

So you have a distinction. You have a similarity and the people who say they are absolutely identical, and the people who say no no they are absolutely separate and God has two different purposes. They are both wrong. But it's very foolish to make a division over it that's going to split the Body of Christ. So I think that both are at fault in that point.

The spirit that is shown in <sup>booklet here</sup> ~~this thing I think~~ is terrible. I think the spirit and type of argumentation shown in that booklet is terrible, but it is a thing I've come into contact with frequently. One thing I wanted to point out to Steve is that this is written by a graduate of Westminster, but I don't think you'd find any professor at Westminster writing anything like that. They might talk like that and might give a teaching that might arouse that kind of an attitude in their students, but I think that everyone (at least everyone I've known of) would have sense enough never to write anything like that.

Neher: I haven't read this pamphlet. Is the main thrust of it that they are absolutely identical? That there is no distinction whatever?

AAM: No, the main thrust is to say how terrible dispensationists are to say that God has one purpose for the church and another for Israel, and how terrible dispensationalists are because they are not as thorough Calvinists as he thinks they should be, and the founder of dispensationism is Darby and Darby was a thoroughgoing Calvinist when he began, and therefore this shows how this will take you away from Calvinism. You can see that if Darby had been Arminian when he began, he would say this shows how the origin of dispensationalism is Arminian. It's typical of the type of argument!