

geologist and the different scientists with whom I came in contact practically every one of them was working in some field of science which had absolutely ~~nothing~~ nothing whatever to do with the the matter of evolution, whether it was true or whether it was false.

And the alleged evidences for evolution were matters in which first hand work was being done by not one-thirtieth of the men who were working in the particular science. So the rest (as in this cases,) were simply basing it on the alleged concensus of scholarship, which simply meant the conclusion of a very very few men! The rest trained in the field had taken what they knew of that particular thing simply from books or statements given to them and they had not done first-hand work in that field.

The number of men who had actually done first-hand work in evolution is very very small. But the people who have worked in other fields, it is very easy to simply take over what somebody says in that field.

I noticed in the U. of PA. some time ago a very interesting illustration of how easy it is for one to do this. There was a professor there who was very ~~highly~~ highly regarded in studies related to the OT. This man used to give courses year by year in some particular book of the OT. He would take up a particular book and it was most stimulating to hear him. He would take up almost anyone of the books of the OT and as he would take it up he would look at the archaeological evidence, linguistic evidence add various ways of finding out what this book meant. He would turn to the critical theories, and they would say this is J and he would show there is nothing to it, and they would say this is P and he'd show there is nothing to it, and he would just ridicule these theories and tear into them! on the particular book with which he was dealing.

The particular statements about how you could see that his verse belonged here and that verse belonged there, he'd show there was absolutely nothing to it. He was going right at first hand study of this particular book and finding that these theories gave no help in the understanding of this particular book. But in the course of his discussion, when he'd refer to other books in which he was not doing study, he would simply turn to the standard critical books on the subjects and see what they said was the situation there. So in any other book on the OT in which he was not giving a course and going right into the facts and the immediate first-hand material, he would simply ask, What does Driver say about it? What does Pfeiffer say? What does Wellhausen say? And that was the last word! He wasn't working in that field. He simply took what the authorities said!

But in the particular one he was working in he would tear into the criticism and tear it to pieces because it got down to the facts there and saw it did not work out. as presented.