

of all, he is not Lord at all! He was full of pious terminology, but the main import of his teaching was definitely anti-Christian. In fact, he tried to change the college too fast and it <sup>provoked</sup> promoted reaction against him. So after he'd been there two years, at the end of my first year, he resigned. Then for my next 2 years there we had the dean who was a good Christian man, who was acting president. He was kind of up in the air philosophically.

My father used to love his Bible class. He had some rather involved complicated things that as far as I knew were strictly Christian ~~Christiana~~ but were not Christian in the simple sense of the word; they were rather involved. But he was a fine man. He was for two years. Then they got a new president who had been assistant professor of church history in Princeton Seminary. Then he'd been professor of church history in the Presbyterian Seminary in San Francisco--- near San Francisco, and so I think they assumed that he was thoroughly Christian. He came indefinitely determined to make it an effective modern college that would not be tied to old-fashioned ideas. I think that what Evans tried to do and failed because he went too fast, this man went a little slower. And also things had gone further by the time he got there. He was able to succeed. He was president 15 or 20 years. I don't know. I had no use whatever for him. Evans \* thought, it was interesting, my first year I had courses in Bible from Evans. He would talk about a freshman's idea of Jesus-- and how interesting to read the papers and see a freshman's idea of Jesus! I thought it was more important to find what a freshman ought to think about Jesus. So subjective. I didn't have much use for his teaching. He would refer to some conservative concept, and he'd say, Of course I know how you people are out here on the Pacific coast. As if we were a little queer out on the Pacific coast with our antiquated ideas, you know!