

PL The purpose of this discussion is for the sake of the long-range implications of the affair of Norman Shepherd for Westminster Seminary. Today we have with us Mr. Jim Payton, Mr. Jack Sawyer and Pete Lillback (myself). Dr. VanTil has consented that this discussion be tape-recorded. We are going to have it transcribed. And he is going to give his permission once its use once he is able to read it and rework it. We are very grateful today for this opportunity, and we ask that the Lord might bless this endeavor for His glory.

PL Dr. VanTil let me ask you, first of all, what do you feel has happened at Westminster that would allow someone like Norman Shepherd to get to the state that he is in at the present? In other words, is it proper that he be dismissed? or, how do you feel about it in general?

SVT Maybe I should go for a little background. See, it was the custom, for a long time back, that, the last time that I was, that one was the chairman of the faculty, he should give the Commencement Address. This was, in the back of Machen Hall. Which I did at the time. I do not recall what I said exactly. I have it on record. But I do know that Mr. Clowney said, right afterwards, "I knew Dr. VanTil would say something polemical. So I thought I would give something more practical." Well, I think that in itself is a sad thing. Because the polemical is the practical. Because the Liberals were fighting for their life to stay in, when they had no right. Christ said, "Ye must strike hard. And the world will hate you." But you see, that has been the difficulty.

PL Well, let me intrude for a second. Do you feel that Norman Shepherd is attempting, in what he is often accused of being polemical, is simply carrying forth the practical implications of the Reformed faith then?

SVT Yes. But if you will just allow me one more couple of minutes background.

PL Yes sir.

SVT At another time when Ed was giving the Commencement Address, I wrote him a letter. And asked him, I says, "This is not adequate! Cause at that time is when young men are going out to preach the sovereign electing grace of God as life and death. And you gave only a few minutes to anything reproaching [sic--approaching] that." He called me into his office, and he said, "I was pretty angry about it. But you were right, I didn't." Now he can do that, he knows. But you see, Evangelicalism is the main. Of course, he was to Berlin. And he goes through the IVF (Inter-Varsity Fellowship). And he's in with Berlin. That was the main ...

PL What was the Berlin situation?

SVT Yeah, now ...

PL Do you recall?

SVT I don't know.

PL It was an Evangelical meeting?

CF And Schaeffer was there too, of course.

(At this juncture a lunchbreak was taken.)

PL And thus far Dr. VanTil has begun to record tous, before he answers directly the question about the Norman Shepherd affair at Westminster, to rehearse what he calls a little bit of the background. And so far he has told us about the graduation address and also Dr. Clowney's attendance at the Evangelical meeting in Berlin, as background items. And now he is going to continue with his background information that he would like to share with us.

CVT If you were to look in the Westminster Library for Norman Shepherd's Master's thesis, you would find a masterful work. He knows, as Dr. Clowney said, he knows the Dutch, he knows Herman Bavinck, he knows the men of there. And part of the difficulty was that he was speaking about things that others did not understand. In the nature of the case, how could a PCA man even have heard of Bavinck? Or of the solidity with which that man has developed the concept of the teaching of Scripture with respect to Justification by faith alone. Now when you talk about Justification by faith alone, seemingly by the sound of words, it might seem as though James were teaching otherwise. But he is not. Machen said he is not. Because, what is, if you take the Heidelberg Catechism. How may I know what my sins and miseries are? How may I be delivered from them? That is, Jesus Christ my Lord. And then, How may I express my gratitude? And then there is a restatement and detailed analysis of the Ten Commandments. That's thanksgiving. That's all it is. Our prayers are thanksgiving to God that we're here. That we are redeemed by the blood of Jesus.

And Machen was, of course, anxious to have that gospel preached or taught to young men. But after a few years at 1528 Pine Street, some of the graduates wanted to go out to the foreign mission field. And they had to be examined by a Missions secretary. And apparently that was J. Ross Stevenson. No, not him, but Robert E. Speer. I heard Robert E. Speer in a large Trenton church, say about this, "How sad a day it is when our board, that is, our Board of Foreign Missions of the USA Presbyterian Church in America, was compelled, or urged, compelled, finally to dismiss that godly, gifted woman Pearl S. Buck." She was the author of The Good Earth. But that's not now the point. "Did not our Lord Jesus say we must feed the poor." But he forgot to say, or didn't desire to say, what Matt. 26 says, "Unless you give it in My name. There are those who do and do not. I shall say I know you not. They shall be cast out in everlasting darkness, where the fire is not quenched." Now over and over again was

deliberately the point of comparison that is all important. That it is for MY NAME. That it is for My name because I died for them, I rose again, I ascended, I make intercession, I am coming again to judge the living and the dead. And I told My Twelve, My Eleven disciples, "Go forth, make disciples. That is, teaching them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Baptizing them. Teaching them to do My commandments. Well, that is, whatever I say is / / Well, God created man.

PL So, Dr. VanTil, what you are telling us is that Dr. Machen was trying to carry over the historic Reformed faith as was seen in the Heidelberg Catechism, as well as the Westminster Confession of Faith.

CVT That's it exactly. The Reformed faith, standards of the Reformed churches of the Netherlands. Like the Belgic Confession, the Five Articles against the Remonstrants, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Shorter and Longer Catechism, and our Confession of Faith. All of them without exception would he say because...Because he would lecture for the Christian Day Schools.

PL Well, let me ask you a further question related to that. Do you think that Westminster was securely established on the historic Reformed faith?

VT Yes.

PL And then, you mentioned Dr. Clowney's recent movements towards Evangelicalism. Thus do you feel that Evangelicalism is a significant departure from the historic position that Westminster was founded upon?

CVT From the beginning, in 1929, Robert Dick Wilson, O. T. Allis, and J. Gresham Machen, and Ned B. Stonehouse, and John Murrays. And one year after that Rienk Bouke Kuiper, who taught practical theology. And especially John Murray. You see, he was, Machen was living on the 12th-story // Account of Dr. VanTil and trains// He said Machen " Van . . . it's not been easy to learn from younger men." Well, he learned from John Murray, because he was there a lot. He learned from Ned. And Allan A. Macrae was there. But, and then when he died, there was no antibiotics. In the bitterness of the cold he must speak to Christ's little ones, you know. That is, those who were still left. And he would say, "Some men would say, 'We're with you Das. But you're going too fast. We're coming too.' They never did come." They said Machen was doing it hurry up, because he wanted honor. He didn't. Because he loved the Lord. And he talked about that blessed Book.

PL Well, let me ask you specifically then--Do you feel that with Machen's deep commitment to the historic Reformed faith, that Westminster has then really, under the leadership of Dr. Clowney, departed from the direction of the founder's?

CVT Yes. The point is that Machen insisted that John Murray must come. And that he was the one. Because he knew the Scottish tradition. And of course, Ned B., R. B., and I knew the historic background. But he must...

PL You mean the historic Dutch Background or Continental background?

CVT Well, you call it that. But that sounds like beer. [Laughter]

But John, you've got to come. Well, you see, Caspar Wistar said and wrote that J. Gresham was the grwatest English-speaking theologian of the twentieth-century. //Account of Trenton drunk who Machen cared for; Monsma; Gray suits; Languages; Sqilder; Genesis//

PL Dr. VanTil, let me help us focus our discussion a little bit more, if I can. What I was aiming at, a little bit more toward our question. I would like you to address the point of why John Murray specifically was called. Do you think it was Machen's interest in founding Westminster, to unite at Westminster the two distinct Reformed traditions? That is, that American Presbyterianism might have a true Continental, as well as a true Presbyterian form? Do you think that's correct to say?

CVT That is correct. But you see, Machen and Caspar Wistar were close personal friends. And I had written under C.W. "The Will in its Theological Relations." And whether he said that or not, I don't know. //An account of why VanTil came to Princeton; his experience in learning German and French//

PL Let's keep on pursuing the specific point of our discussion. I was interested in the beginning, when you were speaking directly concerning the transition from Dr. Machen and Dr. Clowney's leadership at Westminster. Would you be willing to address the question--Do you think that the direction that Dr. Clowney has taken has been a direction that has not sought to faithfully maintain the Continental Reformed tradition, as you see it, and also the Scottish tradition of Murray? And moving more toward a broader Evangelical base? Do you think that is correct?

CVT That is correct. You see, the reason Machen didn't want a president, was because of J. Ross Stevenson. But we had to, to be able to give degrees. And for that reason the Seminary didn't enter into agreement with a Liberal minister's association. Which... because of its liberalism.... But with a so-called state or college. And then there were meetings to which our librarian went, for five years. //

I went to Faith Seminary where they had Gordon Clark speaking. "In the beginning was Logic and Logic was"-- but he didn't this time, steam it out. But he did say, "Oh, it says it right here, 'In Him we live and move and have our being.'" Which means of course, as / / he means identity. Ed was one of his students at Wheaton College.

PL Do you think that Clark's perspective has significantly affected Dr. Clowney?

CVT Yes I do.

PL Has that significantly affected the direction of Westminster and the way it goes?

CVT I think it has.

PL Has that affected the VanTil perspective at Westminster?

CVT Negatively.

PL Negatively?

CVT Yes.

PL In what way would you say that?

CVT Well, because, you see...somebody asked--"Where did that guy get that notion 'presupposition,' did VanTil invent it?" No; the idealist philosophers: Hegel, Bradley, Bosanquet, said we must presuppose the whole before you can talk about the parts. And that's why time...and see. The Greek philosophers 'thought thinking itself' *gnōses gnōsiōs*. Or ideas, truths. But no person. But then comes Christianity. That's the tri-personal. Not as Schaeffer says it "a personal." But the point being that I had studied that.

And he sent \_\_\_\_\_ out. And he sent Allis out, and I still wasn't willing to come. And he came out and we sat in the car and Ned B. said, "Case, if you can honestly say that there is anyone in the history of the Refor...Presbyterian USA churches that has adequately studied philosophy as a background for Apologetics?" Well, I couldn't. And then, when I did come . . . Well, let me go back. I had taught one year at Princeton. And at Spring Lake, where I had been, wired.... about ten days before the opening of the Seminary in the fall: "Would I come to teach Apologetics and so forth." I wired back--"I should be glad to come, that I couldn't do more than these courses that I had taught already." And then he wired back--"I hope you will be as enthusiastic about the teaching, as you have of ~~my~~ acceptance." Well, that was sarcasm. I went . . . Casper Wister . . . and this fellow, he was a Board member, he says, "Van, you're glad you're here, you know you have to begin. But you have to--you've taught systematic theology, You've taught and you've preached on the 10 Commandments; you did this. And we're glad. George didn't give them anything. So give the Middlers what you give the Juniors. And then when you see the President, be courteous to him. For the rest, ignore him." Well, I didn't have to be courteous, because he ignored me with a 1000 feet. But you see he was sarcastic. But he was a great [Interference]

and everybody else, except those that stayed, because they had to [Interference] and there was no reason under the sun why [Interference] and Vos. They were all ready to retire. And Robert Dick did. . . .

PL Okay. Let me ask another question here along these same lines. Would you say that in the United States today there is any school able or willing to do what the early Westminster wanted to do? That is, unite the historic Reformed traditions of the Continent and the American Presbyterian scene coming from Scotland. Do you think there is any school that is doing it since Westminster has seemed, at least to some extent, to depart from that direction?

CVT No, no way. Cause where would you? See, John Murray went to heaven. And Ned Stonehouse went to heaven. And I'm going to heaven. But what is Dave Clowney giving? Now look, this is private. Brett, he says, "VanTil, Clark, Schaeffer, they're all good people. But I just saw what Clark says, 'VanTil, oh no that's Schaeffer again, no that's Frame.' They talk about 'He is an idealist.'" Well, that's the one thing I fought against. To be an idealist and not a Christian. But forgive me. No, I wouldn't know where. Cause at Calvin they are now openly advocating Higher Criticism. One man was not allowed to come in because of that. They don't mention that. But by majority vote he was recommended. Well what of that and what's there now. I would still say, if they asked me, "Yes, come to Westminster. You've got good New Testament men, excellent Old Testament men." Murray was the key pin to it. So was Norman Shepherd. Of whom, when his mentor, when we had a dinner--"I leave my work in good hands." That's what Murray said. Now that doesn't prove it. But obviously the Board has exonerated him, and twice over. And then they start scratching the surface again.

PL Do you think, what has been the motivation specifically for moving against Norman Shepherd since he was exonerated. Do you think it has been specifically Dr. Clowney's intention to do this? or...

CVT No.

PL Has there been external pressures that have forced this?

CVT No, well you see. There are lots new PCA and they have taken over. The new forces are out of Egypt, the house. Well they are. Somebody said, "It was taken for granted OP." Well it never was! But the PCA are now the prevailing men on the Board. And there are others whom I know very well. But they say, "He isn't plain. He confuses." Well, students aren't confused. He just defuses their confusion. If anybody lectures plainly, simply, and directly, or preaches, it's Norman.

PL Well, so you would say that you, John Murray, and J. Gresham Machen would all stand behind Norman Shepherd's position?

CVT Well, that's pretty speculating about dead men. I mean, as far as I know them, I'd say yes, without hesitation.

PL But you would say you yourself are without hesitation.

CVT Oh, absolutely. Oh, I wrote a letter to the Board, I did. These men that went to Faith Sem..., not Faith... Covenant...

PL Palmer Robertson?

CVT Yeah, Palmer Robertson, would pick out famous outsiders. He'd quote... the man that wrote all of the commentaries...

PL Hendrickson?

CVT He says, "Well that's a mixture of Romanism and..." And then Meredith Kline, a good man, a brilliant man, says, "This has, apparently has a Kantian background. Well, I wrote the Board--They are not pagans. I mean that, he did more against the love of God. Well, nobody can know anything about anything. Well, that isn't the worst. Because then the Devil has got you. And that . . . //

PL So they're not Kantians.

CVT And then they didn't.... Fred Klooster said in a note, "I might have said it a little differently, because I was trained in the Heidelberg Catechism. But no, this is sound." They don't quote him you see.

PL They've overlooked those who do support Shepherd...

CVT That's what he did. And that's what he left. And now later on, let's not unite with that OPC because the heresy isn't over yet.

JP Dr. VanTil do you think that Mr. Shepherd's perspective is unwelcome at Seminary?

CVT Yeah, well that's why they put him out.

JP Do you think that it will continue to be unwelcome?

They have appointed, I think, two men of the Board. And they've appointed

PL Poythress. And then they had lots between the New Testament men, and the History man. And the lot fell in favor of the other. And then it's done for [?] But I would wait till that's all done. This is just the indukvout bluder, the Dutch would say, it's just passing upwards. A little wound, let's give the guy a nice chance. Well, we've shot him, but we like to look at the corpse a little while, you know. [Laughter] Well, they like the looks of him. And they got a nice picture.

JP Dr. VanTil do you feel that your own perspective is being pushed out of the way at Westminster?

CVT This man, what's his name?

JP Hurley

JS Hurley?

CVT No, no. A man that you quoted a while ago, that economist.

JS Vickers?

CVT Yeah. Joe Memmler and I were sitting in. And he came up to me--"Dr. VanTil there's absolutely nothing left of your whole position if...unless...if this man is retained. Nothing!" Joe said, "Nothing? But he changed." "I can't change my mind. There is nothing, nothing left of Dr. VanTil, nothing left." Kept on repeating it. He's not on the Board. But he's a very influential man.

PL One time you told me "There is a generation that is risen up that knows not VanTil," so you weren't joking when you said that. Do you feel very seriously...

CVT No, well, I said jokingly "a generation that knows not CVT." Because... No...//

But let me tell you this, for fun. I had been at McIntire's group, you know, and I talked to him. And so in the next Beacon, he says, "Of course nobody's apostate anymore, it's all New Evangelical. Not so, VanTil. He sent them a potent manuscript against the error. They didn't like it, they wouldn't publish it. They threw him out. And Harvie Conn teaches Liberation Theology, period." And Harvie was sitting at the...was an apple over there--"That's the forbidden fruit." "No, I was always taught it was the persimmons." "But I've got an invitation from the Vatican to give them a manuscript on Sol ? Extra Ecclesiae. And I can't do it because I'm writing two other manuscripts." Well, I said, "Harvie, tell the Pope your writing Liberal thes ? in theology." See they had more fun with/ / But I'd rather/ / and later on a bunch of guys/ / they we're going to reproduce it again.

And so I wrote Dr. McIntire. And he said, "Well, I'm sorry this happened. I know they went. But I'm coming to see it more your way. Thankfully, your disciple." Now believe it or not, that's what he said. So, well, that man has done something. But he was so wild. Of course "they" means the administration.

JP Do you think, Dr. VanTil that there is a common background to the opposition to your position and Norman Shepherd's, or to the neglect of your position and Norman Shepherd's?

CVT Well, I don't know that there is self-consciously. But of course, bot will be gone. I mean that way, negatively. He's right, who's going to do it. See, Hurley is certainly not going to do it. I mean, he's not a mean guy. But you see...

PL You say he advocates Schaeffer's position, is that right, do you think?

CVT Oh I know that because he said it. This way he said it--"Joh Frame have you done anything with VanTil's ethics?" "No," he says, "we haven't



got that far." But he had told us all about Schaeffer on this and that, The God Who is There, and Escape from Reason--Well, he knows them all.

JF Do you think, Dr VanTil, that the opposition or neglect of your views and the opposition to Mr. Shepherd are both based, both arise out of a broad Evangelicalism?

CVT Yes.

JF Do you think that movemant of Westminster seems to be in the direction of establishing closer ties with broad Evangelical Presbyterianism?

CVT Yes. Now let me give you a little of the historic background. J. Ross Stevenson had a course in history of philosophy. And there was a course in full-fledged English Bible. And there was another full-fledged man who gave practical theology. It was all practical. Which means theoretical is not... the doctrine are no longer practical. And then everything is counselling, counselling, Jay Adams, and counselling. Well, he's now out down south, but his books are legion. Well now, I think counselling is the "counselling unto life or death." Who are you counselling and who it is that is counselling--dead men, dying men. Christ Jesus came to the earth for sinners. You're about to die, do you accept Him? Or do you think God the Holy Spirit enables you to accept Him?" Well, an elder can do that. Well, I'm not meaning to run Jay down. But it's getting to madness. And the whole / / And that's not Reformed!

FL Well, let me see if I can highlight the contrast. Do you think that it would be fair to say that the direction that Westminster is moving in, which is broad American Evangelicalism, is striking directly against the historic Reformed faith of the sovereign grace of God?

CVT I would definitely, without implying any bad manners or morals. Nobody's thinking that anybody connected has any other ethic or is non-ethical. But after all it is the teuth that I am the Way and Truth. And when people doubt--What is truth?, Well, where is truth? It's trampled underground . . . The blessed book is buried underground. Where it will never be discovered except for the mercy of God of some decent donkey that will dig them up.

VP Dr. VanTil do you think that the current development at Westminster is really a departure from what Westminster was founded to do?

CVT I definitely do.

JF Do you view Westminster now as a place where that historic Reformed faith in all its richness is not now communicated faithfully?

CVT That's right. But I'm hoping and praying there will be a revival of the Reformed faith according to B.B. Warfield, Gerhardus Vos, C.W. Hodge, J. Gresham Machen, John Murray and Norman Shepherd.

FL Would you say John Calvin also?

CVT John Calvin, John Murray and Norman Shep-- not John Wesley! [Laughter]

JP Dr. VanTil, if this were not to take place at Westminster, and it does not appear to be likely, would you be in favor of seeing another institution arise with the purpose of proclaiming the historic Reformed faith?

CVT Well, there is of course Mid-America, that's Christian Reformed. So I couldn't be in favor of that. Because, not that I/ / Somebody wrote me-- "An option." That's what it is, an option out of Egypt. But I don't know how it could be done. I mean, you may say it's practical. But I don't...you can have one man on a log. And maybe there isn't. Maybe in ten years there will be a turn.

JP Dr. VanTil you see a need for an institution to train men to embrace the historic Reformed faith and to proclaim it to the people of God?

CVT Yes, well, I'm still hoping that will be Westminster Seminary. That there will be a revival of the Reformed faith, another John Murray, another J. Gresham Machen. Another Robert Dick [Interference] ...he's been bad-mouthed so much and we have a good Old Testament man, I don't think there is any doubt about his loyalty to the Reformed faith. And Dick Gaffin does marvellously . . . has Vos, you know.

JP A lot of people have talked about the need for another institution... Interference Perhaps another institution under ecclesiastical, under careful ecclesiastical oversight. That would explicitly be committed to the faith of the Reformed confessions.

CVT No, not the OPC. See, Arthur Kuschke's doing all that he possibly can. You see, he was on a committee and he wouldn't want Norman to be in it, you see. Then you're subject to whatever whirlywind any church may take. It should be that Church of Jesus Christ, which has been the Seminary. They never claimed that they were just an independent university. But they are teaching the Word: Hebrew, Greek and.... No, I don't think that/ / Well, maybe it's pessimistic. But there were 7000 who didn't bow the knee. But a few million now, I hope. Dutchman, and German and ... [Laughter]

JS And a couple of Americans.

PL Dr. VanTil, let me put it this way. If Westminster settles definitely against the perspective of the Heidelberg Catechism, as has been, as you have said, expounded by Norman Shepherd and yourself through the years. Do you feel that it would not be wise, at least to start a new study center where this viewpoint could at least get full support? And the perspective of VanTil historically might once again get full support?

CVT Well, I think Norman is going to have some students in his house. I mean

that's/ / You see there are quite a few students that are aroused about this. But say what you want about--Clowney said definitely it was because of doctrinal. Well, for the welfare or for the benefit of the Church, that's why the Roman Catholic Church burned some heretics. I mean, that's purely arbitrary. But then you see, when things do go wrong. Well, it won't go that far back again. But certainly that's the idea. Of course then it becomes a tradition. Instead of the Word, the living Word and the only living Word: Christ and Him crucified.

PL Well, let me come very directly to the point. I'll be completely candid with you. The three of us are deeply concerned in organizing a new school. I'm sure you've felt that already.

CVI No, I haven't heard.

PL Okay. And the reason that we want to do it is 1) because of our deep respect for the Reformed faith; 2) because we feel that that faith is no longer clearly articulated at Westminster, and primarily we feel that the VanTillian perspective is no longer taught clearly or powerfully. And it is not our intention to be opponents of Westminster. But it is our desire to aim at the true historic Continental faith. Would you be willing to support us in that endeavor, from a personal standpoint?

VT I would give you all the books you want. Well, I mean my own and for students. But I can't very well officially connect myself.

PL Well, would you give us permission to name our study center or school the VanTil Seminary, in your honor?

CVI No, I would say the Norman Shepherd School. Well, that's the live issue.

PL But see, what we're talking about is not just a defense specifically of Norman Shepherd, whom we also respect. But we see that Westminster now no longer even advocates the VanTillian perspective clearly. And it's not that we want to involve you in the sense of forcing you to teach or support us financially, or anything.

CVI Well, why not John Murray [Interference, big gap]

JS ...Norman Shepherd feels that the Apologetics of Gordon Clark are triumphing in his demise at Westminster. And VanTil's whole point of view has been eased out. And that it's becoming clearly in focus in his own situation in his mind. He's called it the triumph of Gordon Clark.

PL Well / / Reid said, "It shows you had some influence with these boys." Well, that's fine. I appreciate that no end. But you see, there is an and to all good things / / This would be an open blazed..., the peddling of this would be hostility...

PL Well, let me say this. If we were to do this, if we were to begin a school and name it the VanTil Theological Seminary, in your honor.

Even though you were not specifically desirous that this be done. And that we would take credit for doing this. Would you oppose us or would you allow us to do this in your honor?

lv7 Well I'd rather not. I've had plenty of honor. No, I've had plenty. It's true.

7P Dr. VanTil, let me speak as a pastor out of concern for the churches and for the alumnae who've gone out from Westminster, those who've read your books. Your name is a clear call to the historic richness of the Christian faith. To the tradition of John Calvin and the Reformed faith. To the Apostle Paul and to Augustine. It's been clear and people know what it has meant. And out of concern for the churches we desire, not simply as for an educational institution or some sort of university or seminary. But out of concern to train and develop men to proclaim the Reformed faith in all its richness. Not as Evangelicalism, but as the Reformed faith. Which Warfield says is "Christianity come into its own." Your name is doubtless, or is probably in North America, the clearest testimony that is known widely, to that sort of a perspective. And if you would identify or allow us to identify the institution with you, that gives us an immediate access to and an identifiability as a body, that is concerned in this manner. And that's why we ask you. Yes, to honor you. But most of all to serve the churches. To name something the Philadelphia Theological Seminary, or the Glenside...or whatever. To name it after some obscure or relatively unknown man or movement does not communicate to the people of God the information that they need to have.

PL Let me put it this way. John Calvin, when he died, it was not his desire ever to have a tombstone over his grave, as I'm sure you know. Because he wanted no one to reverence him. And we all can appreciate that great humility that a great man of God had. And so to this day we don't know even where Calvin is buried. But, do we feel it's wrong for the early Dutch settlers to come to this country, when the Christian Reformed Church was forming, to name a school after him? Not because they worshipped him, even though Calvin would not have wanted that himself. But nevertheless, because it indicated unquestionably where the men stood theologically. And you see, we come to you with that same desire. Not to glorify you above what you desire. But to make a clear statement. We would use the name Calvin Seminary if it were available. But what even means more to us is that name of VanTil, that speaks the clear historic faith to the Church.

At this point Dr. VanTil protests against the whole idea of any man's name being used. As he points out . . .

... If it be made plain right away that it's not around any man. And then you don't mention a man. You don't have to name it after any man, John Calvin, or Augustine or John Murray, or the works. But you say, and that's what it is, because in it is the best expression of what is in the Holy Bible, the Word Of God, inerrant and infallible, and that's our confesion. . . .

JP Dr. VanTil I think that's wise and certainly we would want to put that in the catalogue. But it's like sellkng books. If you use the old Puritan book titles, nobody would buy any books because it takes too long to read. So you have to come up with a short, snappy title that summarizes the contents.

CVT I know, you can make a magician out of Machen too. A name a name, what's in a name. Calvinism is niggardly. And John Murray was a dour Scotsman. And VanTil is an ugly, wooden shoe Dutchman. Now they wouldn't say that...//they would rally to their point . . . .

PL Well, how about if we do this. We're going to ask you again, and we're going to ask you to reflect on this for awhile. Because we confronted you so abruptly.

CVT Alright, that's alright. Cause next time I'm going to pay for the lunch.

PL And we do want you to think this over, after we've talked to Norman Shepherd about this. And your endorsement and your willingness to help out. And then we want to confront you, after you've had time to pray over it. Because we know it's too fast to ask for your full final word.

CVT Norman knows very well. The first, the very night in which it was decided I went over to his house and we had prayer together. Norman knows very well...Well, he reads Dutch like nobody's business... He's a

PL Dutchman ex patri.

PL A Dutchman out of the country. Well, let's put it this way. Would you be willing, and hopefully we can convince you to change your mind, but we respect your great wisdom. Would you be willing when we do come to the publicity side, to write a letter of endorsement that is not negative toward Westminster, but is positive affirming the value of the work we're intending to do?

CVT Well, I'll certainly consider it, after I've seen your document. But I can't now, offhand. No, that's good. I'm all for what you're doing. Please don't misunderstand, I'm all against what's going on. Because that's Neo, Neo Orthodoxy. Which they claim, but isn't so. Because they don't know. And Norman knows, and he isn't for it. / / See, Clowney has these flowery speeches. But when does he ever come to the gospel. See, I had to do it for years. I would take someone who was attacking the Gospel, at that moment. And say this is not what we are for. And he doesn't do

it. He always blah, blah, blah, nice and sweet. And we're always nice and sweet. And we must have this, and we must love the Lord Jesus Christ--another Billy Graham.

PL Let me ask another question. And we're not trying to be weasels here, but we do want to understand one another as best as we can. Would you be willing if people were to do so, to have the VanTil Chair of Apologetics at our Seminary, would you allow us to name a chair in your honor [Interference]

CVT That sounds good to me. Then I'm one of a group of equal men.

PL Or another idea we had was the Ursinus Chair of Symbolics or Dogmatics, in honor of the [end of tape, first side].