

I divided up one of two of them. It's the Developmental Hypothesis a new Roman Numeral.

The developmental hypothesis says that in the different documents we see a development going from one stage to another until we see how these ideas came into existence. Do we believe in one God maintainer and creator of the universe because he revealed himself in that way and He told us in His revelation that that is what He is? Or do we believe in that because men have gradually gone through a process of development from one idea to another until they have reached this idea. And if that's the case we may very well progress on to entirely idfferent ideas, in the next stage of the evolution.

Do the documents as they are alleged to stand present an explanation on natural grounds for the existence of the Bible and the religion of Israel? How did this religion come into existence? Is it because God said, This is the fact, these are the truths, this is what I reveal to you and want you to know, or did it come into existence because men did this and then they found something else worked out and then a group held one view and another group another view and the two came into clash and out of the clash there came a systhesis of their various viewpoints?

Is it a natural development and process whereby this religion came into existence. You can easily show how the constitution of the U.S.A. as it stands today is the result of a development of a process. You can show that every 4 years people get together from all the different states and go through the process of casting their electoral ballots for president when everybody knows that two or three months before jus how they are going to vote. It's a rather silly things--our electoral college idea! But you can see that that was a result of the idea of the founders of this republic who thought that the ordinary man did not know enough to pick a president of the United States.

So they said, Let the people get together and in every district elect someone in their district in whom they have confidence and then these men can get together and decide who will be president. So we have the electoral college. But the thing hadn't been going four years before it lost its validity. Within 4 years after it was established people were not voting for men who would -- who they had confidence in asmen, who were capable of getting together and electing a president.

They were voting for men who had promised to vote for John Adams or Thos. Jefferson as president of the U.S. They were really voint voting for John Adamas or T. Jefferson and not for the electoral college at all! Yet we went through this form. And some people think it was the height of the ridiculous when back in Californaa in 1916 the Republican candidate for president lost out in Calif. largely because som many people in Calif. did not like 3 of the electors. They fussed and got out and voted against them and voted for the Democratic electors on that particular point. The presidency of the U.S. was largely decided in 1916 because the people in Calif. didn't like the men who were running