

Neher: So whatever he held at anytime you can make it appear that it was the cause of his error.

AAM: Exactly, yes. There is a lot of that attitude in the leadership of Westminster. And there is a certain amount, I don't know how much because I don't have as much contact with them of that in the leadership of Dallas. Two different views. I think that attitude is wrong whoever has it. I think we should stand on what is clear and what is clear includes the great Reformed doctrines. I think the reason some people are against the Reformed doctrine, or get terribly excited, is usually because they have not been correctly explained. And because they have been presented in a way that sounds hyper-Calvinist.

When I was first at Westminster, about our 3rd or 4th year, <sup>the</sup> ~~we~~ <sup>faculty received</sup> got a letter from <sup>a pastor asking</sup> someone: Can I support this seminary; I understand you believe in Limited Atonement. What is your belief on this matter? Here was this faculty (8 of us) and the students thought we were absolutely united on everything. We turned to R. P. Kuiper as the man in theology. He worked over a statement and we spent 3 or 4 <sup>each of several</sup> different hours in faculty meetings working over a statement when he sent them and which thoroughly satisfied them. But in the statement he very positively said, We believe that the <sup>atonement is</sup> sufficient for all, but efficient for the elect. Who could believe anything else? Who could believe that it is efficient for people who don't believe in Christ. If it is sufficient for all, why on earth should it be called limited? It's a very bad, misleading term. The only reason I can see it was ever originated was in order to make an acrostic. I was much interested to see that Hodges' Theology--you look up the five points of Calvinism in the Index, and there's no such thing! But there's the Five Points of Arminianism.