

About the second or third year I was at Princeton ~~in~~ I began to hear some of fellows from California speaking about the fact that almost as soon as they came to seminary they were others were talking to them about the "limited atonement" and there was much argument about it. Dr. Van Til seemed to be more or less the center of this influence. He himself said once in my hearing that he was being persecuted by the Arminians, meaning that people who questioned the limited atonement were being arguing with him. One time a letter was received from the pastor of the chapel where the memorial service Oakmont Chapel. This pastor wrote, saying that people were criticizing the seminary, saying that it taught limited atonement. Would they please tell what they really taught on this ~~xxx~~ matter. The faculty This was three or four years later, after Dr. Kuyper had returned to the faculty after three years as president of Calvin College. Dr. Kuyper R. B. Kuyper was asked to write a statement about this. ~~xxx~~ The faculty discussed the matter for several sessions, and finally there was agreement on the wording of a letter to send. The letter gave the definition that Kuyper presented as the proper definition of what was believed, that the atonement was sufficient for all but efficient for the elect." (where begin quote?)

It always seemed to me that the term, "limited atonement" originally chosen in order to make an acrostic for the word ~~XXX XXXXX~~ TULIP, was really a very poor definition of what is meant. Certainly if one believes in the sovereignty of God, who has determined all things in advance, and if one believes that Jesus died as a substitute (nc) *fortherly* (?) for all(?) for all, of course only efficient for those efficient only who actually believe.

As the years went by I felt more and more that there was a retreat, or a change from the attitude that had been characteristic of Dr. Wilson and Dr. Machen. This did not apply to tr. Machen's attitude, but to the general attitude of the seminary. Dr. Machen was extre-ely active in the ecclesiastical sphere, trying to oppose modernism. He started the Independent Board as a strong stand against modernism. This led to a split in the seminary which should describe some time but not at this moment. The Dr. Machen was ready to work with those who truly believed the Gospel, and to put his