

It really was too much time in it but it was fascinating and if gave you a vision of a certain aspect of culture and attitudes and I had access to ~~lots~~ lots of material I was ~~using~~ using myself for OT study. So there were benefits from it.

Your second question: It appears the first part of the century the fundamentalists separatist movement involved a great number of Presbyterians, or even primarily Presbyterians (I think that is true), yet ~~now~~ now most of the material I come across where the term fundamentalist is embraced comes from Baptists.

I remember hearing this said that the Baptists tend to argue a great deal about the form of baptism and about infant baptism, while with most of the fundamentalist Presbyterians, their emphasis was on the defense of the Scripture and the great fundamental doctrines of Scripture and they don't spend enough time on it. The Baptists have a positive thing. They claim. To my mind it is based upon such flimsy points that I don't like to take a lot of time on it. If a person is trying to present the Word of God and show how you can be saved through Christ, how you can grow in grace, that's the thing that matters. Anybody who is doing that I consider as my brother and I don't want to get into arguments about these things. Whereas some of the Baptists make a great deal of that. The result is that by neglect the younger ones coming up have heard the Baptists arguments and most of us have not entered into it.

Another point that can be mentioned is that the modernist Presbyterians got busy to try to get it established that the denomination owned the property. Originally the individual congregations owned the property. When we started the Presbyterian Church in America we wrote that right into our constitution. The individual church owns the property and can leave the denomination