

much upset about it. You were there, you heard it. He said it was all on tape. It might be worth listening to to see what kind of questions they asked. My guess would be that the things their people have to know to join his church, Rich Nichol and Ward would have known pretty well, and that they would have known a lot of things that were pretty vital, perhaps not immediately but over the course of their ministry. So it's my feeling, it's the way they presented it rather than what they knew. There's also this about it, that when these people were examining examined for entrance into the church they had been before the same group they know the people. But you take someone just out of seminary and you bring him in to stand before an ordaining council of a lot of ministers and he's apt to be nervous, and forget things he would know. And I also mentioned to him that when I was teaching in Westminster and we were in the old Presbyterian church and they had a man who was chairman of the candidates committee who believed thoroughly orthodox but generally voted with the modernists, and didn't see any sense in our making a fuss about these things. I was very anxious that our graduates should make a good impression and some of our very best students whom I'd had in OTI the first year and given them a thorough understanding of why we don't accept the Apocrypha, etc., would be asked questions and gave answers that showed they'd completely forgotten what I'd given them two years before. And I didn't want to say anything because I wanted our students to make a good impression. He seemed to think the council might not have ordained those fellows except that they didn't want to irritate him, and out of deference to him they ordained him! Well, if they did, what does the ordination mean? If that's why they