

THE FORMATION OF THE NEW EVANGELICALISM (PART ONE): HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL ANTECEDENTS

by Rolland D. McCune*

Defining the “new” evangelicalism is part of the greater problem of defining evangelicalism itself. Usually evangelicalism means a Protestant view of the “good news” (from the Greek word *euangelion*) of salvation by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. Timothy Weber said, “Defining evangelicalism has become one of the biggest problems in American religious historiography.”¹ Mark Noll is undoubtedly correct when he said, “The term ‘evangelical’ is a plastic one.”² George Marsden sees no fewer than fourteen evangelicalisms in the “variety”!³ For our purposes here the term “new evangelicalism” applies to a strain of conservative, traditional Protestant religious thought that coalesced into a

*Dr. McCune is President and Professor of Systematic Theology at Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary in Allen Park, MI.

¹Timothy P. Weber, “Premillennialism and the Branches of Evangelicalism,” in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston (Downers Grove:IL, InterVarsity Press, 1991), p. 12. He sees four kinds of evangelicals: classical, pietistic, fundamentalist, and progressive. The title of the book itself (*The Variety of...*) is suggestive of the problem.

²Mark Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986), p. 1. For further detail on the history of the term “evangelical” and the question of the antecedents of the movement in America, see, among others, Alister McGrath, *Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995), pp. 17–51; George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York: Oxford, 1980), pp. 11–39; Donald G. Bloesch, *The Future of Evangelical Christianity: A Call for Unity Amid Diversity* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), pp. 11–22; John H. Gerstner, “The Theological Boundaries of Evangelical Faith,” in *The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing*, ed. David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge (Nashville: Abingdon, 1973), pp. 21–37 [hereafter called *The Evangelicals*]; *The Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, s.v. “Evangelicalism,” by R. V. Pierard [hereafter called *EDT*]; and Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1976).

³George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), p. 110.

movement in the mid-twentieth century, purporting to avoid the fundamentalist right and the neo-orthodox/neo-liberal left.⁴ Although David Wells disclaims that evangelicalism ever was a “movement,”⁵ it appears difficult to sustain that assertion. In the sense that Joel Carpenter describes fundamentalism as a movement,⁶ the new evangelicalism can also meaningfully be classified as such.

The term new evangelicalism was coined by Harold John Ockenga in an address at the newly-formed Fuller Theological Seminary in 1947.⁷ Like all theological groups or movements, the new evangelicalism has a general motif of belief and practice, with varying shades attached corresponding to the backgrounds and beliefs of those involved. This motif expresses itself in many areas. The purpose of this and the article

⁴David F. Wells, quoting one response to a poll on the definition of evangelical, speaks of the middle-of-the-road between evangelicalism and liberalism (*God in the Wasteland* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994], p. 189). R. Albert Mohler, Jr. characterizes the new evangelicalism as a “middle way between the increasing heterodoxy accepted by the mainline denominations and the obscurantism, cultural isolation, and separatism of the fundamentalists” (“Evangelical: What’s In a Name?” *The Coming Evangelical Crisis*, ed. John Armstrong [Chicago: Moody, 1996], p. 31). J. Elwin Wright, director of the New England Fellowship in the 1940s and perhaps the most energetic personality behind the formation of the National Association of Evangelicals (1942), wanted a new coalition that would form between the two polarities of modernism and fractious fundamentalism (Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* [New York: Oxford, 1997], p. 149 [hereafter called *Revive Us Again*]). Edward John Carnell, certainly a representative of the new evangelicalism if there ever was one, “personified the tensions that would emerge in this new movement that sought to distinguish itself from sectarian fundamentalism on the right, and liberal and neoorthodox theology on the left” (L. Joseph Rosas III, “The Theology of Edward John Carnell,” *Criswell Theological Journal* 4 [Spring 1990], p. 351). The most recurring reason for the “new” evangelicalism was the perceived faults and shortcomings of fundamentalism. Bruce Shelley noted, “the so-called ‘new evangelicalism’ is a fresh current within old fundamentalist (and thus interdenominational) channels which seeks to correct certain excesses of fundamentalism and to recover an earlier evangelical witness to society” (*Evangelicalism in America* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967], p. 9).

⁵David F. Wells, *No Place For Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), p. 8. Decades earlier Shelley had expressed similar thoughts. He said, “Evangelical Christianity is not a religious organization. It is not primarily a theological system. It is more of a mood, a perspective, and an experience” (*Evangelicalism in America*, p. 7).

⁶He said that fundamentalism had “a whole panoply of aims and aspirations” (*Revive Us Again*, p. 15). Elsewhere he described fundamentalism as a movement that had “leaders, institutions, and a particular identity” with its own ideology and agenda (“Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism, 1929–1942,” *Church History* 49 [Mar 1980], pp. 64, 74).

⁷News Release by Ockenga, December 8, 1957, and his chapter, “From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism,” in *Evangelical Roots*, ed. Kenneth Kantzer (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1978), p. 78.

to follow is to give a general account of the formation of the new evangelical movement in the 1940s and 1950s by noting the historical, philosophical, and theological antecedents that formed modernist theology, describing the fundamentalist-modernist controversy that was the milieu out of which came the new evangelical appearance, and showing the subsequent historical rise of the new evangelical coalition.

THE FORMATION OF THEOLOGICAL LIBERALISM

Liberalism (here used synonymously with modernism) arose out of European upheavals in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, upheavals that were political (the French Revolution, the Thirty Years War), technological (the industrial revolution, advances in science), and religious or philosophical (the Enlightenment, Protestant and Roman Catholic scholasticism, and Pietism, among others).⁸ The “Wars of Religion” especially left people in Europe in a state of weariness and religious fatigue and toleration.⁹

Early 18th Century European Thought

This period has been called “from orthodoxy to enlightenment”¹⁰ and is an important antecedent to what later became American liberalism or “modernism.” The theological/philosophical scene in 18th century Europe briefly and generally had the following aspects. There was orthodoxy or Protestant scholasticism.¹¹ The post-Reformation era saw intense theological conflicts between the Lutherans and the Calvinists, the rise of Arminianism, and the formulations of confessions and statements in dogmatics. Protestant scholasticism had a form of rationalism, and it was not always clearly exegetical.

Roman Catholic scholasticism was a compromise between Aristotelianism and theology, a conflation commonly known as Thomism, after Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274). Ancient Greek thought was Platonic; it made an absolute dichotomy between form/spirit and matter. The forms were inherently unknowable. “God” was the form of the good. Aristotle,

⁸William C. Fletcher, *The Moderns: Molders of Contemporary Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962), pp. 15–20 [hereafter called *The Moderns*]. Alister E. McGrath, *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998), pp. 214–20 [hereafter called *Historical Theology*].

⁹McGrath, *Historical Theology*, p. 214.

¹⁰John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity Interpreted Through Its Development* (New York: Scribners, 1954), p. 151 [hereafter called *Protestant Christianity*].

¹¹*EDT*, s.v. “Scholasticism, Protestant,” by R. J. VanderMolen, pp. 984–85.

an empiricist, united form and matter. He repudiated an independent existence of the Platonic form apart from the thing that embodied it. Sense perception is the basis of all the knowledge we receive. In the compromise with theology, Aquinas held that by natural reason converging on sense data one could pursue theology and philosophy independently of Scripture, special revelation, or even grace. He developed the famous “theistic proofs” for the existence of the true God. On this foundation and first floor of natural theology, God added an upper story of special revelation concerning the things of grace. Scholastic Thomism is a nature-grace scheme.¹² Francis Schaeffer credits (correctly, it seems) Aquinas with being the fountainhead of the intellectually autonomous, humanist philosophy that led down the slippery slope to the dialecticism of G. W. F. Hegel (1770–1831) through which autonomous human thinking sank below “the line of despair”—a point where philosophy abandoned any hope for a unified field of knowledge.¹³

Pietism was a protest against Protestant scholasticism, especially German Lutheranism.¹⁴ Pietism emphasized Christian experience, inner feeling, the individual’s personal relationship with God, and high religious idealism. It was a strong reaction to rigid, dead orthodoxy.

The Enlightenment

The Enlightenment was also an eighteenth century phenomenon with philosophical roots in the seventeenth century. It was a movement in thought, sometimes known as the Age of Reason, that was totally secular. It has been called the “modern paganism.”¹⁵ The working assumption of secular thought is that all there is to life is the here and now. Everything is understood in terms of temporality; nothing is transcendent. Life can be pursued without any regard for God or religion.¹⁶ Some of the main characteristics of the secular spirit are contingency

¹²Francis A. Schaeffer, *Escape From Reason* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1968), pp. 9–12. Harvie M. Conn, *Contemporary World Theology* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1974), p. 3.

¹³Schaeffer, *Escape From Reason*, pp. 9–13, 40–42. For Hegel, the field of knowledge was open-ended, never unified but always “becoming” through the dialectical process of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.

¹⁴*EDT*, s.v. “Pietism,” by Mark Noll, pp. 855–58. McGrath, *Historical Theology*, pp. 220–21.

¹⁵Peter Gay, *The Rise of Modern Paganism*, vol. 1 of *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation* (New York, W. W. Norton, 1977) quoted in Harold Lindsell, *The New Paganism* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987), pp. 46–47, 257.

¹⁶*EDT*, s.v. “Secularism, Secular Humanism,” by D. W. Gill, p. 996.

(the universe is the result of causes that are neither necessary, rational, or purposive), relativism (there are no absolutes), transience (constant change and becomingness of all things), and intellectual autonomy (the total independence of human thinking).¹⁷ The Enlightenment was an emancipation of the human mind from its philosophical and religious shackles, and made the mind of man totally autonomous. Thinkers refused to be bound by anything such as revelation, dogma, and tradition. Immanuel Kant called the Enlightenment “man’s emergence from a self-inflicted state of minority.”¹⁸ While some positive contributions to learning came out of the Enlightenment, the theoretical underpinnings were anti-Christian, pagan, and secular. The Enlightenment ended in a deadlock between the rationalists (such as Hobbes, Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibnitz) and the empiricists (such as Locke, Berkely, and Hume), preparing the way for the synthesis philosophy of Immanuel Kant. In theology, Enlightenment thought was filtered into Protestantism by Christian Wolfe (a disciple of Leibnitz; d. 1754) who blended Protestant scholasticism with philosophy, especially that of Leibnitz.¹⁹ The transition was eventually made “from a new scholasticism to a new religion” through a series of “transitional” theologians and “innovating” theologians.²⁰

The Enlightenment made severe impacts against Christianity.²¹ One was the complete autonomy of human reason. Man was totally free intellectually. He was not bound by church creeds, theological statements, revelation, or any particular world view or presuppositions of any kind. Man was intellectually independent in an open universe of chance, relativity, and inevitable change in *all areas*. This freedom was itself almost religious in nature and offered the brightest prospects for the future of both mankind and religion. Part of the fallout of this liberated intellectualism was the detachment of faith from knowledge; God could be “thought” but He could not be “known,”²² especially as this was devel-

¹⁷Gary Scott Smith, *The Seeds of Secularization: Calvinism, Culture, and Pluralism in America: 1870–1915* (Grand Rapids and St Paul: Consortium of Christian University Press and Eerdmans, 1985), p. 36 [hereafter called *The Seeds of Secularization*].

¹⁸Quoted in Conn, *Contemporary World Theology*, p. 3.

¹⁹Dillenberger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, p. 152.

²⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 153–56 give further explication and detail concerning these theologians.

²¹For a good overview, see Bruce Demarest, “The Bible in the Enlightenment Era,” in *Challenges to Inerrancy*, ed. Gordon Lewis and Bruce Demarest (Chicago: Moody, 1984), pp. 11–47.

²²John Jefferson Davis, “Kant and the Problem of Religious Knowledge,” in *Per-*

oped in the Kantian synthesis with its radical dichotomy between the phenomenal and noumenal realms. This philosophical detachment or “gap” was a special legacy going back to the empiricism of David Hume ultimately.²³

Another impact of the Enlightenment was the destruction of the need for divine revelation. Revelation was thought to be dispensable since it brought no more than what man could learn naturally about God and the world. Culture and religion were practically synonymous, both gained, not by divine revelation, but by the Enlightenment rubric of the “omnicompetence of human reason.”²⁴ This in turn destroyed the doctrines of inspiration, inerrancy, miracles, and the like. Hermeneutically, the Bible became a completely culture-bound book.²⁵

A third and equally devastating impact of the Enlightenment was the detachment of religion from history. Religion could now reach forward without being manacled to the past and historical events such as the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth and events in His life and ministry.²⁶ Gotthold Lessing, for example, separated the truth of Christianity from the truth of history and called this chasm “an ugly, broad ditch.”²⁷ This ditch was uncrossable and did not need to be crossed because a religion’s truthfulness is not dependent on its nexus with history’s “facts” but on its ability to transform lives through its “teaching.” Theology became more concerned about spiritual “life” or the practical interests in the field of religion.²⁸

Theoretical thought ended in a philosophical stalemate between the Renaissance rationalists (knowledge is the product solely of the mind) and the Enlightenment empiricists (knowledge comes from sense experience). Meanwhile Protestant thought lost all uniqueness and distinctiveness. Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) forged a synthesis between the two factions and in so doing laid the groundwork for liberal theological opinion. Kant derived from Hume the idea that we have nothing be-

spectives on Evangelical Theology, ed. Kenneth Kantzer and Stanley Gundry (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), p. 236.

²³Ronald Nash, *The Word of God and the Mind of Man: The Crisis of Revealed Truth in Contemporary Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), pp.17–24 [hereafter called *The Word of God and the Mind of Man*].

²⁴McGrath, p. 221.

²⁵Demarest, “The Bible in the Enlightenment Era,” p. 38.

²⁶*Ibid.*

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 27.

²⁸Dillenberger and Welch, *Protestant Theology*, p. 156.

yond the data of our senses (his empiricism),²⁹ and further held that the human mind is latent with certain “categories” by which it comes to the raw data of experience. These categories are innate aptitudes of, or a certain structure of, the mind, sort of an *a priori* grid. Kant also made a sharp distinction between “reality” and “appearance.” What we “know” is not the thing-in-itself from the real world but its appearance, i.e., what our mind has told us about the realm of appearances via the categories. Thus the human mind makes a contribution to knowledge (his rationalism). This made man’s mind totally autonomous and the ultimate referent. In effect, Kant put a “wall,”³⁰ consisting of the human mind, between a person and the “real” world. He limited knowledge to the experienced world—the phenomenal realm, the world of apparitions that comes to us via the categories. Metaphysics was excluded from this realm. Kant did not deny the existence of a higher realm of God, freedom, reality, immortality, and the like; instead he said that this realm—the “real” world, the noumenal realm—while not a source of knowledge can be a domain for faith. In this system God is not a proper object of knowledge because He is not of the phenomenal realm.³¹ God could be *postulated* as a matter of “practical” reason for religion, ethics, and morality, but He could not be cognitively known as a matter of “pure” reason.

The Resultant Theological Liberalism

German rationalism was the well from which liberal theology sprang, and this was so for various reasons. There was the large number of full-staffed German state universities, enabling scholars to do research and writing unencumbered by students. In addition to the exactness and analytical abilities of the German mind, there was wide doctrinal latitude afforded the faculties of these universities. Scholars therefore had the time, ability, and means to specialize in biblical themes.³²

²⁹Nash, *The Word of God and the Mind of Man*, p. 25.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 27. Kant’s “wall” is philosophically akin to Lessing’s “ditch” between faith and history and Hume’s “gap” between faith and knowledge.

³¹For further detail, see Nash, *The Word of God and the Mind of Man*, pp. 25–28; John Jefferson Davis, “Kant and the Problem of Religious Knowledge,” pp. 231–50; W. David Beck, “Agnosticism: Kant,” in *Biblical Errancy*, ed. Norman Geisler (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), pp. 53–78; Colin Brown, *Christianity and Western Thought: From the Ancient World to the Age of Enlightenment* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1990), pp. 309–29; and Robert L. Reymond, *Introductory Studies in Contemporary Theology* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1968), pp. 21–23.

³²Examples of German scholars and universities include G. W. F. Hegel (University of Berlin), F. C. Bauer (University of Tübingen), Friederich Schleiermacher (Univer-

The Influence of Schleiermacher and Ritschl

In addition to the general contributions of Enlightenment thought to the formation of liberalism were the special views of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) and Albrecht Ritschl (1822–1889),³³ both of whom were influenced by Kant. Schleiermacher came out of a background of Pietism (Moravian Brethren) and was heavily influenced by Kantian ideas as well as by philosophical Romanticism, which he absorbed from a group of his friends caught up in such thought. Romanticism stressed the imagination, creativity, freedom, individuality, and the spontaneity of life, especially in the realm of the human spirit, which was not being reached by the rationalism of the day.³⁴ Through the influences of Pietism and Romanticism, Schleiermacher accordingly put the locus of religion in man's feelings, affections, and emotions. "God" was what one took with "absolute dependence," which was a consciousness of the inner unity of all things. Thus he put God and religion in the realm of sense experience, i.e., into the domain of reason although not into doctrinal formulations or a system of beliefs. For him, God and faith were united, i.e., one cannot speak of God without knowing and trusting Him. As such God was not simply a postulate (answering Kant), and religion was not reduced to a system of intellectual beliefs (answering orthodoxy), two vital factors in Christianity as he saw it.

Ritschl opposed Schleiermacher's subjectivism and sought to ground Christianity in history by seeking to restore the historical Jesus. His Kantianism prevented much progress in this endeavor because he accepted Kant's limitation on the knowledge of God, i.e., that God was not an object of theoretical judgments. From Kant he also got the notion that one cannot know the thing-in-itself but only the effect that it has on us, i.e., what our minds tell us about the empirical realm. Thus his quest for the "historical" Jesus in the apparitional world, apart from metaphysics and divine revelation, was extremely difficult; in fact it was doomed from the start. Furthermore, with Kant he also accepted the identification of religion and morality, and Ritschl's theology thus became a mat-

sities of Halle and Berlin), Albrecht Ritschl (Universities of Bonn and Gottingen), Adolph von Harnack (University of Berlin), Ernst Troeltsch (Universities of Heidelberg and Berlin), and Johannes Weiss (Universities of Gottingen, Marburg, and Heidelberg).

³³Nash, *The Word of God and the Mind of Man*, pp. 28–34. Dillenberger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, pp. 182–89, 198–200. On Ritschl specifically, see Alan P. F. Sell, *Theology in Turmoil: The Roots, Course and Significance of the Conservative-Liberal Debate in Modern Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986), pp. 73–87 [hereafter called *Theology in Turmoil*].

³⁴Harold O. J. Brown, "Romanticism and the Bible," in *Challenges to Inerrancy*, pp. 49–65; McGrath, *Historical Theology*, pp. 227–29.

ter of unanalyzable value judgments (derived from the unreachable noumenal realm) and Christianity became a system of ethics.³⁵

Protestant liberalism therefore retained the essentials of Lessing's ditch, Hume's gap, and Kant's wall. All of this added up to a God who was ultimately detached from the historical and cognitive processes, hence impersonal and ultimately unknown and unknowable, a nineteenth century version of the ancient Athenians' Unknown God (Acts 17:23). And it continues to this day; as Conn says, "The isolation of God into the noumenal realm is a favorite theme of contemporary theology."³⁶

The Influence of Higher Criticism

The influence of biblical criticism or higher criticism on the formation of liberal theology was significant because it delivered a hermeneutic or a method of interpretation of what was thought to be a culture-bound book, the Bible. Lower criticism dealt with the text of Scripture, but higher criticism went beyond and dealt with authorship, date of composition, purpose in writing, parallels to other forms of literature, and the like. In itself this was legitimate scholarship, but with the post-Enlightenment presuppositions, principally the ultimate autonomy of human reason, the discipline was devastating to the Bible through the development of the historical-critical methodology.³⁷ Dillenberger and Welch note correctly:

The decisive issue was not the specific interpretations of historical criticism, but lay at a deeper level—viz, at the level of the *significance* and *authority* of the Bible as a whole, i.e., precisely in the giving up of traditional conceptions of biblical revelation. The acceptance of biblical criticism meant the abandonment of the belief that the Bible is an infallible record of divine revelation.³⁸

An important plank was thus laid in liberalism's platform. The Bible came to be regarded as a record of the religious experiences of men and not as the infallible, verbally inerrant revelation of God.³⁹

³⁵Nash, *The Word of God and the Mind of Man*, p. 33; McGrath, *Historical Theology*, p. 283.

³⁶Conn, *Contemporary World Theology*, p. 6.

³⁷Ibid.

³⁸Dillenberger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, p. 195.

³⁹For further detail, see Sell, *Theology in Turmoil*, pp. 39–54.

The Influence of Science and the Theory of Organic Evolution

The dichotomy which existed between science and religion brought about by Galileo and Kepler, who destroyed the universally-held geocentric idea of the universe, was further sharpened by Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species* (1859), a scheme of amoeba-to-man organic evolution. The theory of evolution had some immediate effects on professing Christianity. It directly contradicted the Bible in at least two ways—the interpretation of Genesis and the real need to believe in God in order to account for origins.⁴⁰ Charles Hodge of Princeton Seminary said that Darwinism was atheism.⁴¹ Darwinism was condemned almost universally by conservatives.⁴² Further, the Darwinian notion of natural selection was portrayed as a contradiction between the moral law and natural law by blurring the biblical picture of God as loving, wise, beneficent, powerful, and just. Overproduction, the struggle for existence, and the survival of the fittest seemed incompatible with the biblical view of God. Also, for the same obvious reason, Darwinism ruined the theistic proof for God's existence from “design” previously used by both faith (theology) and reason (science).⁴³ Darwinian evolution also demoted man as a special creation of God with a special position of honor.⁴⁴ Most importantly, Darwinism led the way for evolutionary ideas in other fields, especially religion.⁴⁵

There were several theological effects of evolution in terms of the formation of a new theology. One, it reinforced the growing emphasis on the immanence of God; God, man, and nature were actually on the same continuum. Evolution also brought a reinterpretation of the ideas

⁴⁰George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 136–37.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, p. 138, quoting Charles Hodge, *What is Darwinism?* (New York: Scribners, Armstrong, and Co., 1874). Note that it was *Darwinism* to which Hodge objected. He and some of the other Princetonians were not totally opposed to evolution as such. Hodge's objection to Darwinism was aimed primarily at the denial of divine design on which the Darwinian scheme was actually predicated. See David B. Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 2 vols. (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1996), 2:10–21, 80–82, 256–59. Charles Hodge himself held to a day-age theory concerning the opening chapters of Genesis (*Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. [London: James Clark, 1960 edition], 1: 570–74).

⁴²Smith, *The Seeds of Secularization*, p. 97.

⁴³Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*, p. 141. Smith, *The Seeds of Secularization*, p. 109.

⁴⁴Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*, p. 137.

⁴⁵Smith, *The Seeds of Secularization*, p. 109. Dillenberger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, p. 205.

of sin and redemption. Redemption became more or less the extremely optimistic idea of the gradual education out of the brute state to obedience to God. Harry Emerson Fosdick, a chastened and reconstructed liberal (i.e., a neo-liberal), in his autobiography quotes Samuel Butler, an early (old) liberal, who predicted that through the simple process of evolution, man would one day become “not only an angel but an arch-angel.”⁴⁶ That thought was too starry-eyed even for Fosdick. In the same vein, non-Christian religions were looked upon by some liberals as stages in the development of man’s religious climb toward monotheism.

In summary, the basic ideas of liberalism were: (1) A spirit of free inquiry and open-mindedness. Nothing was off-limits to the inquiring mind. This is actually the genius of liberalism.⁴⁷ (2) An optimism concerning the abilities, natural goodness, and future of man. Man was not thought to be perfect but was certainly perfectible. The dignity of man, even though demoted and diminished, was emphasized and his depravity deprecated or denied. Fosdick quotes a Newell Dwight Hillis, pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, New York as saying,

Laws are becoming more just, rulers more humane; music is becoming sweeter and books wiser; homes are happier, and the individual heart is become at once more just and more gentle... For today art, industry, invention, literature, learning and government—all these are captives marching in Christ’s triumphant procession up the hill of time.⁴⁸

Another said, “Over the crest of the hill the Promised Land stretches away to the far horizon smiling in eternal sunshine.”⁴⁹ (3) The immanence of God; i.e., that God works within the world not just upon it. There is no fundamental disjunction between the natural and the supernatural, man and God. Both are on the same essential continuum. Other, perhaps lesser, tenets are: (4) Sympathy and tolerance among Christians. (5) Confidence in and respect for science and the methods of modern science. (6) A skepticism about achieving absolute truth or a

⁴⁶Harry Emerson Fosdick, *The Living of These Days* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1956), p. 250.

⁴⁷Daniel Day Williams well said concerning liberalism: “In its theological context it designates the spirit and attitude of those who sought to incorporate in Christian theology the values of freedom of thought, tolerance, and the humanitarian motives in modern western culture. Theological liberals have always asserted the claims of reason against a petrified orthodoxy, and have sought freedom for diversity of belief in the Church” (“Liberalism,” in *A Handbook of Christian Theology*, ed. Marvin Halverson and Arthur A. Cohen [New York: World Publishing, 1958], p. 207).

⁴⁸Fosdick, *The Living of These Days*, p. 237.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, p. 239.

knowledge of ultimate reality. (7) Idealism about society and social progress.⁵⁰

THE RISE OF LIBERALISM IN AMERICA

The Influence of the Social Gospel

The “social gospel” is primarily an American phenomenon⁵¹ that made its rise during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, although there were European precursors such as the Christian Socialist movement in Britain which began in 1848 (F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, and J. M. Ludlow).⁵² Also the value-judgment theology of Albrecht Ritschl strongly influenced a concern for social betterment on the Continent.

Among the precursors of the social gospel in America was Horace Bushnell (1802–1876), a Congregationalist who stressed the corporate, social involvement of man in sin. He taught that if sin can be social in dimension, so can virtue. He is most famous for his book, *Christian Nurture* (1847), in which he taught that conversion should come by a process of education or nurture and not in a sudden, instantaneous manner.⁵³ He also understood the atonement of Christ in terms of love rather than penal satisfaction.⁵⁴ Josiah Strong was a Congregational minister who wrote *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (1885) in which he said that money, greed, immigration, Roman Catholicism, and Mormonism were corrupting America. Strong was the executive secretary of the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance (formed in England in 1846) from 1886 to 1898.⁵⁵ The American branch became the Federal Council of Churches in 1908. Other precursors

⁵⁰Dillenberger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, pp. 211–17.

⁵¹Williams, “Liberalism,” p. 209. Dillenberger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, p. 243. *EDT*, s.v. “Social Gospel, The,” by N. A. Magnuson, p. 1027.

⁵²Dillenberger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, p. 242. They also note that 1848 was “the year in which the *Communist Manifesto* appeared and popular insurrections swept over continental Europe, and [the Christian Socialist movement] was explicitly an effort to provide a Christian method of social reform as an alternative to the class struggle.”

⁵³Sydney E. Ahlstrom, “Horace Bushnell,” in *A Handbook of Christian Theologians*, ed. Martin E. Marty and Dean G. Peerman (New York: World Publishing, 1965), pp. 39–40.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 43–44.

⁵⁵*Dictionary of Christianity in America*, s.v. “Strong, Josiah (1847–1916),” by R. T. Handy, pp. 1140–41.

sors of the social gospel were William D. P. Bliss, George Herron, and Graham Taylor.

Charles M. Sheldon (1857–1946) was a Congregationalist who did the most of any to popularize the social gospel. He wrote *In His Steps: What Would Jesus Do?*, a social gospel novel that sold over 100,000 copies within a few months, 23 million within a generation.⁵⁶ Washington Gladden (1836–1918) has become known as “the father of the social gospel.” He also was a Congregational minister and was influenced by Bushnell. He felt that a competitive basis of economics was unchristian, and his stress was on love and moral persuasion as bringing a more ideal society.⁵⁷ His hymn, “O Master Let Me Walk With Thee,” was a statement on the social gospel. His books included *Working People and Their Employers* (1876), *Applied Christianity* (1887), and *Social Salvation* (1902).

Walter Rauschenbusch (1861–1918) was another leading light in the development and spread of the social gospel in America. He was professor of church history at the Rochester Theological Seminary, having been a pastor for eleven years among immigrant workers in a difficult section of New York City. His major publications were *Christianity and the Social Crisis* (1907), *Christianizing the Social Order* (1912), and *A Theology For the Social Gospel* (1917). Rauschenbusch felt that social sins were more devastating to morality than personal sins. He followed Bushnell’s idea that personal existence is social in nature, i.e., that society was an organization and not just a collection of individuals. There was a solidarity to society. Rauschenbusch’s ideas for social betterment came chiefly out of his concept of the kingdom of God, the core of the teachings of Jesus. This kingdom would come out of the existing social order with its institutions and redeem them not destroy them. This would be accomplished by God working immanently in society, not merely by the efforts of people. Through moral, economic, and social reform the new order, not based on competition, would come.⁵⁸ Rauschenbusch understood that the realms of education and democratic principles already had made great social advancement, but the kingdom of God needed advancement in the economic realm.⁵⁹ Although he definitely was a liberal, his theology was not characterized by the “senti-

⁵⁶Dillenger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, p. 246.

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Dillenger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, pp. 247–49. Fletcher, *The Moderns*, pp. 52–59. R. T. Handy, “Walter Rauschenbusch,” in *A Handbook of Christian Theologians*, pp. 192–211.

⁵⁹Dillenger and Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, p. 250.

mental optimism” that marked much of the social gospel; “many of his deepest convictions ran counter to the prevailing liberal theology.”⁶⁰

The social gospel in America was somewhat officially recognized when the Federal Council of Churches was born in 1908, partly for the purpose of centralizing Protestant concern for social problems. The Council drew up a Social Creed of the Churches which called for equal rights for all, child labor laws, old age benefits, shorter work week, labor arbitration, and such.⁶¹ The theoretical underpinnings (philosophical and theological) for the social gospel are patently Enlightenment-liberal in origin and content.

The Influence of a Secularized American Society

Several factors contributed to a trend toward the secularization of American society in the last quarter of the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth centuries. One was the urbanization of the nation and the acceleration of the transition from an agrarian society. In 1870 about one fifth of the population was urban; by 1890 it was one third, and continued to increase until 1910 when suburbs began to form.⁶² The motif and power structures of society by then were no longer agrarian. The metropolis was influencing everything, even the surrounding communities. Compared to an agrarian society, in an urban-oriented culture the home began to lose its influence and the community church waned. Urban churches became affluent as millionaires (such as the Colgates and Rockefellers) gave heavily of their means. Church-related educational institutions expanded dramatically. Then, as now, “there was a tendency to treat the Gospel much as a corporation might treat the promotion of its product.”⁶³ Urbanization had secularized the large Protestant denominations.

The development of the public school system had a secularizing influence on American culture.⁶⁴ Public education combined rationalism with statism and two figures were especially prominent. Horace Mann (1796–1858) has been called “the father of the American public school.” He was a Unitarian who believed in the natural goodness of man, that

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 251.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 252.

⁶²Clifton E. Olmstead, *Religion in America: Past and Present* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1961), p. 123 [hereafter called *Religion in America*].

⁶³Ibid., p. 125.

⁶⁴See Henry M. Morris, *Education For the Real World* (San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1977).

man, by universal, compulsory education, could ultimately develop a perfect society. John Dewey (1859–1956), known as “the father of American progressive education,” was a humanist who believed that man by cosmic evolution had finally reached a state whereby he could control all future evolution. He applied evolutionary concepts to the curriculum and the teaching methods of education. A. A. Hodge, a theologian at Princeton Seminary, foresaw and virtually prophesied the moral and social deterioration that public education, as was being proposed and propagated at the time, would bring. He said,

I am as sure as I am of Christ’s reign that a comprehensive and centralized system of national education, separated from religion, as is now commonly proposed, will prove the most appalling engine for the propagation of anti-Christian and atheistic unbelief, and of anti-social nihilistic ethics, individual, social and political, which this sin-rent world has ever seen.⁶⁵

Immigration in its own way also made a contribution to the secularization of America. Between 1865 and 1900 there were some 13,500,000 aliens who arrived in America, and even more after that in the decades of the twentieth century.⁶⁶ Consequently some denominations grew in size and others were formed, particularly among some of the ethnic and language groups. A number of immigrants rejected evangelical values and further diluted the hope for an evangelical religious consensus in America. Many were absorbed by the secular spirit, swelling the ranks of secularism in America.⁶⁷

As was noted, Enlightenment thought, from which well theological liberalism drank heavily, was secular and not truly Christian. To the degree that secularization took place, the road to liberalism in America accordingly was being paved.

The Influence of Postmillennialism ⁶⁸

Postmillennialism prevailed among American evangelicals between the Revolution and the Civil War. Although secularization had been in process in America, it did not appear, initially at least, to be anti-clerical or very hostile to Christianity. Americans seemed to bless its secularism with Christian symbols; i.e., many thought that materialism, capitalism,

⁶⁵A. A. Hodge, *Popular Lectures on Theological Themes* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publications, 1887), p. 283. See also J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1923), pp. 13–14.

⁶⁶Olmstead, *Religion in America*, p. 106.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, p. 107

⁶⁸See Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, pp. 48–55.

and nationalism were from God and were therefore evidence of His blessings. Others thought that secularism was a “public” philosophy and that individual values could be found in private religion.⁶⁹ The expansion of secularism, and that of liberalism as well, had the theoretical support supplied by the framework of postmillennialism. Postmillennialists were optimistic about the spiritual progress of culture. Those who were more literal (albeit historicist) in interpreting the Bible believed that the (papal) antichrist was in decline and would fall in the 1860s, that the Mohammedans (the little horn in Daniel 8) had reached their apogee of power and were diminishing, and that the United States under God would lead the new world in cultural advance.⁷⁰

Postbellum liberalism, however, began to abandon the supernatural aspects of historic postmillennialism. For example, a leading liberal Baptist, William Newton Clarke, made the formerly supernatural aspects of the Kingdom of God to be natural and normal; i.e., the Kingdom was *now* (a prime ingredient of secularism) and not future.

The leading early American liberals/modernists included Henry Ward Beecher (1813–1887), pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, NY, a progressive who ended his ministry as a liberal. He was very popular as a pulpiteer, political activist, and social reformer. William Rainey Harper (1856–1906) taught Semitics and biblical literature at Yale, and in 1891 became the first president of the University of Chicago, a Baptist school built with Rockefeller money which became the educational hotbed of the social gospel. Shailer Matthews (1863–1941) was dean of the University of Chicago and taught New Testament and theology. He figured largely in the liberalism of the Northern Baptist Convention. A. C. McGiffert (1861–1933) was a Congregationalist and professor of church history at the liberal Union Theological Seminary of New York. C. A. Briggs (1841–1913) was professor of Hebrew and cognate languages at Union. He repudiated the verbal inspiration of the Bible and was eventually condemned and put out of the Presbyterian ministry, only to be ordained by the Episcopal church and retained at Union. William Adams Brown (1865–1943) taught theology at Union Seminary in New York. He wrote *Christian Theology in Outline* (1906) in which he centered theology on the experiencing of the life and teachings of the historical Jesus and not on the objective authority of the Bible or an understanding of sin and atonement. William Newton Clarke (1841–1912) taught at Colgate University and wrote *An Outline of*

⁶⁹Smith, *The Seeds of Secularization*, pp. 37–38.

⁷⁰Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, p. 49. For the leading historicist ideas of the period, see Leroy E. Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, 4 vols. (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing, 1946), 3:687–723.

Christian Theology (1906), the first liberal systematic theology in America. Harry Emerson Fosdick (1878–1969) was a Baptist liberal, trained under Clarke, who for a time pastored the First Presbyterian church in New York City. In 1925 he became pastor of the Park Avenue Baptist Church in New York where John D. Rockefeller, Jr. was a member. In 1930 Riverside Church, constructed largely with Rockefeller money, was built as a place for Fosdick to preach. Fosdick called himself an “evangelical liberal.” More technically, he would qualify as a neo-liberal, i.e., still a liberal but not of the extremely optimistic old liberal vintage. He said, “We do not believe in automatic, inevitable social progress, supposing that by some inherent necessity the world is growing better and better.”⁷¹

THE FUNDAMENTALIST MOVEMENT IN AMERICA AND THE FUNDAMENTALIST-MODERNIST CONTROVERSY

The term “fundamentalist” has its most primitive starting point with *The Fundamentals: A Testimony To the Truth*, a series of booklets published in 1910–1915 on crucial fundamental doctrines which were under attack from the liberals. More directly, the name seems to have originated with Curtis Lee Laws, editor of a Baptist publication, *The Watchman Examiner*, who stated in an article that “we suggest that those who still cling to the great fundamentals and who mean to do battle royal for the fundamentals shall be called fundamentalists.”⁷²

Fundamentalism is a distinct movement and not merely a mood or a mentality. Wells says that a movement needs a commonly owned direction, a common basis on which the direction is based and moves, and an *esprit* that informs and motivates those united in the cause.⁷³ (On those bases, he says evangelicalism was not a movement.) Carpenter states that fundamentalism was a movement with leaders, institutions, and a clear identity.⁷⁴ He broadened his comments by saying that “fundamentalism bears all the marks of a popular religious movement which drew only part of its identity from opposition to liberal trends in the denominations. The movement had its own ideology and program to pursue.”⁷⁵ While Wells’s point that evangelicalism was not a movement is debat-

⁷¹Fosdick, *The Living of These Days*, p. 237.

⁷²July 1, 1920.

⁷³Wells, *No Place For Truth*, p. 8.

⁷⁴Carpenter, “Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism: 1929–1942,” p. 64.

⁷⁵*Ibid.*, p.74

able, fundamentalism, on the other hand, definitely is an identifiable historic religious movement. It has moved in a certain (conservative) direction well-chronicled by historians, its common basis is a set of biblical doctrines and beliefs, and its *esprit* principally is its militant separatism. Fundamentalism is a movement and not an attitude of belligerence, ugliness, or negative mentality as often depicted.

Fundamentalism has always been defined by its beliefs on biblical doctrine. Historically, fundamentalists have held certain core biblical truths, principally concerning Christ and the Scriptures, plus the doctrine of ecclesiastical separation. Together with the practical distinctiveness of militancy, these common biblical convictions have formed the essence of the fundamentalist movement.⁷⁶

In this regard, exception must be taken to those who define fundamentalism as essentially a negative social, cultural, or religious reaction. Bloesch described fundamentalism as “a movement of reaction in the churches in this [present] period of history.”⁷⁷ McGrath likewise concentrates almost exclusively on social and cultural factors, seeing fundamentalism as a reaction within American culture to the emergence of a secular culture. He terms fundamentalism as “oppositionalism,” a “countercultural movement,” and a “separatist attitude toward culture.”⁷⁸ This would be at least partially correct if he had noted that it was *godless* culture that was being opposed. More appalling is the approach of Douglas W. Frank who understands Bible-believers to have awkwardly backed or sort of blundered their way into the twentieth century, solely in terms of (fundamentally Marxist) socioeconomic factors. He impugns the testimony of those who at the time claimed to be following biblical mandates and principles.⁷⁹

Carpenter, on the other hand, was far more historically perceptive at this point when he noted that fundamentalism drew only “part” of its identity from its opposition to liberalism.⁸⁰ He puts little weight on socioeconomic and cultural factors, noting further that “fundamentalism’s commitment to urban evangelism and foreign missions suggests that the

⁷⁶See my “The Self-Identity of Fundamentalism,” *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 1 (Spring 1996) and “Doctrinal Non-Issues in Historic Fundamentalism” 1 (Fall 1996).

⁷⁷Bloesch, *The Future of Evangelical Christianity*, p. 22.

⁷⁸McGrath, *Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity*, pp. 28–29.

⁷⁹Douglas W. Frank, *Less Than Conquerors: How Evangelicals Entered the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986). See my review in *The Sentinel* (published by the Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary) 4 (Fall 1987).

⁸⁰Joel A. Carpenter, “Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism: 1929–1942,” p. 74.

movement was primarily concerned with preaching the evangelical gospel in the twentieth century, both at home and abroad.”⁸¹

George Marsden’s four stages of evangelicalism in the century beginning with the 1870s serve, with slight modification, as suitably paradigmatic for a concise mapping of the fundamentalist movement and its battle with the rising liberal tide in America. His periods are: (1) The 1870s to the end of World War I, a period when evangelicalism was intact in America; (2) 1919–1929, the fundamentalist-modernist controversy; (3) 1929–1940s, a time of withdrawal and regrouping; and (4) 1940s–1970s, the emergence of the new evangelicals, whom he calls “self-conscious evangelicals.”⁸²

The Period of Conflict and Beginnings: 1876–1919

Many institutions, movements, and personalities converged during this period to form historic fundamentalism. There was the Bible Conference movement. The annual summer Bible conferences were a powerful means used by the conservatives to combat liberalism and to promote biblicism. Some of the main characteristics of the Bible Conference era were the teaching and preaching of premillennialism, the exposition of the major or cardinal doctrines of the Bible, and the defense of the Bible as the Word of God. The flavor of the movement was interdenominational, although the Baptists and Presbyterians were dominant. The conferences ignored denominational distinctives due largely to the transdenominational character of liberalism and the perceived need to unitedly confront unbelief by the same characteristic. The Bible Conference era began with the Niagara Bible Conference in 1876⁸³ and died out by the early 1960s.

Another tributary of fundamentalism was the Training School/Bible Institute movement. Originally the Training School or Bible Institute had a two-year curriculum that emphasized Bible content and evangelism. In the 1920s it became a three-year program, and in the 1940s many switched to four and five-year curricula in a Bible College framework by adding liberal arts courses to the Bible major. Some of the prominent schools of the period were Nyack, NY (1882), Moody, Chicago (1886), Gordon, Boston (1889), Trinity Bible Institute, Chicago

⁸¹Ibid. See also Mark Sidwell, “Defining Fundamentalism: A Question of Theology or Sociology?” *Biblical Viewpoint* 30 (November 1996).

⁸²Marsden, “From Fundamentalism to Evangelicalism,” in *The Evangelicals*, p. 122.

⁸³See Larry D. Pettegrew, “The Historical and Theological Contributions of the Niagara Bible Conference to American Fundamentalism” (Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1976).

(1894), Practical Bible Training School, Binghamton, NY (1900), Providence, RI (1900), Northwestern, Minneapolis (1902), Bible Institute of Los Angeles (1907), Northern Baptist Seminary, Chicago (1913), and the Philadelphia School of the Bible (1916).

Another impetus in the rise of the fundamentalist coalition of this period was the presence of popular and influential pastors and evangelists such as D. L. Moody, J. Wilbur Chapman, Billy Sunday, Sam Jones, Gypsy Smith, A. J. Gordon, W. E. Biederwolf, C. I. Scofield, James Brooks, A. T. Pierson, W. J. Eerdman, W. B. Riley, R. A. Torrey, A. C. Gaebelein, and Bob Jones, Sr. These men affirmed the cardinal doctrines, saw souls saved, and started schools and publications. Most were moderately Calvinistic and espoused varying degrees of dispensational premillennialism.

A final and major contributor of the period was the stream of literature that came out of the previous categories of men and institutions. One of the most important was the *Scofield Reference Bible* (1909), the influence of which is practically incalculable.⁸⁴ There were *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth* (1910–15), a series of 12 paperbacks of essays on doctrines and themes crucial to Bible believers. Conceived by Lyman and Milton Stewart, successful Christian businessmen of the Union Oil Company, some three million copies were given away. The Moody Bible Institute, the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, and the Philadelphia School of the Bible each had publishing and/or colportage ventures.⁸⁵ Other noteworthy publications of the time were *The Pilot*, *Our Hope*, *Princeton Theological Review*, *The Watchman Examiner*, *The Watchward*, *The Truth*, *The King's Business*, *The Christian Workers Magazine*, and *The Sunday School Times*. These and other publications gave analytical expression to the issues facing conservatives, exposed the unbelief of liberalism and liberal functionaries, expounded the truths of Scripture, and gave publicity to men and causes who stood for evangelism and the fundamentals of the faith.

The Period of Controversy and Battle: 1919–1929

This is the period commonly known as the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, a gigantic theological and ecclesiastical clash between the old-line conservatives (fundamentalists) and the purveyors of

⁸⁴David O. Beale notes that the *Scofield Reference Bible* was “the single most influential publication in Fundamentalism’s history” (*In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850* [Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1986], p. 37).

⁸⁵Carpenter, “Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism,” pp. 66–67.

post-Enlightenment religion (liberals/modernists).⁸⁶ It had to do with ideas and property—the faith and the furniture. It concerned the truth-claims and belief-system of New Testament Christianity versus an essentially new religion. It was a fight over the retention and control of denominations, mission agencies, colleges, seminaries and other such ecclesiastical institutions. The clash raged between those who had historically sacrificed, founded, and nurtured these organizations and those with alien intentions who were endeavoring to infiltrate and capture them for the spread of theological and philosophical novelties. No one understood the antithesis of the times better than the editor of the liberal *Christian Century*.

The differences between fundamentalism and modernism are not mere surface differences, which can be amiably waved aside or discarded, but...they are foundational differences, structural differences, amounting in their radical dissimilarity almost to the differences between two distinct religions. Christianity according to fundamentalism is one religion. Christianity according to modernism is another religion. [The antithesis implies] that the differences which characterize fundamentalism and modernism are so broad and deep and significant that, if each group holds its respective views consistently and acts upon them with conscientious rigor, they find an alienating gulf between them.... There exists in present-day Christianity two structurally distinct religions, irreconcilable not alone on the side of apologetics but of churchly function and ideal and of missionary propagation.

Two worlds have crashed, the world of tradition and the world of modernism. The God of the fundamentalist is one God; the God of the modernist is another. The Christ of the fundamentalist is one Christ; the Christ of modernism is another. The Bible of the fundamentalist is one Bible; the Bible of modernism is another. The church, the kingdom, the salvation, the consummation of all things—these are one thing to the fundamentalists and another thing to modernists. But that the issue is clear and that the inherent incompatibility of the two worlds has passed the stage of mutual tolerance is a fact concerning which there hardly seems room for any one to doubt.⁸⁷

J. Gresham Machen had seen the issues equally as clearly when in the previous year (1923) he published *Christianity and Liberalism*. He wrote,

We shall be interested in showing that despite the liberal use of traditional phraseology modern liberalism not only is a different religion from Christi-

⁸⁶I note again the dubious idea that fundamentalism and the controversy of the 1920s were simply cultural matters. This is a wholly reductionist notion that fails to capture and explain the genius and spirit of the time.

⁸⁷Charles Clayton Morrison, "Fundamentalism and Modernism, Two Religions," *Christian Century* (Jan 3, 1924), pp. 5–6.

anity but belongs in a totally different class of religions.... Our principal concern just now is to show that the liberal attempt at reconciling Christianity with modern science has really relinquished everything distinctive of Christianity.⁸⁸

The bulk of the controversy of this period affected the northern churches of the United States, principally the northern Presbyterians and the northern Baptists. In the main, it was from the northern tier of fundamentalism that the new evangelicalism emerged. While large dissertations and books have been devoted to the period, only a few of what are judged to be the high points of the time can be noted here.

The World's Christian Fundamentals Association: 1919

The WCFA grew out of the Bible conferences, especially the 1918 Prophecy Conference in Philadelphia. The driving personality behind the WCFA was W. B. Riley, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis, a dynamic speaker from a large downtown metropolitan church who possessed exceptional organizational skills; and he was a militant fundamentalist. The organization was made up of churches, individuals, and other organizations, and it published literature, held rallies, and had aspirations in the field of education.⁸⁹

Large anti-evolution rallies were probably the distinctive of the WCFA. There was a shift among fundamentalists from an emphasis on prophecy to the "fundamentals" during a couple of years prior to the founding of the WCFA. Evolution became a prominent national issue, highlighted by the famous Scopes trial in Tennessee in 1925. Riley traversed the nation holding anti-evolution rallies and public debates. The WCFA attracted some prominent names of the time. Riley noted in 1943 that of the original number of ministers who joined the WCFA those still living were himself, J. C. Masee, P. W. Philpot, Lewis Sperry Chafer, William Pettingill, and George McNealy. Those who had gone to be with the Lord were Charles Alexander, R. A. Torrey, James M. Gray, Paul Rader, C. I. Scofield, W. H. Griffith Thomas, John Roach Straton, L. W. Munhall, I. M. Haldeman, Joseph Kyle, George E. Guile, and A. B. Winchester.⁹⁰ The WCFA began to wane in the late 1920s for a number of reasons, principally because the issues became less

⁸⁸Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism*, p. 7.

⁸⁹Out of the WCFA the idea of a fundamentalist seminary was proposed, which eventually saw the establishment in 1924 of the Evangelical Theological College in Dallas, TX, now the Dallas Theological Seminary. W. H. Griffith Thomas and others were the founders.

⁹⁰Riley, "World's Christian Fundamentals Association," *The Pilot* (June 1943), p. 259.

attractive and other groups had similar emphases or became more popular in their own right.⁹¹ W. B. Riley was president of the WCFA from 1919–1929, Sidney Smith from 1929–1931, and Paul Rood from 1931–1952, after which it merged with the Slavic Gospel Association. The WCFA made a serious impact for fundamentalism in the great controversy of the times.

The Fundamentalist Fellowship: 1920

The fundamentalist-modernist controversy in the Northern Baptist Convention had its principal locus around the Fundamentalist Fellowship. The Fellowship was formed in 1920 in opposition to the liberalism that had infected the Convention from its beginning in 1907 but which had begun to rise to dominance particularly within the ecclesiastical infrastructure. The main impetus that triggered the fundamentalist-modernist controversy in the Convention and the subsequent establishment of the Fundamentalist Fellowship was the Interchurch World Movement. Begun after World War I, it was an interdenominational relief organization controlled by liberals that wanted \$100 million from the Baptists. The 1919 Convention voted to participate, and the fundamentalists objected. The Fundamentalist Fellowship grew out of the 1920 pre-Convention conference, June 21–22, in Buffalo, NY.

The Fundamentalist Fellowship was essentially non-separatist in the sense that it was not its intent to leave the Convention but to be a catalyst for fundamentalism within in the hopes of purging the modernists and recapturing the Convention's political machinery. It had a "loyal opposition" mentality, a "separation from within" type of purpose. Its principal mode of operation was to hold pre-convention meetings to plan strategy to combat the modernists. There were militant fundamentalists in the Fellowship (such as W. B. Riley, John Roach Straton, William Pettingill, and Robert T. Ketcham) and moderate fundamentalists (such as Russell Conwell, Curtis Lee Laws, J. C. Masee, James Whitcomb Brougner, John Marvin Dean, and Frank Goodchild). As a legacy of the loyal opposition philosophy, of the 156 signers of the original call for the pre-Convention conference, few ever actually left the Northern Baptist Convention. The first president was J. C. Masee, pastor of prestigious churches such as the Baptist Temple, Brooklyn, NY and the

⁹¹The Research Science Bureau, begun by Harry Rimmer in 1920, the Anti-Evolution league, begun by Riley himself in 1923, the beginning of the American Council of Christian Churches by Carl McIntire in 1941, the formation of the National Association of Evangelicals in 1942, and the denominational concerns and struggles among fundamentalists beginning around 1930 all proved to be in competition with the WCFA and its goals and emphases.

Tremont Temple, Boston.⁹²

The fundamentalists were almost routinely defeated on the Convention floor, the most notable and perhaps the most strategic being the 1922 gathering in Indianapolis. The chief combatants were W. B. Riley, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis and Cornelius Woelfkin, former professor of Rochester Seminary and pastor of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, New York City. Speaking for the fundamentalists, Riley moved the adoption of the historic and conservative New Hampshire Confession of Faith as the creedal/confessional basis of the Convention, thereby hoping to gain the ecclesiastical leverage necessary to deal with the modernists. Woelfkin shrewdly proposed in a substitute motion that the New Testament itself serve as such a basis. The modernists prevailed overwhelmingly, and the fundamentalists thereafter were continually defeated on the Convention floor until the Fundamentalist Fellowship made an open break with the Convention in the early 1940s by launching the Conservative Baptist movement.

The Baptist Bible Union: 1923⁹³

There was considerable agitation within Baptist fundamentalism for a much larger testimony that would transcend its Northern Baptist Convention denominational boundaries. Furthermore, there was dissatisfaction in some quarters with the loyal opposition, moderate approach of J. C. Masee and the Fundamentalist Fellowship.

The Baptist Bible Union was formed in Kansas City, MO, in 1923 with three main influential leaders: W. B. Riley of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis, J. Frank Norris, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Fort Worth, TX, and T. T. Shields, pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church of Toronto. Shields was the president. The Union was more organized, more separatistic, and more militant in its stance than the Fundamentalist Fellowship. Its strategy was to withhold support from non-sympathetic schools and mission agencies rather than supporting them while trying to purge them of the bad elements. The Union had a plan of procedure that projected the organization of new schools,⁹⁴ publishing efforts,⁹⁵ and missionary endeavors.⁹⁶

⁹²For a biographical study on Masee, consult C. Allyn Russell, *Voices of American Fundamentalism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), pp. 106–34.

⁹³A definitive work on this subject is that by Robert G. Delnay, “A History of the Baptist Bible Union” (Th. D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1963).

⁹⁴For example, it took over and ran Des Moines University as a separatist, fundamentalist institution from 1927–1929 (Ibid., pp. 180–226).

⁹⁵The Union had a magazine, *The Baptist Bible Union Herald*, later named *The Fundamental Baptist*. Some of the pastors had their own publications. Riley, for example,

The Union men had met continual defeats within the Northern Baptist Convention. Also, one of the leaders of the Union, J. Frank Norris, was involved in the fatal shooting of D. L. Chipps, a local adversary of Norris, in 1926.⁹⁷ This earned Norris a good deal of opprobrium even from men within the Union causing a serious disruption of the fellowship. And then there was the controversy, amid rumors of improprieties, and the subsequent student riot at the Des Moines University in 1929, causing the school's eventual dissolution and a further disturbance within the Baptist Bible Union.⁹⁸ The Baptist Bible Union declined in importance and eventually was reconstituted as the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches in 1932.

The Northern Presbyterian Conflict

Presbyterian ministers had been prominent in the Bible conference and Bible college movements, such as James H. Brookes, W. J. Eerdman, L. W. Munhall, Billy Sunday, William E. Biederwolf, A. T. Pierson, Thomas C. Horton, William Evans, William Jennings Bryan, Charles G. Trumbull, and Lewis Sperry Chafer. Liberalism crept into the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. through lax presbyteries that would ordain men of liberal views, especially the New York presbytery. In the late 1890s there were three prominent heresy trials in the Presbyterian church: Henry Preserved Smith (1892), C. A. Briggs (1893), and A. C. McGiffert (1899). There was also an attempt, agitated by Philip Schaff and C. A. Briggs, among others, to revise the Westminster Confession in order to tone down its Calvinism and to give space to new ideas of a liberal slant. While all of these ended in technical victories for the conservatives, the denomination eventually succumbed to the new thought.

Several issues were involved in the controversy of the 1920s such as liberalism on the mission fields and the case of Harry Emerson Fosdick, a liberal Baptist who had become the associate pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of New York City.⁹⁹ Another issue was the Auburn

published *The Baptist Beacon*, Norris had *The Searchlight*, and Shields put out *The Gospel Witness*, the latter becoming sort of the official organ of the Union when Shields was the leader. A wide and aggressive colporteur endeavor for the Union was planned early on (Delnay, "A History of the Baptist Bible Union," p. 71).

⁹⁶Ibid., pp. 73–80.

⁹⁷Dollar, *The History of Fundamentalism in America*, p. 168.

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 110. Delnay said, "The collapse of Des Moines University...ruined the Baptist Bible Union" ("A History of the Baptist Bible Union", p. 238).

⁹⁹For a description of the Fosdick issue, see Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity*, pp. 153–55 and Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 2:338–39, 347, 350.

Affirmation. In 1910 the General Assembly had adopted the famous “five fundamentals,”¹⁰⁰ and they were reaffirmed in 1916 and 1923. A committee of 15 located in Auburn, NY drew up an affirmation that denied that the fundamentals should be required beliefs for ordination. The General Assembly of 1924 declared the five-point doctrinal statement affirmed in 1923 to be unconstitutional, a bitter defeat for the Bible-believers.¹⁰¹

In the wake of the Auburn Affirmation controversy, a Peace Commission of 15 (liberals and conservatives) was appointed to deal with the unrest in the church. In 1927 it presented its recommendation that the five-point doctrinal statement no longer be required for ordination, opting instead for a bland statement that the standard is “the Word of God as the Spirit speaks through it.”¹⁰² This was passed by the General Assembly.

The final indignity for the fundamental conservatives and the removal of any hope for the Presbyterian Church was the reorganization of Princeton Theological Seminary. Turmoil between the hard-line conservatives and those with less restrictive views had been brewing in the Seminary for a number of years.¹⁰³ A committee was appointed in 1926 to look into the turbulence. Princeton Seminary had been operating with two boards, one for education and the other for finances. The committee recommended a reorganized administration with one board, and that tipped the balance of power towards the liberals. The reorganization brought sort of a religious syncretism to the Seminary and precipitated the exodus of several professors to form the Westminster Theological Seminary in 1929.¹⁰⁴

The Scopes Evolution Trial: 1925

One of the more celebrated events of the 1920s religious controversy was the Scopes evolution trial in Dayton, TN in 1925. William Jennings Bryan was secured as one of the prosecutors of John T. Scopes, a school

¹⁰⁰They were the inerrancy of the original manuscripts of Scripture, the virgin birth of Christ, the vicarious atonement of Christ, the bodily resurrection of Christ, and the reality of biblical miracles.

¹⁰¹Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 2:350.

¹⁰²Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity*, p. 161.

¹⁰³Calhoun acknowledges the problem with designations for the two groups at Princeton Seminary at the time. While not strictly divided into liberal and fundamental, one group was militantly antagonistic toward liberalism and the other was tolerant; one stressed doctrine and the other peace and unity (*Princeton Seminary*, 2:512).

¹⁰⁴Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity*, p. 169.

teacher accused of violating the anti-evolution law of the state of Tennessee. The noted, flamboyant Clarence Darrow, retained by the American Civil Liberties Union, was one of the defense attorneys. The trial attracted national attention. While the verdict was a victory for the prosecution, the media fallout was almost wholly negative for the fundamentalists. The Scopes trial left a generally bad aftertaste against fundamentalism in that Bryan, somewhat out of his league as a trial lawyer in a civil-religious-scientific suit, seemed outmaneuvered by Darrow in the eyes of most, and fundamentalism was publicly made to appear ridiculous.

The Period of Consolidation and Building: 1929–1940s

This was a period of the formation of fundamentalist groups, associations of churches, schools, mission agencies, and the like around strong fundamentalist leaders. In most cases there had been attempts to purge an organization of liberalism and these attempts had failed to accomplish that purpose. Fundamentalists then resorted to the only recourse open to them—separation and rebuilding. This period saw the beginning of true separatism. Prior to this, fundamentalists were “separatistic”; i.e., they tried to separate the liberals from their organizations. That having failed, they were forced to separate themselves from the liberals in a more formal practice of ecclesiastical separation.¹⁰⁵

Westminster Theological Seminary, 1929: J. Gresham Machen

The reorganization of Princeton Theological Seminary in 1929 represented a victory for the liberals. The conservatives’ outspoken leader in the struggle was J. Gresham Machen, a Princeton graduate and faculty member since 1906.¹⁰⁶ Machen and three other Princeton faculty members resigned¹⁰⁷ and formed the Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia on September 25, 1929.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵Beale rightly describes these two stages as “nonconformist” fundamentalism and “separatist” fundamentalism (*In Pursuit of Purity*, pp. 5–6). Carpenter notes: “Fundamentalist efforts to cleanse the denominations of liberal trends had seemed to fail. Rather than persisting along the 1920s lines of conflict, fundamentalists during the 1930s were developing their own institutional base from which to carry on their major purpose: the proclamation of the evangelical gospel” (“Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism: 1929–1942,” p. 73).

¹⁰⁶Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 2:233.

¹⁰⁷Robert Dick Wilson, Oswald T. Allis, and Cornelius Van Til. They were joined by four Princeton graduates: Allan MacRae, Paul Wooley, Ned Stonehouse, and R. B. Kuiper (*ibid.*, p. 396).

¹⁰⁸*Ibid.*, p. 395.

**The Independent Fundamental Churches of America, 1930:
William McCarrell**

The IFCA grew out of the American Conference of Udenominational Churches, formed in 1923 in Iowa. The ACUC met for six annual conventions and grew from 24 members to 150 in 1929.¹⁰⁹ In the Chicago area there were some fundamental Congregational churches, among which was the Morton Park Congregational Church (later called the Cicero Bible Church), pastored by Dr. William "Billy" McCarrell. After the Illinois State Congregational Conference united with the Universalists, the fundamentalists eventually withdrew. McCarrell's church voted out of the Congregational Association in January 1930.¹¹⁰ On January 22, 1930, McCarrell and other interested men met at the Cicero Bible Church to consider uniting with the ACUC. On February 6, 1930, 39 men met in the Cicero Bible Church under the leadership of McCarrell principally. This meeting resulted in a motion to affiliate with the ACUC. In June 1930 the annual convention of the American Conference of Udenominational Churches met at the Cicero Bible Church at which time it enlarged and strengthened its doctrinal statement and became the Independent Fundamental Churches of America. Influential men in the IFCA movement were M. R. DeHaan, Wendell P. Loveless, W. L. Pettingill, M. H. Reynolds, Sr., J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., Louis Talbot, John Walvoord, and William E. Ashbrook.¹¹¹

**The General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, 1932:
Robert T. Ketcham and Others**

The GARBC was the successor to the Baptist Bible Union which had been in decline for several years. The last annual meeting of the Union was in May 1932, in the Belden Avenue Baptist Church, Chicago, with only 34 delegates in attendance. There apparently had been no meeting in 1931. Out of the Bible Union the GARBC was formed by Baptist fundamentalist leaders such as Robert T. Ketcham, Harry Hamilton (president), O. W. VanOsdel, and Earle Griffith (vice president), among others. Ketcham and Griffith pastored in Ohio and were instrumental in forming the Ohio Association of Independent Baptist

¹⁰⁹James O. Henry, *For Such A Time As This: A History of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America* (Westchester, IL: Independent Fundamental Churches of America, 1983), pp. 29–31.

¹¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 37.

¹¹¹Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America* (Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1973), p. 223. *Dictionary of Christianity in America*, s.v. "Independent Fundamental Churches of America," by C. E. Hall, p. 573.

Churches. Hamilton pastored First Baptist Church, Buffalo, NY. VanOsdel pastored Wealthy Street Baptist Church in Grand Rapids, MI, and had started the Michigan Orthodox Baptist Association.

The GARBC had three general characteristics early on: it was composed of churches and not individuals, it was a fellowship not a convention, and it had the practice of "approving" existing agencies rather than starting them. It was also required that churches sever all connections with modernism, direct or indirect, before membership in the GARBC could be obtained.

Ecclesiastical separation was a hallmark of the Association from the beginning. The Baptist Bible Union, as originally envisioned and implemented, was a separatist movement.¹¹² However, some of the early leaders, notably W. B. Riley and T. T. Shields, disavowed separatism at that juncture in their lives and ministries, and Riley especially steered the Bible Union away from separatism before it was formally organized in May 1923.¹¹³ The Baptist Bible Union became more of a separatistic protest group within the Northern Baptist Convention rather than a strictly separatist movement. The separatist mentality, however, was still a viable though subliminal stratum in the Bible Union. It became fairly obvious to many after the defeats of the Union men in the 1926 and 1927 Conventions that separation was the only final solution to the modernism issue.¹¹⁴ This was finally realized in 1932 with the formation of the GARBC and its strong separatist requirement for membership.

The Independent Board For Presbyterian Foreign Missions, 1933:

J. Gresham Machen

Liberalism on the mission fields of the Presbyterian Board for Foreign Missions had been a problem for some time. In 1920 W. H. Griffith Thomas and Lewis Sperry Chafer visited the mission field in China and came back with the report of modernism and higher criticism among Presbyterian ministers.¹¹⁵ J. Gresham Machen spoke out against this modernism in missions and presented evidence of liberalism on mission fields. As a result he led in the organization of the Independent Board For Presbyterian Foreign Missions in 1933. The General Assembly declared the board to be divisive and ordered the members who were Presbyterians to withdraw or stand ecclesiastical trial. Machen and oth-

¹¹²Delnay, "A History of the Baptist Bible Union," p. 52.

¹¹³Ibid., pp. 52-54.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 238. J. Murray Murdoch, *Portrait of Obedience: The Biography of Robert T. Ketcham* (Schaumburg, IL: Regular Baptist Press, 1979), p. 128.

¹¹⁵Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity*, p. 317.

ers refused to withdraw and consequently were suspended from the Presbyterian ministry. In 1936 Machen led in the formation of the Presbyterian Church of America, which was later named the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.¹¹⁶

Grace Theological Seminary, 1937: Alva J. McClain and Herman A. Hoyt

Liberalism had invaded the Ashland College and Theological Seminary, Brethren schools in Ashland, Ohio. Alva J. McClain, from the beginning of his ministry, opposed the inroads of modernism in the Brethren Church. He was a professor in the college (1925–1927) and later (1930) the directing leader, dean, and, supported by Professor Herman A. Hoyt, the guiding light for fundamental conservatism against the incursion of worldliness and liberalism in the seminary. McClain and Hoyt were dismissed from the faculty of the seminary in 1937, and this precipitated the founding of Grace Theological Seminary in the fall of that year. In 1939 the National Fellowship of Brethren Churches was formed after two stormy years of controversy between the Ashland and Grace groups within the Brethren Church.¹¹⁷

The American Council of Christian Churches, 1941: Carl McIntire

The ACCC began in New York City on September 17, 1941. The leader and first president was Carl McIntire, a militant fundamentalist who, along with J. Gresham Machen and others, had been suspended by the Presbyterian Church a few years earlier. The initial impetus for the founding of the Council was to be a protest against the Federal (now National) Council of Churches, a liberal federation, and to be a witness for fundamentalist separatism. The Federal Council had become the representative for Protestantism with the federal government. McIntire challenged that right and thus gained recognition for fundamentalist chaplains in the military as well as securing free radio time.¹¹⁸ The stated purpose of the ACCC was and still is

¹¹⁶Russell, *Voices of American Fundamentalism*, p. 156.

¹¹⁷See Alva J. McClain, "The Background and Origin of Grace Theological Seminary," in *Charis: The History of Grace Theological Seminary 1931–1951*, ed. John C. Whitcomb (Winona Lake, IN: Grace Theological Seminary, 1951), pp. 9–38, and Homer A. Kent, Sr., *250 Years... Conquering Frontiers: A History of the Brethren Church* (Winona Lake, IN: Brethren Missionary Herald, 1958), pp. 125–168.

¹¹⁸*Dictionary of Christianity in America*, s.v., "American Council of Christian Churches," by The Editors, p. 45.

to expose and oppose liberalism, socialism and...communism...to unify those Protestants who believe in an inerrant Bible, each denomination however, retaining its identity and full autonomy; to obtain advantages for the historic Christian Faith in America and all lands.¹¹⁹

The Conservative Baptist Movement, 1943:

R. V. Clearwaters and Others

For over twenty years the Fundamentalist Fellowship within the Northern Baptist Convention continued to agitate against liberalism and endeavored to capture the machinery of the convention from the modernists. The “loyal opposition” and “separation from within” mindset had prevented these fundamentalists from an open break with the convention as had been done earlier by the Baptist Bible Union/GARBC men.¹²⁰

After decades of failure to accomplish a cleansing of the Northern Baptist Foreign Mission Society from liberal control,¹²¹ the Fundamentalist Fellowship (renamed the Conservative Baptist Fellowship in 1946) launched the Conservative Baptist organizations by first establishing the Conservative Baptist Foreign Mission Society in 1943, with Vincent Brushwyler as the general director. The Conservative Baptist Association of America, an association of churches, was begun in 1947 with I. Cedric Peterson as the general director, followed by B. Myron Cedarholm a short time later.¹²² The Conservative Baptist Home Mission Society was formally organized in 1950, having operated with provisional organization since 1948. George Washburn was the first general director, followed by Rufus Jones in 1952.¹²³

The Conservative Baptist movement began as a separatist fundamentalist movement. The statement of purpose of the Conservative Baptist

¹¹⁹Constant H. Jacquet, Jr., ed., *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches 1984* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1984), p. 8, quoted in Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity*, p. 368.

¹²⁰The framers of the (later) Conservative Baptist movement took criticism over the years for this delay and for allowing churches membership in the Northern Baptist Convention while joining the CB movement; i.e., a *complete* break with the apostasy was not required for membership in CB organizations. Justification of the criticism was tacitly admitted decades later (R. V. Clearwaters, “The GARB Guilt Complex of Dr. Merle R. Hull, Editor of The Baptist Bulletin,” *Central Testimony* [published by Central Baptist Theological Seminary of Minneapolis] 10 [Sept–Oct 1968]).

¹²¹Chester E. Tulga, *The Foreign Missions Controversy in the Northern Baptist Convention: 30 Years of Struggle for a Pure Missionary Society* (Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1950). Shelley, *A History of Conservative Baptists*, pp. 26–47.

¹²²Shelley, *A History of Conservative Baptists*, pp. 48–62.

¹²³*Ibid.*, pp. 63–66.

tist Association of America said explicitly that the organization was to “provide a fellowship of churches and individuals upon a thoroughly Biblical and historically Baptist basis, unmixed with liberals and liberalism and those who are content to walk in fellowship with unbelief and inclusivism.”¹²⁴

Other Formations

Bob Jones College was established by Evangelist Bob Jones, Sr. in 1927 at St. Andrews Bay, FL. John R. Rice started the *Sword of the Lord* on September 28, 1934. The Los Angeles Baptist Seminary began in 1927, Baptist Bible Seminary (Johnson City, NY) in 1932, Western Baptist Bible College in 1935, Baptist Bible Seminary (Ft. Worth, TX) in 1939, and Grand Rapids Baptist College in 1941.

Thus by the 1930s fundamentalism had gone through a major struggle with liberalism, had regrouped itself, and had made a fresh start with new organizations and institutions around strong leaders. At this point, the terms fundamentalism and evangelicalism were being used interchangeably, and would continue so into the 1940s and 1950s.¹²⁵ In the late 1930s and early 1940s there was agitation within the fundamentalist/evangelical ranks against the separatism of the fundamentalists. This stirring led to the founding of the National Association of Evangelicals in 1942, a major and decisive step in the formation of a new coalition self-styled as the “new evangelicalism.” This new group and other events—such as the founding of the Fuller Theological Seminary, the publication of *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, the rise of ecumenical evangelism with Billy Graham, and the launching of *Christianity Today*, among others, brought an entirely new movement, distinct from fundamentalism, into being. A later article will examine the rise of the new evangelicalism around those factors and events.

¹²⁴CBA: Its Mission” (Chicago: Conservative Baptist Association of America, B. Myron Cedarholm, General Director, pamphlet, n.d.).

¹²⁵Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 152