for the future of Christian organizations. All too often I have seen in-
stances where an organization which has been founded by real Christians
and has stood for great biblical teachings has admitted to its teaching
staff someone who claims to believe in biblical infallibility, but denies
that it is historically or scientifically dependable, and perhaps showing
a very fine Christian attitude in many ways he is welcomed by others and
the difference is overlooked. But gradually he trains men who take carry his
this position he takes further than he ever carried it, at least publically,
and eventually the institution comes into the hands of those who have little
interest in the Bible.

I have heard it said that the parts of Lindsell's book on the Battle
for the Bible that deal with problems in inerrancy are not very well done.
I cannot judge this because I have not read those parts. I believe however
that Lindsell has done a very excellent service for the Christian world in
showing institution after institution that which has taken a weak position on
biblical inerrancy and then has gone on to deny great fundamental Christian
truths.

On the second column Pinnock says that "the issue that divides the
evangelicals is really quite a small one, although it looms remarkably large
at times in the discussion. It concerns what we ought to do with minor
difficulties that exist in the text of the Bible; for example, duplicate
portions, numerical discrepancies, the semitic world-picture, levicula,
popular expressions and the like. . . . Why then do people get so excited
about this matter?" He says further: "This apologetic concern is offset from
another direction by an equally cogent and opposite conviction held by Orr,
Berkouwer et al., that is extremely foolhardly to suspend the entire
edifice of belief on a single detail of Scripture."