

good to invite. I think 5 months later we were having a meeting of the faculty and I asked, Did you receive an invitation to this meeting in October? No, they said, never heard of it! I thought, well, the next slip that was sent out, somebody blackballed them. But I was wrong; eventually every one of them received invitations. Six of us were present at the meeting.

But the next list I received contained all the names of all those people had sent in for that first mailing, and additional ones, and they said please mark them, and this time they said, Please give us your reasons for or against. I think there were about 4 such lists sent out. They said, Be sure we do not want to invite anybody who does not believe in inerrancy. They said, This is not a meeting for confrontation. They said, Our purpose now is to get people who believe in inerrancy to agree on how it should be presented. I thought that a very good idea. They desire to have confrontation, to have discussion but first to get an ~~xxxxxx~~ agreement on how it should be presented. That was the purpose of the meeting. The others from the seminary had to be by 1:30 on Thursday afternoon for the first meeting. I had to be there by 9 a.m. and did not want to start at midnight, so I went the previous afternoon.

At the first meeting -- the council met, which had met two days before it -- it was explained the council had sat down and made ~~aa~~ a list of things they ~~xx~~ thought, should be in the statement. Then they had asked one member of the council to write up something that would cover these. He said, I can't do it in three sentences. They said, Take what is necessary. He wrote three or four pages. Then they asked J. I. Packer, author of Knowing God, to take this statement and go over it and revise