we want to know it, we want to cast it aside. But we believe the Bible will stand every test if it is treated fairly.

During the last 10 or 15 yrs. the S.S. material in most of our large denominations has blossomed out teaching the higher criticism. "Moses didn't write the Pentateuch; it was written by the writers J, E, D, and P hundreds of years apart and ~~then~~ then combined together in the Bible. They have issued little booklets, like the one I have here - "The Holy Scriptures, a Survey" which combines a very pious tone with an attempt to inculcate the teachings of the H.C.

I went to the Free Library in Phila. and looked in the religious dept., looking just at books published in the last 15 years, & I found at least 20 books published in these last 15 years presenting the H.C. as established fact. These include books by so-called Protestants, 3 or 4 by R.C. leaders, a number of them by Jews, books from all sorts of viewpoints defending the H.C. (presenting the H.C.) of the Bible as established fact.

I brought one of these as a sample: "The Holy Scriptures, a Survey" by Robt. C. Denton by the Dept. of Christian Education of the Protestant Episcopal Church. We find practically the same in any other of our large denominations today. On p. 32 that when we read the first chs. of Gen. with an open mind, we discover a curious fact. There are two accounts of the creation of man; one in ch. one the other in ch.2. The one in ch. one is what is called the P document, which is the latest of all, while the story in ch. 2 is from J the earliest of all." He says when we read these stories and compare them with each other we perceive that the story in ch. 2 is a much more primitive story than ch. one, since it describes God as creating man by