

are so close. I've found many cases where someone made a statement that would have utterly shocked people with whom I'd been associated. I'd suggest a statement which completely removed any basis that would shock, and they would accept it. I found that to a great extent it's a matter of terminology or of reading into people's statements implications which they don't really mean. And which if they are confronted with them and they are forced to them, they might feel, Well, I said that. I'll stick by it. Or they might say, I made a mistake. But there is a division there that I think is extremely unfortunate. I never really saw the animus and the feeling until it came to just about that last year.

I did not intend to spend as much time on that here. I was going to mention that when I was walking with John Murray that he expressed the fear that we would not get so many of these fine students. I cannot help feeling that Dr. Barnhouse, while some of his manouvers I thought were unfortunate, I can't help feeling that as a basis of strategy that there was a lot of truth in his attitude. Here was a church of 2 million people. Of which 30 years before-- my guess is that 30 years before there were not more than 4 or 5% of the ministers who were not thoroughgoing Christians. At that time there might have been 30% who were not. But the overwhelming majority of them were earnest Christians, wanting to advance the gospel. But the boards and agencies had a number of men in them who had been greatly affected by modernism, and the ministers were getting this progaganda from them in which there were subtle things that would undermine the faith. We were then getting some of the ablest fellows in the Presbyterian church U.S.A. and they were graduating and proving themselves to be so much superior to graduates of other seminaries that despite the efforts of the