

the main thing I think he meant was, Let's x take the Scripture and stand on it, and whatever it says we will stand for and not fight over it, on these matters. I would perfectly agree with that. This little pamphlet that Steve Christian let e copy that was given to him by a fellow from Westminster and written by a graduate there, says that I left Westminster because I would not teach in a school which did not insist on premillennialism! Which of course is the exact opposite of what the fact was.

But that was not the major thing. As time went on I became more and more irritated at this narrow attitude that was developing. Dr. VanTill to some extent exemplified it more than most anyone else. I liked him personally. Always did, and do now. But I had the feeling that right down the line this is what you have to believe and this is the most important thing. As he used to say, I don't believe in making people Christians and then making them Reformed Christians, we should do it all at once.

I think there is a difference between an intelligent Christian who understands what the Bible says about God's election and sovereignty and a Christian who is saved through the blood of Christ but is hazy on these things, and this is not one thousandth as great as the difference between any Christian and an anti-Christian. This did not seem to be a proper division! But that attitude developed more and more during those years. An interesting thing was that of all the faculty there were 3 who were not married. John Murray came there our second year. He had been preaching in Princeton the previous two years. John Murray, Dr. Machen and I were not married. Dr. Machen was quite a bit older and he was very busy anyway. But Murray and I used to eat together and take walks together and were very good friends.