The fault was the Board wasn't standing 100% with the attitude -- the majority attitude of Westminster

Neher: And that was Dr. Woodbridges' position?

AAM: Yes. That was Woodbridges' position, and when we resigned they made Woodbridge editor of the Presbyterian Guardian, and he wrote articles in it about Westminster students standing on street corners preaching the Gospel! And you'd think they were all wonderful evangelistic group. And then all the sudden you heard he --- and he had been standing so strongly with Dr. Machen. They'd metnion the S. Presbyterian Ch. And he'd say, The S. Presby. Church is just like the Northern. It has not gone as far; it's going the same way. The next you heard he accepted a pulpit in the S. Presby. ch. and he appeared before the presbytery there and told them howhis ancestors had been S. Presbyterians, etc. They received him and Ed Rian said the two saddest days in his life were when Dr. Machen died and when Charlie Woodbridge resigned. But he said in the Guardian then that he saw that with the group that had defected, the group that remained was not sufficient to maintain the Board and to maintain his positions in the way in which they should be. Which was very evidently he wanted more support.

He took the strongest stand with them for 3 mo. and then just left it and went there. Then he was with the S. Presby. Ch. for years and he taught at Fuller for years. I asked him during the ____years you were at Fuller, how many of those students there do you think are preaching the Gospel now? He said, Probably none. I said, How many inthose churches you had in the S. Presbyterian Ch. now are really standing for the Gospel. "Probaly none.he said. Yet after he did all that for a few years, then when he retires hecomes back and tells McIntire he is 1000% with us, and says we at Faith are soft on the issues! He -- McIntire praisedhim for having gone full circle and come back to where he was before. He had much to do with our having to leave Faith. One estreme to exreme to the other he went.