I looked over these questions again that you gave me last time and they are very interesting questions. They suggest a lot of ideas. We could spend many hours discussing them, but I think it's worth looking at a few points in connection with them.

Under the first question. You day, Does the fact that McCartney was elected moderator -- some people thought it would turn the tide of liberalism but it didn't -- does this reflect faith in the great man rather than in God? I think these men had great faith in God who had done this, and they did not think it was in him, but he was, you might say, a focal point of a considerable group. There was a very active group in the Presbytery of NY at that time. Though the liberals through Union Seminary had gotten control of NY. I would say there were at least one or two strong fundamentalists in probably every presbytery of the country at that time. There were, I would say at that time, probably 3/4 of the ministers in the Presbyterian church believed in the gospel, but about 1/2 of them felt there are new discoveries, we want to keep up to date with developments, and I don't know about the precise details about how the books of Genesis and Exodus were written, etc. It's a strang thing, even today I read a statement that though evangelicals today reject as a whole quite conclusively the Welhausen theory, there are many outstanding evangelicals scholars today who look very favorably on the source theories about the Gospels. What's the great difference? There is considerable difference because the Welhausen theory assumes that these things were written over a period of centuries, so therefore there are all sorts of opportunities for mistakes to come in. The cource theory of the gospels assumes they were written ov a period of decades. So that in a way, it's not near so harmful