

I don't know how much any of the others had to do with it, whether they did -- answered two or three questions like I did or whether they did a lot of work. Whether some of them were people who really contributed a great deal. I have no idea. Then when they asked him if he would get a group of people, he asked me if I would participate. I agreed to do it.

When the Pilgrim Bible came out there was an article in the Presbyterian Guardian written by a man who was a graduate of Westminster Seminary in its earliest days who I think was director of its buildings and grounds, or something like that, at the time. He wrote an article reviewing the Pilgrim Bible in which he began substantially like this: Faith Seminary is supposed to be a Presbyterian school. Dr. MacRae is President of Faith Seminary. Dr. MacRae is one of the editors of the Pilgrim Bible. The Pilgrim Bible is actually more dispensational than the Scofield Bible because on the notes on Daniel such and such it says such and such, and he picks out two lines which taken completely out of context could give an idea on some minor point and then he went on showing how terrible Dr. MacRae and Faith Seminary were. That's the type of reasoning you find in this <sup>pamphlet</sup> thing here. I don't usually bother to even answer itm such stuff.

People are human, even saved people have got their weaknesses. I think the Lord wants us not to answer in kind.

Neher: I'm wondering if we might have anything more to say about -- we've concentrated mainly on the fact of the controversy and the damage it does when it's done in a way that is vitriolic.

AAM: When I left Westminster, the feeling I had there was that they had 1000 points they considered to be the points of what they might call Calvinism or Covenant Theology or whatever name they might give it. And that everyone one of these points to them was just as important as every other point. And if you differed on any