

was impartial. They didn't enter into that. Dr. Machen said in his book, Christianity and Liberalism, he thought that pre-millennialism was wrong, He said, I don't say that I would follow Dr. Warfield in thinking that before Christ comes back every man, woman, and child on earth will be a Christian. But, he said, I ~~x~~ certainly would feel that the Holy Spirit <sup>can</sup> ~~would~~ have far greater effectiveness in the conversion of the world than has yet been displayed." Which was certainly a post-millennial approach. I would say Machen was a mild post-millennialist which is the exact opposite of an amillennialist. Yet the amillennialists often talk as if he were an amillennialist!

When the controversy got exciting and they'd have meetings of the presbytery of New Brunswick, half the Princeton faculty would go there and stand strongly on the conservative side, and about a third would go and strongly take the side opposed to Dr. Machen, and Dr. Loetcher would go and play golf! He said his study of church history made him irenic! Well, I think there is an aspect there that is correct. I used to get terribly upset when the modernists seemed to be winning, and I think that the Lord wants us to do our best and then in the end to realize that He controls and not get too upset when the battle goes the other way. Incidentally we sometimes hear people talk as if logically a Calvinist should be a post-millennialist but if Calvinism means God has elected who is going to be saved, why should He elect a few ~~x~~ in one generation, a little more in the next, a little more in the next, and so on until he elects the whole world? Why not do it all in reverse order or mixed up order or in any way He chose? I see no correlation whatever. I certainly don't