

things should go, and I don't think Dr. Machen's ideas were quite the same perhaps. Theoretically they were quite similar to his but his emphasis was altogether different.

Two years before Dr. Machen left, during the whole year students were criticisizing him strongly that he wasn't taking a strong enough stand on particular things on which Machen agreed with them but did not feel those should be primary. He thought we were facing modernism with its attempt to destory the Christian faith, and we should make a united stand against that.

I saw this attitude of people during that next to ~~my~~ the last year. Now almost unconsciously, I think, there came a dislike between the leaders there and Dr. McIntire because he assumed a sort of leadership among those who were wanting to carry on the kind of testimony that I am sure was the kind of testimony that Dr. Machen really wanted to do and which Dr. Machen represented.

But during the last half year of Dr. Machen's life, certain members of the faculty there had come under strong criticism, and some of that criticism was in the Christian Beacon. The criticism centered around two things: it centered around attacks on pre-millennialism, and it centered around the attitude toward worldly practices that most fundamentalists considered as very very wrong, and which some of these men with a Dutch or Scotch background considered to be perfectly neutral and no reason reason they should not follow them so long as they did it in moderation, and if someone should interfere with me in those things I should assert my Christian liberty, and perhaps do it more than I would have otherwise.

McIntire being editor of the paper and having an increasing influence he came into constant controversy with these people, but he had a tremendous loyalty to everything he'd gotten at Westminster. Tremendously loylaty to the reformed faith, and tremendous loyalty to each individaul of the faculty.

Neher: He didn't have any official connection with Westminster at this time, did he?

No, merely an alumnus, but he was an alumnus of the seminary. He had this great loyalty to them and this loyalty was wrecked by their action, not his. He did not try at that time in any way to dictate to the seminary. It was when individuals in the seminary began attacking what fudamentalists considered the separated life, and when they began attacking premillennialism or at least when he considered they were premillennialism, that they began to develop the attitude in the student body there that they had developed toward Machen the year before.

When certain members of the faculty came under attack, Dr. Machen had a tremendous loyalty to the members of his faculty.