

They had simply taken it over from somebody else and had been very busy on the parts of the work on which they were doing careful research and so had put down what was not an argument at all, but a misunderstanding of Paul. Of course Paul believed in verbal inspiration, but what kind of inspiration is it if it isn't inspiration of the Word? Ideas are revealed. Words are inspired. The only inspiration there is really is verbal inspiration. The words of the Bible we believe are kept free from error, but that does not mean you can grab a verse out of context and get just any idea that you get from just those words taken alone.

God spoke. God spoke in various ways, therefore we should compare Scripture with Scripture and see what is taught but whatever we find there we should stand upon.

When I went to this trial I was told a professor from Harvard was going to be the witness for the other side. So I was interested to know what this man had written. I was already familiar with some of his writings. My friend out there had gone to the library and gotten different books he could find by him. One book he got was called The Rule of God. It was a series of sermon addresses which he had given in theological seminaries in many parts of this country. I was particularly interested to look into that because he had some very good teachings included in these talks he gave. The thing that disappointed me was that the teaching seemed to be built on an utter foundation of sand.

For instance, one of these lectures was on Genesis 3. In his discussion of == in this lecture he described the wickedness of the world, the evil of it, all the confused tendencies of this world. Then he went on to say the writer of Genesis, the best he could do to try to find an answer for this was to go back to an old story told by the Yahwist, the J writer, an old story which he gave as an explanation of how sin came into the world. He went on to say, We have our choice, which are we going to take? The myth of pithecanthropus erectus or the myth of Genesis 3? Well now, he's making evolution a myth --- the myth of pithecanthropus erectus. And he's making Gen. 3 a myth. I don't think the evolutionists would like that; and I'm sure the Bible-believers don't like it. He calls them both myths. Which are we going to take? Then he went on to give a beautiful figure. He said what is man like? Is man like the coliseum, a great tremendous structure, a colossal thing but in a ruined condition? Or is man like a ranch house in one of our suburbs? Which is man like. Well, he said, if he's like the coliseum, a great wonderful structure but in ruins retaining some signs of his former majesty or is he like the convenient ranch house? The ranch house which can be quite small, but very comfortable & very functional, and you can add to sections if you want; much more comfortable to live in