

think through all the things he was doing. Therefore he had to make snap decisions.

The other thing was that he had a quick mind which could often immediately see the answer to a problem. I heard. One man told me in connection with the ACCC that the committee meets and we discuss things for a day. We have our views this way and that. And the next day McIntire gets there. These were people from different denominations and he said, McIntire gets there and we all get in line and march straight forward, in agreement.

He had a way of entering leadership. Time after time he would sit and there would be a problem. Should we do this or that? He would immediately see the answer. They would discuss it for an hour or two, pros and cons back and forth, and in the end they would come to the conclusion he had in the first place! That's a wonderful thing. But if you have that ability, and you have that experience a few times and you're trying ~~to~~ to do an awful lot of things, it's very easy to get the feeling, why waste all that time arguing and discussing, why not say in the first place what to do and go ahead and do it?

The man who ~~told me he had~~ praised to me the way in which his coming would ~~gl~~ galvanize ~~people~~ people so they would move forward and accomplish things, I quoted that to one of his closest friends, and he said, ~~But~~ *Oh, he is* very critical of Dr. McIntire, I'm not sure how much longer he's going to work with him.

I think on the ~~one~~ hand he admired it and on the other there is that feeling, he's making us do what he wants to do. Of course that would not be too bad if he'd always reach the right answer! But if he reaches the right answer 3 times out of 4 and if once out of 4 he makes a wrong decision, and if he's takes on so many things that he doesn't have time to think them through right, there will be a good many times when he'll insist on the wrong approach. So that was an important factor, I think, in changing him.

Another was the way he was attacked by those people and later on through the years he stood for the truth against modernists. The modernists would attack him. He would come to get something of a complex--Well, they are attacking the truth and we must stand strongly for it, and he stood on so many issues that he got a name among Christians as always fighting about something. Of course you get a name like that and it spreads; it becomes greater.

It affects certain people, and turns them into a prejudice against you, and then you in turn can be pushed into the attitude of thinking that anyone who attacks anything you stand for is attacking the central features of the gospel.

To me my whole feeling about the whole thing is one of great sadness. To think of all the wonderful things he started, and the fine Christian people he got together who differed on many points and yet he got them to work together for a great cause. The many fine things he started and the fine effectiveness he has had in some ways of holding back the force of modernism and unbelief and its