

seminaries, and the colleges. They indoctrinated the fellows and eventually they get into positions of control. It's like in our nation today. Practically all our newspapers and magazines are liberal oriented. The reason isn't because the owners of those magazines and newspapers and journals want them to be liberal oriented (it may be in some cases) but the main reason is because the professors in the school of journalism are liberal, so the journalists come out with pretty a clear idea in their minds of the direction of social development we ought to go that many of them would not dream of being for communism, but the things they have in mind that we ought to work for are substantially the same as communism. It plays into the hands of the communists. For instance Luce who wanted TIME magazine to be generally a conservative magazine, after all he had to make a success of the magazine, he had to have good writers, and when most of the good writers are trained in schools where they have a strong liberal emphasis, he could not help getting many liberal writers. Even if they understand they are supposed to take a conservative viewpoint, they can insert little words and phrases and movements, etc. and have a tremendous influence. It's amazing what you find. I think it's due largely to these people who have been indoctrinated in these schools. Certainly the schools are what caused the coming of the liberalism and modernism. But people in general don't realize that. The strong conservatives in the Presbyterian Church thought, if we can just get control of the Assembly, and get rid of two or three men who are strong liberals, and get Fosdick out from preaching in that Presbyterian church in New York, well think how much we can accomplish by that. It was while I was in seminary, I believe, that there were two young men who were ordained by the Presbytery of