

a movement or would utterly ignore it. While I liked the general thrust of the paper, and felt that indeed those who truly believe in Christ ought to stand together for inerrancy, and that if we do not have that other issues there is no solid ground really for discussion of other issues, yet I was rather upset, fearing that such a statement would simply cause people on all sides of these many issues to look on the askance at the proposal, and that it would accomplish nothing. I thought it was one of the most important issues that could possible address be addressed and I would like to see a great deal accomplished on it, and therefore felt that great harm would be done if this was were distributed.

I immediately wrote to Dr. Grimstead I don't remember when I ;wrote him ~~except~~ accepting the membership on the advisro ADvisory Committee, but I ;know that the day I received this statement I phoned him and mentioned to him that I thought it could do great harm if this statement were distributed in the form that it then had. He said that this was not true, that actually people who rarely stood together were now standing together on this great issue. He named the ~~xxx~~ presidents of ~~Bibliotheca~~ Dallas and Westminster<sup>e</sup> seminaries, which ordinarily did not stand together on anything, but were going to stand together on inerrancy. I forget whom else he mentioned, and I didn't feel I had made any headway with him.

I hated to see something that was starting a move for so vital an issue as this die a quick death// and therefore phoned Dr. Boice whose name was listed, I believe, as president, of the new o-rganization. This was the first time I ~~had~~ had had any direct contact with Dr. ~~Dr.~~ Boice, and I hesitated about calling him. However, I got him on the phone and when I mentioned my being invited to be an advisory member of the conference it is my -impression, I believe, if I recall correctly, that he said something that gave me the impresdion that it he was the one who had suggested that I be thus invited. My memory might be at fault on this point. I pointed out to him the great danger of the paper as I saw it, and he said that the purpose of it was simply to point out the very great importance of biblical inerrancy to which all others are subordinate. I could agree with him on this, but it did seem to me that the paper went far beyond that and that it would not that it would greatly retard