

He studied the whole subject matter of it. He was not a trained theologian but he learned as much as he could. He put two months of solid work preparing the background for this course. Not only did he attend the course but in so doing he had a chance to become acquainted with the students, and so when we had the trial, he had six students carefully picked out of the class after he had seen them day after day and seen their reactions to the course. He had them carefully picked to come forward and testify about the course.

Our lawyer kept saying, If we could get some students to testify what the course has done to them, for our side. Naturally the University refused to give us the list of students who were taking the course. If we could have had somebody take it and gotten just as many who would have been ready to testify on our side. Or if we had had a little more time to hunt, we could probably have found some people who had taken the course in previous years. One girl came forward and let us know she had taken the course three years ago. She felt it was very detrimental to the Christian faith. But we had one witness of that type as against their six or seven, and they were thoroughly protected.

Not only that, as far as tipping our hand, we were going to bring witnesses from the East. When I got out there for the meeting on June 6 I was informed that the University was bringing G. Ernest Wright, Harvard Prof. of Divinity at Harvard U. They were also bringing Prof. Michaelson, head of the department of religion in the U. of Calif. They were having the Provost of the U. of Washington for the trial to testify. They had affidavits from the Seattle Council of Churches, and they had representatives from the R.C. Diocese of that area, from the Episcopal diocese, from the ACLU, they had a number of organizations which were giving support and they were very thoroughly prepared.

I mentioned that we had a deposition from Dr. Fowler. They got our two BP ministers to give a deposition. So they had them sit and asked them as many questions as they wanted. These depositions were not an actual part of the trial but they could bring up anything in them they chose to. When they had one of these ministers there, they asked him: Do you know anything about Prof. J. G. Alders. He said, No, I'm not familiar with the name. They said, He was prof. at the Free U. in Amsterdam. They said, Are you familiar with the Free U. in Amsterdam which was founded by A. Kuyper, a noted defender of the faith who led a great movement out from the State Church in Holland about 100 yrs. ago and established a large church to stand against the modernism that was coming in there. A. Kuyper became prime minister of the Netherlands and was able to found a Free U. which was to be a solidly Christian U. This man was the prof. of OT in the Free U. Our minister had never heard of Dr. Alders. ~~xxx~~ If the minister was a little older I'm sure he would have heard of Dr. Alders. Because in 1952, Dr. McIntire, Dr. Alders and I spoke in various churches in Scotland. Dr. Alders was a great defender of the faith, a strong supporter of ICCO. The young minister did not know that fact. I don't think the others knew that particular fact either or they would have borne down even more heavily on ~~xxx~~ him if they had on the testimony re Dr. Alders.

They said, This is who Dr. Alders is. Now what do you think of this statement in his book? So our young minister had the book put in front of him with which he was unfamiliar called An Introduction to the Pentateuch. J. G. Alders trans. it into Eng. and ~~xxxx~~ pub. by the Intervarsity Printing of Great Britain. They pointed to a certain