7/18/89 Machen #5

comes what I think was the great mistake that he made.

I do not say that I would have done any better or that anyone I know of would have. It's not really a criticism of him but it's an observing of a situation and wishing that it had been done differently.

Thre are two other matters I think I should mention. The first of these is perhaps the most important: this was the fact that during a great part of the seven and ahalf years that he taught at Westminster he was so occupied with making a stand for the truth in the church in tgeneral that he did not give the thought he might have to the developments (nc?) on of (?) the seminary. In all the ordinary matters of the seminary I believe he ca-ried on very proper fashion and di what was right. In addition to this he himself an made up the deficits each year from his own pocket, and once complained that there was not enough money being raised and it was proving necessary for him to sell interest-bearing securities in order to pay off the deficits. But, while he taught a full schedule of courses and did so very excellently, and presided in faculty meetings very well, and gave good thought to most of the matters that came before him, his great preoccupation with matters in the denomination outside kept him from taking the time and thought to realize that the influence over the students was largely being lost and falling into the hands of Dr. Van Til instead of Dr. Machen. My first realization of this might be wehn Dr. Van Til once in a faculty meeting made a rather slighting remark about the fact that he thought that I was apt to follow the type of aploo apologetics that Warfield had taught rather than the presuppositional apologetis that he was teaching. After the meeting I asked Dr. Machen if whether that was to be considered as a proper criticism of myself, and Dr. Machen, "As between Dr. Warfield's apologetics and Van Til's apologetics I would stand with Warfield every single time. This shows that Dr. Machen did not agree with the emphasis on presuppositional apologetics that Van Til was teaching, but Machen did not realize that Van Til was making that major point and driving it home to the students to the point where they became so completely convinced of it that they thought the fine historocal apologetics that Dr. Machen himself taught was rather a waste of time--that Dr. Machen used in his classes and h in his books. An Also, while Dr. Machen was out making a strong stand in the church at large for the truth of the great issues of the Gospel, #Van Til was driving home his particular stand on certain points of theology to the extent that in the minds of many of the students these points became more important than the great central issues of the Gospel. In fact, this reached the point that abanks in the last full year before the year in which Dr. Machen died many of