

found the procedure would be: each of us would have 20 minutes to present our view, then the audience would ask questions. They could question either one of us, but the other could have a chance to discuss it if he desired to do so. It seemed to me absolutely fair arrangement, so I agreed to go. I presented my view; the other man presented his. The first two questions were addressed to me. Each time, I very carefully after I had answered said, Now I think Dr. _____ probably has some ideas on this; I hope he'll say something about it. That established that I'd have a chance to answer everything that he was asked. So for the rest of the evening each spoke on each question that was asked. It was most interesting and conducted in a most courteous way, with each of us sitting on the front row ~~and~~ while the other one talked and then taking his turn except once.

On that case I'm afraid I was the one that broke the courtesy of it. I just seemed unable to resist it. He was discussing a certain thing and he said, Well, of course we don't believe any more in a flat world like the Bible teaches, and I just couldn't wait till my turn came. I blurted out, Where? He said, The whole Bible. I said, Where. He said, The Book of Genesis. I said, Where? He said, a flood covered the whole world, doesn't that show a flat world? When I came to speak I said, I thought a flood that covered the whole world fitted much better with a round world than with a flat world because the water would all flow off of it! I got a letter two or three months later from the young man who had arranged the meeting, and he said that tape was played over and over and over. Great interest in that discussion that night. But it was a unusual opportunity to have a chance to meet one of these men face to face and try to get him to give a specific ans. to these charges they are always making against the Bible. Of course, they can't be altogether blamed for some of these false ideas they have because back in the days when most people thought the world was flat, they taught that what' the Bible said! But if we will not just try to get ideas out of our heads on these things, but go to the Bible and see what it says. I find in most cases the attacks made on the Bible simply disappear when we see just what the Bible really says.

Now of course there is much the Bible does not say anything about. That's one of the wonders of the Bible. I don't think the men who wrote the Bible were men who knew everything. I don't think God made these men omniscient, that he gave them His knowledge, and I don't think He erased from their minds all the false ideas they had. I'm sure they had many erroneous ideas; I'm sure the Apostle Paul had many erroneous ideas. I don't think God made him into an omniscient person. But the H.S. in those things He wished to have in the Bible kept out of it those ideas that were false. For instance, a man might want to describe a situation in which there was a man and a woman, and he might have thought there were two men. If he said, two men did so and so, and it was a man and a woman, the statement would be incorrect. But the H.S. would lead him to say, two people. That doesn't say where it was a man and a woman, or two men. We should not read into it what is not there. That's one of the most important rules of the Bible and I personally believe 90% of our theological discussions that have caused great acrimony among real Christians would disappear if we observed this rule of taking only from the Bible what's there.