

The whole committee was pretty well agreed. But it's interesting. There were a few points they were sticklers on. Like the the difference between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven. Mason is one of the strongest dispensationalists in the country. Mason had made a study and he was quite convinced that the kingdom of God and kingdom of heaven were identical, and he's one of the leading dispensationalists in the country. So to make that one of the terrible things of dispensationalism, it doesn't seem to me it's a terrible thing one way or the other. It's seems to me it's a mater for careful exegesis and study. They certainly overlap tremendously. Are they absolutely identical? Is there a certain difference? That's a matter for exegetical study.

But on the committee there was nearly half the committee wanted to eliminate any dis inction between them, but there was a slight majority -- Mason was very definitely in favor of eliminating that, but there was a slight majority that wanted to keep it. Then Mason said, Well, it's a Scofieldism! We should keep it. It's a Scofieldism! After all we all had in mind this wasn't our Bible. This was Scofield's Reference Bible, and we were revising it to make it continue to do the good work it has done and we were not necessarily changing things unless we were definitely convinced they were wrong. The sharp divisions that might occur were in my opinion on comparatively minor points at that. Which I don't see how they affect Chrsitian truth at all.

The thing is you get two professors in two insitutions, one of them speaks this way, and the other speaks this way, and they are almost together. Then their students diverge. Then you get their students that are poles apart, and pointing to these professors as the great authorities on that, and the professors