

not a pre-millennialist, I'm not a post-millennialist, I'm not an a-millennialist, I'm a millennialist!" I never could figure out what that means. But actually what I think he meant, which I don't think that term brings out, was that he felt that the great issues of the faith and the truth of the Scripture, and the deity of Christ and these issues were so great that we shouldn't be dividing up over that, and I believe his father was a pre-millennialist. I'm not sure, but he devoted his life to defense of the OT, and he didn't think we should make divisions over that. Actually that's the attitude I took when we started Westminster. It was only when I saw the way things developed there, we should mention later, which led me to feel that it is an issue === it is not we that are pushing it, it is the enemies of pre-millennialism who are making a real issue of it. I think when they do I think we should stand strongly on it.

I wanted to mention Chas. R. Erdman. He was supposed to be a pre-millennialist and I guess if you asked him what he believed he believed in pre-millennialism. But he was typical of so many people in every church, in every group. Men who believe in what is right and present it, but their objective doesn't seem to be closely related to what they believe. Somebody said, Erdman thinks he's going to win everybody together by smiling at them, and saying good-morning to them. Only once do I remember his being really riled and that was when he attacked Dr. Machen so strongly in a letter to the Presbyterian (the magazine was called at that time). Dr. Erdman would talk ~~by~~ very conservatively but he seemed to want to get ahead in the church and to be well thought of. He'd married a wealthy wife. He had plenty of money. His children have