

from a man who was the pastor of Grace Chapel in Upper Darby. He said that he had heard that the seminary taught limited atonement and he wondered whether this cut the root of evangelism. What did we mean by it? etc. (I forget the exact wording of the letter.)

At that time faculty meetings were held every Saturday morning, after the two classes that met at eight and nine. Faculty meeting would start at ten and generally end by noon or one o'clock, though sometimes we would go to lunch and return to continue the ~~meeting~~ meeting. This letter was discussed at length in three or four successive faculty meetings. In the end Dr. R. B. Kuiper wrote the statement that was sent to the pastor. In it he stated that "the atonement is sufficient for all but efficient for the elect." The more I thought of it the more I realized that if the atonement is sufficient for all, it is then our duty as Christians to bring the knowledge of God's offer of salvation to as many people as possible even though we understand fully that God knows just how many will receive Christ. Surely it is our duty to spread the Word rather than to argue about limited atonement. Furthermore, it seemed to me that if we believe that the atonement is actually a substitution, bearing our place on the cross, then it simply follows logically that the sins that Christ bears on the cross are the sins of those who will ultimately believe on Christ and be saved. All this seems so clear and simple that the only reason I can see for making a phrase "limited atonement" is in order to make an acrostic to fill out the description of the five positions at which the Council of Dordt answered the five points of Arminianism. Surely there is nothing "limited" about the atonement if it is sufficient for all. It is limited only in the sense in which everything on earth is limited because God has foreordained all that comes to pass, though without interfering ~~with~~ with the contingency of second causes, as the Westminster Confession puts it. There were certain faculty members, I never heard for sure who, but I had the general feeling that Dr. Van Til was at the heart of it, who made this an object of argument and discussion among the students from the time they arrived. I remember hearing Dr. Van Til say at one time that he "was being persecuted by the Arminians."