

speech, which convinced the students they should not do it. I don't remember they sang some other songs or whether they did not sing at all but I know Roland Armes was rather disgusted at that. Gutske also. He said to me afterwards: I see that this group is not one in which I would feel at home. Things were heading up at that time. It was the changing attitude there at that time which the faculty was producing. That wasn't being produced by Dr. Machen. I think that on most of the points at issue, Dr. Machen had passively accepted pretty much so, the view that the rest held. But he never emphasized it at all. It was not his emphasis. His emphasis was on promoting solid Biblical Christianity. That was his solid emphasis. He was ready to cooperate with anyone who accepted all the great fundamental teachings of Scripture. He would make his emphasis perhaps on certain points I would differ with-- I mean he would agree with certain points ---

Incidentally many times Dr. Machen has been referred to as an amillennialist because Westminster was predominantly amillennialist until within the last year or so. During all that time. Now, I think there is quite a swing toward post-millennialism. But they were solidly amillennialist, and I believe most of their students had the impression he was an amillennialist. But if you read his book Christianity and Liberalism in which he tells how there are major things on which we must stand solidly, and there are things on which we may have different opinions, he mentions premillennialism. What he says in there is that I do not believe that the Holy is not able to convert the world. Now, I forget whether it was in that, or whether it was in class I heard him say, I do not