

they should be always attacking premillennialism. They would say, We are not attacking; we've got Wooley and MacRae on the faculty who are premils. But I was teaching beginning Hebrew and advanced Hebrew. It did not enter into what I was teaching until my last year there. Wooley never brought it out at all in anything he taught. They said that outwardly, and then in their classes Stonehouse, Murray and these others were just undermining premillennialism and attacking Machen Allis? too very very strongly all the time.

I was with John Murray and Murray ^{Forest} Thompson, a young lawyer who was very much with that whole group. They would say, That IBPFPM is a very bad board, a bad board. Just look at it, and they went down the list and at least 3/4 of the people who were willing to take a stand with Machen were premils. And they said, This man's a premil, this man is a premil, this ~~man~~ man is a dispensationalist, this man is a dispensationalist == and as they went through the only difference I could see between who they called premil and who they called dispensationalist were that the ones they called premils were people who ~~we~~ would call themselves premils but never said much about it, and the people they called dispensationalist were premils and thought it was a ~~we~~ thing worth standing on. I could not see any difference. My observation was if you ask somebody what is meant by a dispensationalist whether he'd call himself one or be opposed to it, you ask 20 people and you get 20 different definitions! I think it's a word that does not convey an idea in the way it's come to be used. But that was their attitude. They wanted to get rid of these people == out of the IBPFPM who were the majority of the Board. Then they took some of the fine women who were on the Board, wonderful Christian women, and they persuaded them they were being wrongly attacked, etc. and that we weren't really standing with Dr. Machen.