

cule certain phases of it, and in addressing certain ignorant audiences, it may be a proper method. It is sometimes a proper method of debate, and with a certain type of audience it may be necessary simply to ridicule. Yet one can ridicule anything and it is just as easy to take our Christian views and make fun of them as it is to take the higher criticism and ridicule it. It may be a proper method of debate in certain audiences but I think it is vital that we have leaders who are able to see the relative strengths and weaknesses of the argument in both directions. In A.D. 1500, most people considered that the earth was the center of the universe and that the sun went around the earth. Then when Copernicus' ideas had become widespread there was a time when most people believed that the sun was the center of the universe, and that the earth and the rest of the planets went around the sun. Now all who know anything about it know that neither the earth nor the sun is the center of the universe. The two extreme attitudes were both utterly false. We need leaders who can understand the strengths and weaknesses of the Higher Criticism, and who can therefore intelligently talk to the person who is not satisfied with having been told it is a bunch of nonsense, but who find that many people believe it and therefore wants to know what it is. He needs to find people who can intelligently discuss it with him and show him what its weak points are and what its strong points are. He needs someone who can show how it came about that great scholars and learned men can have accepted a thing which is actually unscientific.

The higher criticism of the Bible is the main force which has been used to lay a foundation for the destruction of faith in the Word of God. It is not so much discussed today as it was thirty years ago. At that time, great sections of the church were wondering whether there was any truth to the higher criticism and were beginning to lose their faith as a result of it. Today the liberals consider the battle won. The question now is not, "Is the higher criticism true?" but rather, "What does the higher criticism teach in relation to some section?" The real fight over the higher criticism is more apt to be found in Brazil or Argentina or some such area where modernist books are just beginning to be distributed, attractively presenting the higher criticism in order to lead people to take that step which, logically carried out, leads to loss of all faith in the Word of God, and eventually of all faith in any