

If I had come under attack I think he would have strongly supported me. I was not under attack in any way, at least not openly. But these men were under attack somewhat in the Beacon, somewhat in other ways and Dr. Machen came strongly to their defense.

They would criticize McIntire very strongly when they were talking together. I remember Ed Rian saying, they thought they might bring charges against two men, one of them being McIntire because he would not print the long statement that R.B. Kuiper wanted printed in the Beacon. I remember Rian saying gleefully, 'We'll have both of our leading opponents under charges.'

Well, of course I wasn't saying much, but I didn't like that attitude of Rian's. Rian now has gone completely over. He is the assistant to the president of Princeton Seminary in recent years! Gone completely back. He went extreme this way, and then went completely to the other.

But they were criticizing Carl McIntire to the extent that his brother who was a second year student in the seminary told me later, I just feel the students looking at me with that feeling of detestation because I was the brother of Carl McIntire. As I say, Carl shared none of that feeling towards them at the start. In fact I think it was a long time before he came to feel at all that way.

An interesting incident of the loyalty he had for them was in 1937 (of course we founded Faith), and it was 1950 thirteen years later when we had the second meeting of the ICC in Geneva and I was asked to speak on Archaeology at the Geneva meeting, and they asked R. B. Kuiper to speak on the atonement. Kuiper went to the meeting determined to oppose McIntire in every possible way. I was not then on the executive committee, but in the executive committee he brought up matter after matter wanting to change the constitution, wanting to change things around.

They couldn't please him. He just wanted to knock it, to destroy it. Stonehouse's attitude was entirely different, but that's what he wanted to do there, and yet when McIntire introduced him he spoke about this great theologian. Oh, he praised him to the skies, whereas when I spoke he said Dr. MacRae will speak on archaeology! Maybe he thought they'd all know who I was. I don't know. He didn't realize how he'd barely mentioned me, while he'd given all that to R. B. Kuiper then.

But I mean it showed his loyalty still! But they developed a tremendous detestation of him because he was interfering with their interpretation that the new church would be exactly what they wanted it to be right straight down the line. He was one of the biggest obstacles in the way of that.

I wasn't thinking so much of this now. I was thinking of the general events, as how that would affect him over a period of time.

Another instance of his loyalty to them. When I resigned from Westminster. I showed him my statement. He made a couple of