

THE FORMATION OF THE NEW EVANGELICALISM (PART TWO): HISTORICAL BEGINNINGS

by
Rolland D. McCune

In the early 1940s there arose notes of dissatisfaction with fundamentalism from among those who were within the general pale of the fundamentalist cause. Their historical and educational roots were in fundamentalism, and organizationally they were within the broader fundamentalist movement. Their feelings came to light in various publications and actions. Over the course of ten to fifteen years they planned, agitated, and eventually launched a coalition self-styled as the “new” evangelicalism. The plan here is to chronicle the rise of the new evangelicalism through a series of crucial issues and events that reflected the dissatisfaction with fundamentalism in such a way as to participate in and promote a new movement. These issues overlap in many cases, so that it must not be construed that they were separate and unrelated factors that gave rise to the new thought. For example, dispensationalism impacted several areas, and the matter of ecclesiastical separation was found intruding itself into many of the differences that the moderate evangelicals had with the fundamentalists in the struggles of the 1940s and 50s.

THE UNITY/SEPARATION ISSUE: THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS (1942)

With the formation of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) new evangelicalism was conceived if not born. The distinction between “fundamentalist” and “evangelical” was beginning to take shape at this point,¹ and the decisive measure, the “most explosive issue” and

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

¹Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford, 1997), p. 152. Elsewhere he noted that part of the significance of the call to form the NAE was that it represented “a ferment within Fundamentalism.” “The Fundamentalist Leaven and the Rise of an Evangelical United Front,” *The*

“dilemma”² for the dissatisfied element within fundamentalism was the issue of separation from corrupt denominations. The agitators for change were loyal to the fundamentals of fundamentalism but they also wanted to be loyal to their own denominations, which were capitulating to liberalism, and thus infiltrate and recapture them for orthodoxy.³ They as well wanted to present a genuine alternative to other religious groups, such as the current fundamentalism, neoliberalism, and neoorthodoxy, in a positive not negative manner. Ellingsen well describes the unity/separation issue and its ultimate resolution:

In many ways this desire to present the old fundamentals of the faith in a positive, not merely defensive way was to set the agenda and rationale for the emergence of Evangelicalism out of its original Fundamentalist heritage.⁴

The vision for a cooperative, unified evangelical voice that did not have the supposed stigma of fundamentalist negativism nor the doctrinal heresies of liberalism is to be ascribed to J. Elwin Wright, leader of a group of evangelicals called The New England Fellowship, which he founded in 1929. Referring probably to the World’s Christian Fundamentals Association (begun in 1919) and the American Council of Christian Churches (begun in 1941), if not also the Federal Council of Churches (begun in 1908), Wright declared at the organizational meeting of the NAE in April 1942:

Although several movements having similar objectives are in the field, it is evident that none of these have succeeded in winning the confidence and support of that vast section of Protestantism still loyal to the historic doctrinal positions of the Church.⁵

Wright had been touring the country from 1939 to 1941 stirring up revival fires and pressing for a new coalition of evangelicals.

Another energetic and capable leader in the efforts to form a new united evangelical organization was Harold John Ockenga, pastor of Park Street [Congregational] Church, Boston (1936–1969). He was a

Evangelical Tradition in America, ed. Leonard I. Sweet (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), p. 260.

²George Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 6–7.

³Ibid.

⁴Mark Ellingsen, *The Evangelical Movement: Growth, Impact, Controversy, Dialog* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), p. 99.

⁵Wright, “An Historical Statement,” *Evangelical Action! A Report of the Organization of the National Association of Evangelicals for United Action*, compiled and edited by the Executive Committee (Boston: United Action Press, 1942), p. v.

graduate of Taylor University, attended Princeton Seminary, and was graduated from Westminster Seminary in 1930. He received the Ph.D. from the University of Pittsburgh in 1939. In 1936, after serving for five years as an assistant to Dr. Clarence MacCartney at First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Ockenga was chosen as pastor of Park Street Church. In 1940 and 1941, he and J. Elwin Wright planned and promoted what became the NAE, and Ockenga eventually served for several years as its first president.⁶

At the Moody Bible Institute on October 27–28, 1941, some evangelical leaders first met for prayer and discussion concerning the formation of the new endeavor. An organizational meeting was held in St. Louis on April 7–8, 1942.⁷ In the understanding of the evangelicals in the early 1940s, the three great enemies that they faced were Roman Catholicism, liberalism/modernism, and secularism (generally in the form of Franklin D. Roosevelt's political liberalism, and international communism).⁸ Even liberals at the time were concerned about the

⁶Data on Ockenga was gleaned from "Harold J. Ockenga: Chairman of the Board [an interview]," *Christianity Today* (Nov 6, 1981), pp. 26–30; Randy Frame, "Modern Evangelicalism Mourns the Loss of One of Its Founding Fathers," *Christianity Today* (Mar 15, 1985), pp. 34–36, and EDT, s.v. "Ockenga, Harold John (1905–1985)," by J. A. Carpenter, p. 837.

⁷Joel A. Carpenter, "From Fundamentalism to the New Evangelical Coalition," *Evangelicalism and Modern America*, ed. George Marsden (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 12.

⁸Harold John Ockenga, "The Unvoiced Multitudes," A Report of the Organization of the NAE, pp. 26–31. These three items were the main reasons given for considering the formation of a new body. See also his "The Last Word," *Christian Life and Times* (October 1947), p. 52. Ockenga saw in the increase of government at the expense of private interests and capitalism "the most tremendous danger of all" ("The Unvoiced Multitudes," p. 31). William Pettingill called Catholicism, Modernism, and Secularism the "Big Three" (*Christian Life and Times* [October 1947], p. 101). Carl F. H. Henry feared fundamentalism would become a despised and oppressed sect "in the event of Roman Catholic domination in the United States" (*The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans], preface). William Ward Ayer deplored the advancing "statism" and the government's recognition of the Federal Council of Churches as representative of Protestantism. He declared, "evangelical Christianity has the America of our fathers to save. Evangelicals have the 'keys of the kingdom'" ("Evangelical Christianity Endangered By Its Fragmented Condition," in *A Report of the Organization of the NAE*, pp. 42, 46).

For the fear of communism, see Carpenter, "From Fundamentalism to the New Evangelical Coalition," pp. 6, 9; Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, pp. 154–55; and H. H. Savage, "United Evangelical Action" (presidential address at the 1955 NAE convention), *United Evangelical Action* (May 1, 1955), p. 3. An implicit polemic against communism can be seen in Carl F. H. Henry, "Christianity and Social Reform," *Bulletin of the Moravian Theological Seminary* (1960), pp. 22, 24, 27. For an outright polemic see Edward John Carnell, *A Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952), chapter 4, "Bread Alone?" pp. 83–128, as well as Henry, "Christianity and Economic Crisis," *United Evangelical Action* (May 1, 1955), pp. 7–9.

strength of Roman Catholicism.⁹

Ockenga's formula for meeting the spiritual enemies of the day were, first, unity; fundamentalism faced a "terrible indictment" for its "failures, divisions, and controversies." Rugged individualism was a "millstone" that must be repudiated.¹⁰ Second, doctrinal purity, an emphasis on the cardinal evangelical doctrines of Christianity.¹¹ And third, "consecrated love."¹²

Interestingly, some separatist fundamentalists were in sympathy with the early aims and goals of the NAE despite the recently-formed fundamentalist American Council of Christian Churches (1941) by Carl McIntire, Robert Ketcham, and others. John R. Rice and Bob Jones Sr. and Jr., for example, worked within the NAE to promote evangelistic campaigns throughout the country.¹³ However, during the early 1950s Rice and the Joneses, who "led the fundamentalist faction,"¹⁴ and other fundamentalist leaders dropped out of the NAE because of its weak position on separation. These departures confirmed the leadership of the NAE in the hands of those with less restrictive convictions who wanted a softer stand and a far less militant direction. NAE polemics against unorthodoxy accordingly died down.¹⁵

The NAE was criticized from both the left and the right. Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the liberal *Christian Century*, noted that "in the formation of the National Association of Evangelicals For United Action, the atomistic sectarianism which has long been a scandal of Protestant Christianity appears to be receiving a new lease on life."¹⁶ Fundamentalist W. B. Riley decried the NAE as a "divisive

⁹Harold Fey, "Can Catholicism Win America?" a series of eight articles, *The Christian Century* (Nov 29, 1944 through Jan 17, 1945). Even liberals were trying to "win America."

¹⁰Ockenga, "Unvoiced Multitudes," p. 32.

¹¹Ibid., p. 34.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Farly P. Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1976), p. 29. Mark Taylor Dalhouse, *An Island in the Lake of Fire: Bob Jones University, Fundamentalism, and the Separatist Movement* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1996), p. 53.

¹⁴Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," p. 29. See also Dalhouse, *An Island in A Lake of Fire*, p. 73, and Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, p. 159.

¹⁵Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," p. 29.

¹⁶Charles Clayton Morrison, "Sectarianism Receives New Lease on Life," *Christian Century* (May 19, 1943), p. 596.

organization."¹⁷ He forcefully reproved the NAE leaders for not joining in with the World's Christian Fundamentals Association (in whose formation he had a principal role in 1919) because it did not fully represent them, and strongly suggested that there was pride of leadership among the NAE men that only fosters division.¹⁸ One of his final comments on the NAE was that "it has effected some very positive divisions, and doubtless will itself become just another semi-fundamentalist movement, illustrating afresh the fact that Fundamentalists defeat themselves by divisions."¹⁹

Carl McIntire, who was instrumental in starting the American Council of Christian Churches in 1941, wanted the NAE men to join the ACCC. Various talks were held between the two groups, but it became obvious that the NAE was less restrictive on ecclesiastical separation, and thus it refused to join up with the ACCC.²⁰ Clyde Taylor, past general director of the NAE, on its thirtieth anniversary (1972) said three issues separated the NAE and the ACCC men: ecclesiastical separation, the question of creating a council of churches vis-a-vis a fellowship of evangelicals, and the difference between a "polemical" and a "constructive" approach in dealing with the theological and ecclesiastical issues of modernism.²¹ In short, the ACCC fundamentalist separatism offended the NAE moderates such as Harold Ockenga, Donald Grey Barnhouse, John Bradbury, Will Houghton, and J. Elwin Wright, and union was impossible.²² From then on McIntire was a constant critic of the NAE. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., who was part of the original organization of the ACCC, reported the difference between the two groups.

Our interests and purposes were similar in many ways. With others of the

¹⁷Riley, "The Fatal Weakness of Fundamentalism," *The Pilot* (May 1942), p. 227. The "weakness" was the failure to unite together strong leaders with sound doctrine in an established organization, doubtlessly meaning the World's Christian Fundamentals Association.

¹⁸Riley, "National Association of Evangelicals For United Action," *The Pilot* (November 1942), pp. 53–54. He proposed a clearing house for fundamentalist activities composed of representatives from the various groups (WCFA, NAE, and ACCC).

¹⁹Riley, "National Association of Evangelicals," *The Pilot* (October 1943), p. 31.

²⁰Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," p. 16. The issue was the ACCC position of separation from the Federal Council of Churches and from any denomination which was a member of the Federal Council. One compromise proposal that was finally rejected by the NAE leaders was that membership in the NAE could be predicated on the fact that there was at least a *willingness* formally to go on record as being opposed to and repudiating the Federal Council.

²¹Clyde W. Taylor, "NAE Celebrates 30 Years of Service," *Action* (Spring 1972), p. 9.

²²Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, pp. 145–46.

ACCC I attended the meeting [the NAE organizational meeting in St. Louis, 1942] and prayed for rapprochement and understanding. But our differences came clearly to light. The NAE view crystallized in opposition to the ACCC constitutional provision that constituent membership be limited to denominations not in the Federal Council. Thus the NAE was formed of brethren who sincerely desired to spread the Gospel but who did not see the doctrine of the purity of the visible Church as we believe the Bible sets it forth.²³

While there was criticism from both the left and the right, most evangelical pastors and leaders were sympathetic to the new group. Typical were the encouraging words of Lewis Sperry Chafer, editor of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*:

There is genuine ground for encouragement in the nationwide movement which has been styled the *National Association of Evangelicals for United Action*, which has as its objective the uniting of the vast evangelical forces in America for the fair and reasonable expression of their convictions. This movement was born by the Holy Spirit in the minds of certain prominent evangelicals in the East.... This new undertaking for united action deserves the support by prayer and gifts of all those who have a heart for the vital things of God.²⁴

The formation of the National Association of Evangelicals was a watershed event in the rise of the new evangelicalism and in the history of fundamentalism/evangelicalism. It was part of an agenda that was clear to certain leaders who were convinced that the fundamentalism of the 1920s and 30s was not suitable for the new generation of evangelicals and their vision for the future. That being the case, Clyde Taylor's observation is significant that most of the agitators for change, and the majority of those at the first meeting of the NAE, had not personally been involved in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy.²⁵ With the NAE the "refurbishing" of fundamentalism had begun.²⁶ Nevertheless, Carpenter is entirely correct when he writes: "...fundamentalists provided the initial vision and leadership for 'united evangelical action.'" Like the Methodists in the early nineteenth century and the holiness people in the late nineteenth century, "the fundamentalists were the

²³Buswell, "The American and International Council of Christian Churches," *Christianity Today* (Jan 29, 1965), p. 9.

²⁴Chafer, "United Action of Evangelicals," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 39 (Oct-Dec 1942): 385-86. See also his testimonial in *United Action*, p. 144.

²⁵Clyde W. Taylor, "NAE Celebrates 30 Years of Service," *Action* (Spring 1972), p. 9. Taylor was the general director of the NAE from 1963-1974, having served in various other capacities since 1944.

²⁶Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, p. 153.

salient evangelical movement in the 1920s."²⁷

One can only speculate what might have been if the separatist fundamentalists had prevailed in the progress and direction of the NAE. Early Butler muses somewhat pensively:

Had the NAE men, the Baptist fundamentalists led by [John R.] Rice, the independent fundamentalists represented by [Bob] Jones, and the men of the American Council been joined together in a strong organization with a clear platform, the history of evangelicalism in the next years might have been far different.²⁸

Indeed, there were efforts to unite the two factions (separatists and moderates) within the pale of the new organization. During the early years of the NAE, most of the leaders hoped for a reconciliation between the two groups and a merger made possible. Bob Jones and John R. Rice were heard to discuss the hope of bringing the two groups together.²⁹ In fact, in the *Sword of the Lord* Rice urged people to pray for such a reconciliation.³⁰ But it was not to be. The separatists were outnumbered. As Weber observed,

By the 1940s...many more moderate fundamentalists were convinced that their movement had become needlessly marginalized. They longed for the days when evangelical religion really mattered in American culture and decided to rid fundamentalism of its excesses and negative image and create a "new evangelicalism."³¹

²⁷Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 155. Elsewhere he said that the NAE was a "fundamentalist-initiated but genuinely inclusive fellowship that signaled the formation of a new coalition" and "the new evangelical coalition was made possible to a large extent because fundamentalism, as the era's most vocal and visible evangelical movement, had influenced many other evangelical groups" ("From Fundamentalism to the New Evangelical Coalition," pp. 12, 13).

²⁸Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," p. 30.

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 19.

³⁰May 24, 1944, p. 6. In 1947 Carl F. H. Henry was suggesting a meeting between the two groups "in a spirit of mutual love and compassion" to seek a united voice (*The Uneasy Conscience*, p. 81). And as late as 1968, in his own words, "I tried to close ranks...between evangelicals per se and radically independent fundamentalists." He was invited, and prepared to go, to address the Seventh World Congress of the International Council of Christian Churches (1968), intending to speak on "Demythologizing the Evangelicals." But, due to correspondence confusion between him and Carl McIntire, he never made it (Carl F. H. Henry, *Confessions of a Theologian: An Autobiography* [Waco, TX: Word, 1986], p. 300). That would-be address to the ACCC was printed in *Christianity Today* (Sept 13, 1968), p. 13.

³¹Timothy P. Weber, "His Life and Ministry" [referring to former Fuller Theological Seminary president David Allan Hubbard], *Studies in Old Testament Theology: Historical and Contemporary Images of God and God's People*, ed. Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., et al. (Dallas: Word, 1992), p. 23.

With the founding of the NAE the basic difference between the militant fundamentalists and the moderate evangelicals was clear,³² although the terms evangelical and fundamentalist would be used somewhat interchangeably for another decade or more.³³

**THE SOCIAL ISSUE: *THE UNEASY CONSCIENCE*
OF MODERN FUNDAMENTALISM(1947)**

Carl F. H. Henry published the above book describing and decrying the lack of social concern in the fundamentalist movement of which he generally considered himself a part. He felt it his duty to “perform surgery”³⁴ on fundamentalism and call it back to the cultural consciousness squandered by fundamentalists during their reaction to the threat of modernism. The “uneasy conscience” was not about the verities of the faith, but about the “frequent failure to apply them effectively to crucial problems confronting the modern mind.”³⁵ Henry betrayed a keen sensitivity to what others of the time (i.e., non-evangelicals) were thinking of fundamentalism. He said fundamentalists had “needlessly invited criticism and ridicule” from liberals and others for majoring on minors and replacing the primary aspects of the fundamentalist position with secondary and sometimes obscure aspects. To that extent fundamentalists failed to oppose the social gospel with the “full genius of the Hebrew Christian outlook.”³⁶ This lack of social concern was “almost wholly unintelligible to the naturalistic and idealistic groups.”³⁷ “From the

³²I would have to disagree in principle with George Marsden’s conclusion: “Almost no one seems to have regarded the formation of the NAE as a sign that ‘evangelicals’ were now breaking from ‘fundamentalists’ over the principle of separatism” (*Reforming Fundamentalism*, p. 48). This may have been the understanding of the liberals. It is true that the terms fundamentalist and evangelical had not yet developed all of their peculiar connotations and innuendos; and it is also true that some separatist fundamentalists thought they could work inside and thus direct the new group. And to be sure W. B. Riley was about the only fundamentalist leader in outspoken, public opposition to the new body (some would say this was due to his vested interest in the WCFA). But given the backgrounds, statements, and actions of its organizers of the time, it should have seemed clear where the NAE’s toes were pointed despite which way its face was turned.

³³Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 152. In fact, as late as 1978, Harold John Ockenga said, “Doctrinally, the fundamentalists are right, *and I wish to be always classified as one*” (italics added). “From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism,” *Evangelical Roots*, ed. Kenneth Kantzer (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1978), p. 40.

³⁴*The Uneasy Conscience*, preface.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid., p. 17.

standpoint of not a few religious modernists, ethical idealists and humanists,” humanitarianism had evaporated from fundamentalism.³⁸ Henry was tuned into the “suspicions on the part of non-evangelicals” of fundamentalist failures to mount campaigns against social evils. According to him, a [philosophical] world view that has no [social] world program will not get a hearing from “contemporary speculation” in the “struggle for a world mind.”³⁹ He was anxious that fundamentalism’s theology of a future millennial kingdom (a “kingdom then” message) not “identify Christianity further *to the modern mind* in terms of an escape mechanism” (italics added) [i.e., as an evasion of present social responsibilities].⁴⁰

Henry denied that he was influenced in his social views and their urgency in the post World War II era by his encounters with the social gospel as a graduate student at Boston University and its leading light, Edgar S. Brightman, a liberal Methodist personalist theologian. However, one is nearly compelled to agree with Carpenter that “it is hard to believe that it was only a coincidence that Henry was putting the finishing touches on *The Uneasy Conscience* (1947) in the summer of 1946 when he was studying in Boston.”⁴¹ Furthermore, Carpenter is probably well taken when he suggests that there was a strong dislike for the penurious background of fundamentalist Christian service that Henry and his evangelical graduate school colleagues experienced, in contrast to their respectable gentlemen teachers and scholars in liberal institutions. That plus their desire for more upward social mobility undoubtedly contributed to the new impetus on social betterment.⁴²

Harold John Ockenga introduced *The Uneasy Conscience* by saying that “the church needs a progressive Fundamentalism with a social message,”⁴³ noting there was a “growing revolt in evangelical circles on ethical indifferentism.”⁴⁴ He wanted Henry’s book to articulate that revolt.

³⁸Ibid., p. 20.

³⁹Ibid., p. 23.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 52.

⁴¹Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 193.

⁴²Ibid., p. 203. Carpenter notes that both Henry and E. J. Carnell were able to buy new houses and Buicks when they arrived in Pasadena as faculty of the newly-formed Fuller Theological Seminary (pp. 203, 310). He concludes that this upward mobility was an “important dimension in the neo-evangelical impulse. Bound up with doctrinal revisions and the recovery of social concern was the determination to stake a fresh claim on middle-class respectability” (p. 203). This is also an implication of Mark Ellingsen’s note concerning the contacts of certain evangelicals with the wider culture during and after World War II (*The Evangelical Movement*, pp. 94–95).

⁴³Carl F. H. Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience*, Introduction.

⁴⁴Ibid.

He reflected the tension in evangelicalism to “vacillate between Fundamentalist isolationism and cooperation with the World Council of Churches.”⁴⁵ He believed that a message addressing world questions, the needs of society, and education, as well as evangelism, should spring from the Great Commission in Matthew 28:18–20.⁴⁶

Henry bemoaned the “evaporation of fundamentalist humanitarianism”⁴⁷ and the inveighing of fundamentalists almost exclusively against individual rather than social evil.⁴⁸ He sensed a growing awareness in broader fundamentalism that “evangelical Christianity [had] become increasingly inarticulate about the social reference of the Gospel.”⁴⁹ He said that “the rejection of non-evangelical solutions does not involve—at least not logically—a loss of the social relevance of the Gospel. A globe-changing passion certainly characterized the early church....”⁵⁰ In rejecting the social gospel, fundamentalism

seemed also to revolt against the Christian social imperative. It was the failure of Fundamentalism to work out a positive message within its own framework, and its tendency instead to take further refuge in a despairing view of world history, that cut off the pertinence of evangelicalism to the modern global crisis.⁵¹

Henry derived his cultural agenda from the social comments of the Old Testament prophets, John the Baptist, Jesus of Nazareth, and the Apostle Paul.⁵² But more to the point theologically, Henry extracted his social imperative from the central message of Jesus Christ which concerned the kingdom of God. While admitting that he was “broadly premillennial,” he had no interest in dispensationalism and its “postponement theory of the kingdom.”⁵³ He held to what in modern

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 16.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 20.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 26.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 28. Henry made sweeping, unsupported claims for a social consciousness of the early New Testament church, such as this quote. He spoke of apostolic Christianity “turning the world upside down,” presumably socially (p. 28). He lamented that “no voice is speaking today *as Paul would* either at the United Nations sessions, or at labor-management disputes, or in strategic university classrooms whether in Japan or Germany or America” (p. 34, italics added).

⁵¹Ibid., p. 32.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 38–43.

⁵³Ibid., p. 52. He said there were “remote affinities” between the liberal “consistent eschatology” [i.e., wholly future] of Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer and the

parlance is the already/not yet kingdom view; the kingdom exists today in “incomplete realization,” will be further realized before Christ comes back, and will be fully realized in the millennium.⁵⁴ It is the “kingdom now” that has far-ranging social implications for the present day church. But one legitimately wonders whether for Henry the kingdom came first and brought its social implications, or if a preconceived social agenda brought its kingdom implications. It may well have been the latter, for he says:

Whatever in our kingdom views undercuts [the world relevance of the Gospel] destroys the essential character of Christianity as such. No study of the kingdom teaching of Jesus is adequate unless it recognizes His implication both that the kingdom is here, and that it is not here.⁵⁵

It appears that the “world relevance of the Gospel,” which is simply code language for societal concerns, is that to which kingdom theology must conform. Thus the view of dispensational futurism that prevailed in fundamentalism/evangelicalism almost from the beginning had to be expunged as being totally inadequate to carry the social relevance of Christianity. In Henry’s mind, this view had cut the nerve of social activism by placing the messianic kingdom *after* the second coming, leaving little or no basis for a world wide social mandate for the institutional church of the New Testament in the present age.

The new evangelical platform for the social implications of the gospel is predicated on a present form of the messianic kingdom of God with its wide social dimension. To that end, the already/not yet kingdom theology of George Eldon Ladd became sort of the official view of the early new evangelicalism.⁵⁶ Ladd’s view of the kingdom of God and

postponement theory of dispensationalism.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 53.

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Ladd became a New Testament professor at Fuller Theological Seminary in 1950 and had a profound influence on his generation of students, especially concerning the doctrine of the kingdom of God. His first book-length contribution to kingdom thought was *Crucial Questions Concerning the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952). With his powerful mental energy and abilities, Ladd almost single-handedly turned the tide within the new evangelicalism in favor of “historic” (covenant, posttribulational) premillennialism and against dispensational premillennialism. In the later 1960s, posttribulationalism was declared to be the official view of the new evangelical theology (Millard Erickson, *The New Evangelical Theology* [Westwood, NJ: Revell, 1968], p. 126). Some of the second generation new evangelicals, self-styled as “young evangelicals,” virtually canonized Ladd, along with Clarence Bass of Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN, as the theological mentors whose kingdom views emancipated them from dispensationalism and biblically legitimized their societal activism. See Richard Quebedeaux, *The Young Evangelicals* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), pp. 38, 74–81.

end-times scheme was “more conversant with classic Christian beliefs and more able to sustain evangelical social engagement.”⁵⁷ “Evangelicals had to recover a theology of the kingdom that would enable them to be its advance agents and effect significant social transformation before Christ’s return to establish the kingdom in its fullness.”⁵⁸

This surely explains much of the anti-dispensational bias so evident in the development of the new evangelicalism.⁵⁹ Dispensationalism, with its doctrine of the professing church and society each growing more apostate toward the end-times, and its concept of a utopian kingdom of God that was being delayed until the eschaton, was simply too pessimistic to sustain any hopes of present global betterment through the church and its gospel. Harold Ockenga saw this clearly as he chronicled the formation of the new evangelicalism thirty years after *The Uneasy Conscience*. He said, “The social theory of the fundamentalists was governed by eschatology. It was believed that conditions would grow worse and worse so that until Christ came again, the only effective application of the gospel could be to the individual.”⁶⁰ Dispensationalism as an inhibitor of the efforts and success of early new evangelical endeavors has been duly noted (and usually deprecated) by different commentators on the fundamentalist and evangelical movements.⁶¹

⁵⁷Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 195.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 203.

⁵⁹Dispensationalism also impacted other areas of the developing new evangelicalism. Its rubric of “literal interpretation” was predicated on the verbal inspiration/inerrancy of Scripture, an issue which festered in the new evangelicalism for some twenty years before reaching a breaking point in the latter half of the 1970s. Dispensationalism’s doctrine of an apostate church in the end-times and a need for the purity of the visible church in the present age had a direct bearing on the separatism controversy. The idea of a pure church also made dispensationalism one of the chief anti-modernist systems of biblical thought, which tended to retard the success of new evangelical dialogue and cooperation with non-evangelicals in various settings. Helpful in understanding these matters and the place of dispensationalism in early fundamentalism is the sketch by Mark Ellingsen, *The Evangelical Movement*, pp. 60–72.

⁶⁰Harold John Ockenga, “From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism,” p. 43.

⁶¹For example, Carl F. H. Henry, “The Vigor of the New Evangelicalism,” *Christian Life* (April 1948), p. 34; E. J. Carnell, *The Case For Orthodox Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959), pp. 117–19; Leon McBeth, “Baptist Fundamentalism: A Cultural Interpretation,” *Baptist History and Heritage*, 133 (July 1978), p. 32; Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 310, fn. 54; Donald W. Dayton, “The Search for the Historical Evangelicalism”; George Marsden’s History of Fuller Seminary as a Case Study,” *Christian Scholar’s Review* 33 (Sept 1993): 30–33; “Is Evangelical Theology Changing ?” (Symposium of Evangelicals), *Christian Life* (March 1956), p. 18; Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, index, p. 314; Thorwald W. Bender, “What Is New In Theology?” *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 2 (Summer 1959): 17, 21–22; Millard Erickson, *The New Evangelical Theology*, pp. 122–26; Ronald Nash, *The New*

**THE SCHOLARSHIP/INTELLECTUALISM ISSUE:
FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY (1947)**

A common complaint in the 1940s during the developing new evangelicalism was fundamentalism's lack of scholarship and general intellectual ability. It was widely held that the leaders of fundamentalism were deficient in their educational background if not in their cerebral energy as individuals, the universally acknowledged exception always being J. Gresham Machen of Princeton Seminary. A more mature perspective, however, shows that much of this criticism was prejudicial and exaggerated. Many of fundamentalism's leaders were very well trained and had taken degrees from academically respectable institutions of the day.⁶² Nonetheless, the charge was rather routinely made that fundamentalism was intellectually challenged.⁶³

The original milieu for this complaint seems to have been the intellectual climate of secular, liberal, and non-evangelical institutions at which many evangelical scholars were earning graduate and post-graduate degrees. In the 1940s there was over a dozen evangelical scholars studying for Ph.D.s at Harvard alone.⁶⁴ In this atmosphere many of

Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963), p. 178 (philosopher Nash calls dispensationalism, which is a biblical/theological formulation, a "dismal morass"); Alister E. McGrath, *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998), p. 251; and Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), pp. 115–20, 132.

⁶²For example, W. B. Riley (1861–1947) earned degrees from Hanover College and Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; R. A. Torrey (1856–1928) studied at Yale and in Germany; and J. Frank Norris (1877–1952) graduated from Baylor University and Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. More recent fundamentalist leaders likewise were not educationally deficient. R. V. Clearwaters (1900–1996) took degrees from Moody Bible Institute, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Kalamazoo College, and the University of Chicago (M.A. and all but a dissertation for the Ph.D.); B. Myron Cedarholm (1915–1997) graduated from the University of Minnesota, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, and Princeton Theological Seminary (Th.M. and residence work completed for a doctorate); John R. Rice (1895–1980) earned degrees from Decatur Baptist College, Baylor University, and Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary; and Carl McIntire (b. 1906) studied at Princeton Seminary and finished at the newly-formed Westminster Theological Seminary. What was said of James M. Gray, dean of the Moody Bible Institute, could be said of the leaders of fundamentalism in general: He "was never one to disparage scholarship" (Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 40).

⁶³It is easily granted that in its basic motif fundamentalism was evangelistically/revivalistically and not scholastically oriented as to ministry, certainly not so in comparison with the aspirations of the new evangelical complainants in this regard. The issues, priorities, and bustle of the controversy with modernism did not give fundamentalists the leisure to pursue the life of the mind. But the frequent and usual broadside against the fundamentalist intellect of the time seems greatly overdrawn.

⁶⁴Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 191. Some of them were Harold B. Kuhn, Samuel

them concluded that their fundamentalist contemporaries simply were not up to par intellectually, could not interact with modern thought on an academic level, and consequently were not turning out cogent scholastic material that commanded the attention of non-evangelicals. Fundamentalism's intellectual dimension needed a drastic overhaul if it were to gain a hearing in the marketplace of ideas and the cultural centers of the USA and beyond.

The complaint against fundamentalism's intellectual deficiency took different forms, but the underlying grievance ran as a common thread through all of them. As a matter of fact, fundamentalism not only lacked scholarship, it was charged with despising it.⁶⁵ Furniss gave as characteristics of the fundamentalist movement anti-intellectualism, ignorance, and illiteracy.⁶⁶ "An increased emphasis on scholarship" was one of the changes taking place in new evangelical theology's beginnings.⁶⁷ Ronald Nash notes that "during the early years of the orthodox [i.e., fundamentalist] reaction [to liberalism], the controversy was generally waged on a high intellectual level," but gradually fundamentalists developed "a spirit of anti-intellectualism."⁶⁸ Even current evangelical critics of fundamentalism still echo the early complaint.⁶⁹

It was the prodigious pen of Carl F. H. Henry that in the 1940s and 50s did the most to raise the issue of fundamentalism's intellectual want and in turn tried to elevate the standard of evangelical/fundamentalist scholarship and intellectualism of the day. And it was Henry who did as much or more early on to set the scholastic tone and academic standards of the new evangelicalism's flagship center of learning—Fuller Theological Seminary.

In 1946 Henry undertook an extensive (and enlightening) critique of modern thought in *Remaking the Modern Mind*.⁷⁰ In it he organized

J. Schultz, Kenneth Kantzer, John Gerstner, Burton Goddard, Roger Nicole, E. J. Carnell, Gleason Archer, George Ladd, and Paul King Jewett. Carl F. H. Henry was studying at Boston University at the time. Millard Erickson paints a somewhat idyllic picture of Henry and Harold Öckenga in this regard as they viewed the intellectual (and social) scene in 1946 (*The New Evangelicalism*, pp. 13–16).

⁶⁵E. M. Blaiklock, "Conservatism, Liberalism, and Neo-orthodoxy," *Eternity* (August 1960), p. 23.

⁶⁶Norman F. Furniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918–1931* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1963 reprint), pp. 38–41.

⁶⁷"Is Evangelical Theology Changing?" (Symposium of Evangelicals) *Christian Life* (March 1956), p. 18.

⁶⁸Nash, *The New Evangelicalism*, pp. 22, 26.

⁶⁹For example, Alister E. McGrath, *Historical Theology*, p. 251.

⁷⁰Carl F. H. Henry, *Remaking the Modern Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1946).

his analysis around the then-current, modern (i.e., 1914–1945 era of world wars) philosophical revolt against the assumptions that had prevailed for the previous 350 years, those assumptions being (1) the inevitability of human progress, (2) the inherent goodness of man, (3) the absolute uniformity of nature, (4) the ultimate reality of nature, and (5) the ultimate animality of man. While the book is a polemic against the modern revolt and not a criticism as such of fundamentalism's lack of philosophical input, his goal is still clear and the warning is patent.

It remains that the modern philosophical scaffolding has proved so unfruitful and so unempirical that contemporary thinkers must be schooled as thoroughly in its disillusioning denouement as they were in its utopian prophecies and, beyond this, they must be driven to a satisfactory metaphysics for the alternatives demanded by the sobered western mind. Such a metaphysics will surely be one which is radically different from that to which the modern mind is accustomed *and that evangelical is visionless indeed who does not see in such an hour a time ripe for proclaiming his convictions* (italics added).⁷¹

In a similar volume Henry reiterates compactly much of the same thought but with a more pointed criticism of fundamentalism.⁷²

In 1948 Henry was quite explicit in inveighing against fundamentalism's intellectual and philosophical deficiency, and set forth the new evangelical agenda in this area. Fundamentalism had "permitted the philosophic implications of Christianity to become obscured."⁷³ To avoid fundamentalism's deficiencies, "the new evangelicalism aims to clarify the philosophic implications of Biblical theism."⁷⁴ "Because the fundamentalism of the past generation was not interested in a salvation emphasis formulated in philosophic as well as Biblical terms," evangelical students had gone to schools that taught non-Christian philosophy and had "gradually lost their faith."⁷⁵

In his *Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology*, Henry was likewise concise and forthright in his dissatisfaction with fundamentalism's failures in the intellectual field, especially in chapter 2, "The

⁷¹Ibid., pp. 274–75.

⁷²Carl F. H. Henry, *The Drift of Western Thought* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), pp. 151–52.

⁷³Carl F. H. Henry, "The Vigor of the New Evangelicalism," *Christian Life* (March 1948), p. 35.

⁷⁴Ibid. Harold B. Kuhn stated that fundamentalism [which he called orthodoxy] "had not developed a definitive philosophical grounding" ("Philosophy of Religion," in *Contemporary Evangelical Thought*, ed. Carl F. H. Henry [Great Neck, NY: Channel Press, 1957], p. 217).

⁷⁵Henry, "The Vigor of the New Evangelicalism," p. 37.

Fundamentalist Reduction.”⁷⁶ Therein he gives at least six criticisms of fundamentalism in this regard: (1) “Concentration on ‘the fundamentals’ often displaced doctrinal responsibilities of the Church in the wider dimensions of historic creeds and confessions of faith.”⁷⁷ (2) Fundamentalism’s “theological emphasis and temperament were primarily concerned to correct the social matrix and social philosophy shaped by liberalism” and thus neglected “to exhibit Christianity as a comprehensive world and life view.”⁷⁸ (3) Fundamentalism “lacked theological and historical perspective.”⁷⁹ (4) “Fundamentalism neglected the production of great exegetical and theological literature” relying instead on reprinting “the theological classics of the past.”⁸⁰ (5) Fundamentalism neglected “the doctrine of the Church, except in defining separation as a special area of concern,” leading at times to anti-denominationalism instead of interdenominationalism.⁸¹ (6) Fundamentalists “identified Christianity rigidly with premillennial dispensationalism.”⁸² He went on to say, “Fundamentalism paid scant attention to basic principles with which its theological positions were integrally connected. Had evangelical theology pursued the tasks of Christian philosophy, emphasis would not have been placed upon isolated doctrines.”⁸³ “A fresh exploration of the interrelations of revelation and reason...is one of [evangelicalism’s] present imperatives.”⁸⁴ “Evangelical theology’s best hope for a relevant and aggressive impact in our turbulent times lies in a bold, biblical, emphasis on the relation of revelation and reason.”⁸⁵

In many minds fundamentalism was anti-intellectual and anti-science because it was anti-evolution. The theory of organic evolution had captured secular philosophical thought and liberal religious opinion since the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Anti-evolutionism was a major plank in the fundamentalists’ platform in their clash with modernism in the great 1920s Controversy. W. B. Riley and the World’s

⁷⁶Carl F. H. Henry, *Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Society* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957).

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 32.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 33.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 34.

⁸⁰Ibid.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 35.

⁸²Ibid., p. 36.

⁸³Ibid., p. 61.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 63.

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 66.

Christian Fundamentals Association (founded in 1919), for example, held large anti-evolution rallies around the country and entered into numerous debates with evolutionary scientists and educators.⁸⁶ The apogee of anti-evolutionism was the Scopes Evolution Trial in Dayton, TN, in 1925. John Scopes had violated the Tennessee law that prohibited the teaching of evolution in the public schools. Due to media coverage, the trial was sensationalized and followed nation wide. Press and radio reporting of the trial, especially on the aging William Jennings Bryan, the trial leader for the prosecution and thus in a direct sense for fundamentalism, was caustic and hostile. Both Bryan and fundamentalism were depicted as wallowing in intellectual backwaters totally out of their depth with reference to modern thought.⁸⁷ National pundits, such as H. L. Menchen, were scathing in their denunciations of the fundamentalist presence and mentality.⁸⁸ As a result it seems that fundamentalism did not fare well in public opinion after Dayton, especially since Bryan's testimony as a self-professed expert witness on creationism was considerably less than brilliant. Bryan was no match for the ACLU defense attorney, Clarence Darrow.

None of this was lost on the budding new evangelicals of the 1940s and 50s, the leaders and thinkers of which quite evidently were embarrassed by the mentality of some of their fundamentalist forebears and peers. In the landmark article in *Christian Life*, "a friendly attitude toward science" was the first component put forth in the changing evangelical thought.⁸⁹ Thorwald Bender preferred the term "Critical Conservatism" to describe the new evangelicalism, and went on to criticize the intellectual aspect of "some types" of fundamentalism.

By Critical Conservatism we mean to emphasize the *self-critical* open-mindedness of science at its best, as over against the spirit of some types of Fundamentalism in which criticism and suspicion of *others*, nursed by an attitude of self-righteousness, unteachable arrogance, spells the essence of being orthodox (*italics his*).⁹⁰

⁸⁶It was principally the Darwinian amoeba-to-man evolutionism of the time that was opposed. Some fundamentalists were sympathetic to an old earth and the rubric of scientific uniformitarianism.

⁸⁷Robert D. Lindner, "Fifty Years After Scopes: Lessons to Learn, A Heritage to Reclaim," *Christianity Today* (July 18, 1975), pp. 7-9.

⁸⁸Menchen's wry but devastating witticism was, "Heave an egg out of a Pullman window, and you will hit a fundamentalist anywhere in the United States today" (*American Mercury* 6 [1925]: 160, quoted in Norman F. Furniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931*, p. 40).

⁸⁹"Is Evangelical Theology Changing?" (Symposium of Evangelicals), *Christian Life* (March 1956), p. 17.

⁹⁰"What Is New in Theology?" *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 2

Ronald Nash boldly declared, "Fundamentalism's attitude toward science was typical of its deprecation of scholarship in all fields."⁹¹

It was Bernard Ramm in 1954 who more than any other evangelical chastised the fundamentalists for their attitude toward modern science and virtually electrified the evangelical community with his synthesis of the Bible and science called "progressive creationism."⁹² He called the scientism of his fundamentalist forbears an "ignoble tradition."⁹³ They were the "hyperorthodox."⁹⁴ Ramm's book and the kind of thinking it represented were a great boost to the fortunes of new evangelical vis-a-vis old fundamentalist mentality. Butler noted, "Orthodoxy was to be rendered intellectually respectable by the appearance of concessions to the scientific viewpoint. This first surfaced in a book by Bernard Ramm published in the fall of 1954, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*."⁹⁵

The foregoing is intended as a general backdrop or framework with which to appreciate the attempts by the new coalition of evangelicals to gain academic and intellectual reputability in the founding of the Fuller Theological Seminary. This institution was not only a tangible effort to correct the perceived shortcomings of fundamentalism in this area, it was symbolic of the new evangelical mindset regarding academia itself.

As noted, the leaders of fundamentalism were not adverse to genuine scholarship. Nor did they consider education and training a waste of time. In fact, Bible institutes and colleges followed in the fundamentalist

(Summer 1959): 17.

⁹¹Nash, *The New Evangelical Theology*, p. 26.

⁹²*The Christian View of Science and Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954). While not original with him, Ramm's ideas made a tremendous impact on evangelical thinking. George Marsden noted, "By the next summer [i.e., 1955] Ramm's book had indeed caused the largest stir in fundamentalism since the RSV controversy" (*Reforming Fundamentalism*, p. 159). I was in Bible College at the time and observed and felt firsthand this impact. Ramm summarized the principles of progressive creationism on pp. 112–17, and his summary statement on p. 256 says, "we accept progressive creationism which teaches that over the millions of years of geologic history God has been fiatly creating higher and higher forms of life." A similar scheme, described briefly and non-technically, and termed "threshold evolution," had been put forth earlier by Edward John Carnell (*An Introduction to Christian Apologetics* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948], pp. 238–39). Not all evangelicals accepted Ramm's synthesis and its presuppositions. See the quite negative assessments by Joseph T. Bayly, "The Christian View of Science and Scripture: A Critical Review of Bernard Ramm's Book," *Christian Life* (August 1955), p. 4 ff.

⁹³*The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, Preface.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁹⁵Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," p. 6.

train as a matter of course.⁹⁶ Fundamentalists disparaged the godless, pagan, and critical post-Enlightenment presuppositions and philosophical underpinnings that imbued secular education. They perceived the need for a distinctively Christian, biblical education for their youth in order to have a trained ministry and perpetuate the faith of their fathers. And in so doing they were in the best of company and tradition; the early schools and colleges in America were just such learning centers. But in the minds of the new evangelical academes, such education was top-water, superficial, and inadequate to grapple with modern thought and leave a mark on the contemporary culture.

The original idea for what became Fuller Theological Seminary came to Charles E. Fuller in a night in November 1939 when God awakened him out of his sleep and burdened his heart “for a Christ-centered, Spirit-directed training school, where Christian men and women could be trained in the things of God, to become steeped in the Word, so as to go out bearing the blessed news to lost men and women.”⁹⁷ Such a proposal, of course, sounded quite “Bible-institutish,” although Fuller wanted the school to be on a higher level than the Bible institute ordinarily was. Actually he wanted something on the college level but nonetheless oriented to practical Christian service.⁹⁸ However, the very capable and seemingly tireless leader and organizer of new evangelical projects, Harold John Ockenga, persuaded him of the need for a graduate level, scholarly institution where the nation’s top-notch evangelical scholars could work.⁹⁹ Fuller Theological Seminary was in business by the fall of 1947 with Ockenga as the first president.¹⁰⁰ It was not long before the new seminary was being called “a Cal Tech of the evangelical world” and “a research center of evangelical scholarship” engaged in “rebuilding western civilization” and “redefining the fundamentalist mission.”¹⁰¹ At the school’s opening convocation address in 1947, entitled “The Challenge to the Christian Culture of the West,” Ockenga eloquently intoned,

⁹⁶See the excellent summary by Joel Carpenter on “Training Leaders,” *Revive Us Again*, pp. 16–22. His conclusion is well-taken: “Educational institutions did much to hold fundamentalism together, form its future leaders, and give expression to its beliefs and concerns” (p. 22).

⁹⁷Daniel P. Fuller, *Give the Winds a Mighty Voice: The Story of Charles E. Fuller* (Waco, TX: Word, 1972), p. 189.

⁹⁸Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 194.

⁹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁰Ockenga went on to serve for eleven years as president in absentia of Fuller Seminary.

¹⁰¹Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, pp. 53, 56, 69.

Now there is a task to be done. And that task is not going to be done by the ordinary Christian alone. It's going to be done by those who are prepared to do it. It must be done by the rethinking and restating of the fundamental thesis and principle of Western culture. There must be today men who have the time and energy and the inclination and the ability and the support to be able to redefine Christian thinking and to fling it forth into the faces of unbelievers everywhere.... We need men who can once again in an intellectually respectable way present an apology for God, and for His creation of the world, and for the soul, and for eternal life, and these things must be brought so that our young men, and those who are going to take the places of leadership, will once again believe in the eternal law of an eternal God.... I envisage a school that can become the center of missions and evangelism on the basis of a Gospel of which we need not be ashamed because we can give a reason for the hope that is within us.¹⁰²

In keeping with the academic/intellectual philosophy of the new evangelicalism, the early faculty of Fuller consisted of men with earned doctorates from accredited and recognized universities: Everett F. Harrison (University of Pennsylvania), Carl F. H. Henry (Boston University), Harold Lindsell (New York University), George Eldon Ladd (Harvard), Edward John Carnell (Harvard, Boston University), Charles J. Woodbridge (Duke), and Gleason Archer (Harvard). The faculty in the first years of Fuller were mainly Presbyterians or those with a Presbyterian background; a few were Baptists. The opening class was to consist of "graduates of accredited universities and colleges."¹⁰³ On the early faculty was also Wilbur M. Smith, an erudite evangelical who had himself in the early 1940s called for a new center of scholarship and academics that could turn out men "for the powerful defense of the faith in the great citadels of unbelief in our country,"¹⁰⁴ and who would produce a stream of high caliber literature in defense of the faith.

Fuller Theological Seminary emerged as the enfleshment of Smith's dream and a showcase of the new evangelical corrective to the philosophy and practice of old fundamentalism. In the eyes of the new evangelical coalition, it embodied what was right in Christian academia and stood against what was wrong with the old fundamentalist mentality. Theoretically, what the seminary was, was as it should be. Or so it

¹⁰²Daniel P. Fuller, *Give the Winds a Mighty Voice*, pp. 209–210. It was in this same address that Ockenga coined the phrase "new evangelicalism," a conscious self-designation of the new coalition of conservatives in distinction from fundamentalism.

¹⁰³So stated in an early ad for the seminary in *United Evangelical Action* (Sept 1947), reproduced in Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, p. 55.

¹⁰⁴Wilbur M. Smith, *Therefore Stand: A Plea For a Vigorous Apologetic in the Present Crisis of Evangelical Christianity* (Boston: W. A. Wilde, 1945), p. 498. See pp. 498–507 for an expansion of his vision of an intellectual penetration of unbelief by evangelicals.

seemed. But it was not long before tensions arose concerning the motif of the school. Charles E. Fuller wanted a heavy slant toward the practical, and the faculty generally were predisposed to the philosophical and the academic.¹⁰⁵ Finding professors for the practical courses “proved to be the lowest priority.”¹⁰⁶ Deference was paid to the practical leanings of Charles E. Fuller, but the ambivalence was felt by the faculty. The same pull accompanied the separation issue. There was general sympathy for the separatists’ cause but no sympathy for separatism.¹⁰⁷ The Baptist and Presbyterian connections of the school’s founders made projecting a truly interdenominational outreach difficult.¹⁰⁸ A tug existed between the individualism and high expertise of the scholar-teachers and the development of a faculty team spirit.¹⁰⁹ There also was the fact of the dispensational leanings of Charles E. Fuller, Everett F. Harrison, and Wilbur Smith and the unsympathetic if not hostile attitude toward dispensationalism by Carl Henry, George Ladd, and others in and around the seminary.¹¹⁰ Perhaps the greatest strain was the need to forge a new position between fundamentalism and non-evangelicalism (i.e., neo-liberalism and neoorthodoxy). In this “the seminary faced in two directions at once.... In the early days, hopes were high that it could carve out a large middle ground where a healthy third force in Protestantism could operate between the separatist fundamentalists and the modernists.”¹¹¹

And so the scholarship/intellectualism issue of the early new evangelicals resolved into the Fuller experiment of the ideal. “The Fuller professors were renowned for their hard work. They were going to rise to the top of their professions, fill the Christian world with outstanding books and popular literature, be great teachers....”¹¹² They were to teach about eight academic hours a semester, have one month in the summer for vacation, and two months for research, writing, and outside travel

¹⁰⁵Ockenga, for example, wanted evangelism backed by “apologetics based on impeccable scholarship” (Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, p. 36). Marsden notes that “the tension between Fuller Seminary’s two missions—being a center for apologetic scholarship and a training base for sending out spiritually empowered missionaries—dominated its quest for a self-image” (p. 83).

¹⁰⁶*Ibid.*, p. 122.

¹⁰⁷*Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹⁰⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 38, 95–98, 76, 103–107, 133.

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 28–30.

¹¹⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 6, 71, 72, 76, 81, 189.

¹¹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 67–68.

¹¹²*Ibid.*, pp. 128–29.

and speaking. “Each scholar was endeavoring to make a contribution that the theological world would have to take seriously, that would signal the emergence of a new evangelicalism, that would contribute to Christian cultural renewal in the West.”¹¹³ Whether the seminary ever reached those lofty goals is another question. As with most new endeavors, the goals were only partially reached at best. Edward John Carnell, for example, complained somewhat bitterly:

After pouring the fruit of my philosophical labors into it [*A Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, released in 1952], it has received little or no acclaim; at least not in a measure of what I thought it was deserving in light of the effort expended.... There is a parochialism in evangelicalism from which I must withdraw.... I want to command the attention of Tillich and Bennett; than I shall be in a better place to be of service to the evangelicals. We need prestige desperately.”¹¹⁴

Three decades after Fuller’s founding, Carl Henry would still write: “Evangelical Christianity has not yet in fact very deeply penetrated the radically secular mentality evident in schoolroom and society today and reflected by the media.”¹¹⁵ The final chapter in his autobiography, “The Evangelical Prospect in America,” consisting of nine points, is in the main quite pessimistic.¹¹⁶

With Fuller Theological Seminary and all it represented up and running, the distance widened farther between the new coalition of moderate evangelicals and the old fundamentalist/evangelical alliance.

THE EVANGELISM ISSUE: BILLY GRAHAM (1949–1957)

One ideal that both the fundamentalists and the new evangelicals held was a commitment to evangelism, revival, and missions.¹¹⁷ It was a substantial and integral part of their common heritage. Both groups

¹¹³Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, p. 195.

¹¹⁴Letter to Carl F. H. Henry, reported by Henry in his *Confessions of a Theologian*, p. 137. Some five years after Carnell’s lament, Henry put forth a more sophisticated complaint that *The Christian Century* and the neo-liberals were retaining too much of the outdated old liberalism and had not taken evangelical criticism seriously, if it had noticed it at all. Carl F. H. Henry, “Dare We Revive the Modernist-Fundamentalist Conflict?” *Christianity Today* (June 10, 1957), pp. 4, 6.

¹¹⁵Carl F. H. Henry, “Evangelical Summertime?” *Christianity Today* (April 1, 1977), p. 38.

¹¹⁶Henry, *Confessions of a Theologian*, pp. 381–401.

¹¹⁷Carl F. H. Henry put it this way: “Both the American Council of Christian Churches and the National Association of Evangelicals cast their weight—in principle at least—behind mass evangelism” (“Theology, Evangelism, Ecumenism,” *Christianity Today* [January 20, 1957], p. 21).

assented together and worked in tandem in furthering this mutual conviction until the 1950s. It was an issue that was often used to head off or quell an outbreak of ecclesiastical hostilities in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy in various provincial settings,¹¹⁸ and its legacy kept some fundamentalists within the more moderate National Association of Evangelicals for about ten years.¹¹⁹ But it was also the thing that eventually made the cleavage between the moderate evangelicals and the militant fundamentalists permanent. The 1957 Billy Graham New York Crusade was the struggle that finally made the two camps irreconcilable.

The United States (and other parts of the world as well) in the 1940s was in a fearful and chastened frame of mind because of the ravages of the Great Depression and the Second World War, the aggressiveness of international communism, and the beginning of the tensions of the Cold War. There was at least a general mood of God-consciousness among the populace if not a divinely endowed hunger for inner peace and the ultimate reality of a meaningful relationship with Him. Already in the 1930s mass evangelism in the US had reached a low ebb although there were a few evangelists who were seeing good results in city-wide campaigns. Local church evangelism, on the other hand, was being quite successful and continued so into World War II.¹²⁰ But, "by 1942 a vigorous evangelistically aggressive wing of Fundamentalism now believed that it stood on the threshold of revival,"¹²¹ and in the mid 1940s mass evangelism began to ascend again. Hyman Appleman, Bob Jones, John R. Rice, and Paul Rood had successful city-wide meetings. Other evangelists entered the field such as Merv Rosell, Torrey Johnson, Bob Cook, Jack Shuler, Phil Shuler, Chuck Templeton, Percy Crawford, Jack Wyrzten, T. W. Wilson, Jimmie Johnson, J. Edwin Orr, Armin Gesswein, and others. There were campus revivals at Northern Baptist Seminary, North Park College, California Baptist Seminary, Wheaton College, Asbury College, Seattle-Pacific College, and Greenville College. Charles E. Fuller's Old Fashioned Revival Hour

¹¹⁸For example, J. C. Masee, a moderate fundamentalist but a prominent leader in and first president of the Fundamentalist Fellowship in the old Northern Baptist Convention, grew weary of the denominational infighting over liberalism and ended up calling for the fundamentalists to lay down their swords and join the liberals in denominational evangelism and missions. See George W. Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1973), p. 157.

¹¹⁹Mark Taylor Dalhouse, *An Island in the Lake of Fire*, pp. 53, 73; Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, p. 159; Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," p. 29.

¹²⁰Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," pp. 52-53.

¹²¹Carpenter, "The Fundamentalist Leaven and the Rise of an Evangelical United Front," p. 266.

weekly radio program was extremely popular. The Christian Businessmen's Committee was hosting well-attended prayer breakfasts around the country. These were certainly "extraordinary times" when "evangelical religion was carving out some new cultural space for itself."¹²² Fundamentalist evangelism prospered again as local church and city-wide campaigns began seeing remarkable results. Evangelism and revival were "in the air." Virtually everyone with a heart for souls and a modicum of evangelistic abilities and techniques was having success.

An important stratum in this religious awakening out of which came the most far-reaching evangelistic impact was the youth rally movement, especially Youth for Christ, organized in 1945. Billy Graham, the acknowledged titular head of evangelism since 1949, was a product of the original Youth for Christ evangelistic thrust, being the first YFC full-time, traveling evangelist and one of the early popular speakers of the youth rally movement.¹²³ Graham held large and successful Youth for Christ evangelistic rallies in the US, Great Britain, and Europe in 1945–47.¹²⁴ Graham's evangelistic team was eventually built of former Youth for Christ evangelists and workers such as George Wilson, Walter Smyth, Cliff Barrows, and Tedd Smith, among others.

Mass evangelism and the eventual impasse that ended fundamentalist/evangelical unity was propelled by the 1949 Christ For Greater Los Angeles tent campaign of Billy Graham and his team which went from September 25 to November 20, 1949. After traveling for Youth for Christ, Graham held city-wide meetings in 1947 at Grand Rapids, MI, and Charlotte, NC. In 1948 he was at Augusta, GA, and Modesto, CA. In 1949 he held meetings in Miami, FL, Baltimore, MD, Altoona, PA, and then in Los Angeles. The LA campaign saw unbelievably huge crowds and an astonishing response, including the conversion of several well-known celebrities. This crusade was followed in the next several years by equally amazing campaigns in Boston, MA, Columbia, SC, Portland, OR, and many others. 1954, 1955, and part of 1956 were spent holding mammoth crusades abroad.¹²⁵ But the crusade of greatest importance in the fortunes of the new evangelicalism and

¹²²Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, pp. 229, 231. See also his description of the post-WWII spiritual awakenings on pp. 213–17.

¹²³A concise but helpful account of the beginnings of Youth for Christ, Young Life, and Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship (in the US) is Bruce Shelley, "The Rise of Evangelical Youth Movements," *Fides et Historia* 18 (Jan 1986). See also Mel Larson, *Youth For Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1947).

¹²⁴See Billy Graham's own account of his Youth for Christ years in *Just As I Am: The Autobiography of Billy Graham* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1997), pp. 92–111.

¹²⁵See a complete itinerary of Graham crusades from 1947 to 1996 in *Just As I Am*, pp. 736–39.

fundamentalism was the 1957 New York Crusade which ran from May 15 to September 1. This was a precedent-making campaign because two issues of extreme importance, over which the moderate evangelicals and the militant fundamentalists became permanently polarized, came to the fore—sponsorship and convert referrals.

Billy Graham's roots were in fundamentalism as well as that of other Bible believing evangelists before him. Modernism and neoorthodoxy have no true evangelism and consequently their churches and denominations wither into irrelevancy. Their strategy in the 1950s was to ride the crest of the evangelical wave of evangelism and revivalism and thus fill their empty churches. And this tack proved to be productive once evangelical evangelists, principally Billy Graham, acceded to the inclusivist idea.¹²⁶ Both evangelical and non-evangelical churchmen lived off each other's wealth to promote a common goal—reaching the masses.

Originally Graham had the policy of being sponsored in evangelistic endeavors by fundamentalists. That all changed with the New York Crusade when new evangelical evangelism made a calculated about-face and demanded, and received, broad-based approval and support, including that of non-evangelicals. The Los Angeles campaign of 1949, while certainly interdenominational, was sponsored only by evangelicals/fundamentalists, although Graham now seems to demur a bit on that point.¹²⁷ Graham had always solicited fundamentalist support, and his early years in crusade evangelism reflected this.

He had spoken against 'apostasy' as strongly as other fundamentalists, and there was little to indicate that he would become the struggle which would cause great bitterness among conservative Christians. Eventually Billy Graham came to be *the* issue in the division of conservative evangelicalism.¹²⁸

¹²⁶Nothing is more revealing of this liberal strategy than the report by Michael Boland on the Graham Harringay Crusade in England of 1954 ("Co-operative Evangelism at Harringay," *The Banner of Truth* 42 [May/June 1966]). He said "one constant feature [of the Harringay campaign] is the participation of leading ministers who could not be described as evangelical" (p. 7). He then documents the testimonies to liberal gains of the Archbishops of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey and Geoffrey Fisher, the Anglican bishop of London, J. W. C. Wand, and the former pastor of City Temple, Leslie Weatherhead, all liberals. The latter's assessment is quite plain: "...any Minister who frequently preaches to small congregations might rejoice that Billy Graham is helping to fill our churches for us" (p. 10). Boland's conclusion is apt: "Billy Graham was to non-evangelical ministers at Harringay, ... a recruiting sergeant filling their churches for them. He was providing them with congregations in whom they could inculcate their liberal and Anglo-Catholic teachings" (p. 10).

¹²⁷In *Just As I Am*, Graham says that he insisted that the LA Campaign Committee broaden its church support to include as many denominations and churches as possible because the Committee "represented too limited an evangelical constituency to make an impact" (p. 144).

¹²⁸Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," pp. 9–10.

There is a virtual litany of statements made by Billy Graham and others around him at the time disclaiming anything but fundamental sponsorship for his early campaigns. Robert P. Shuler, militant fundamentalist pastor of the Trinity Methodist Church, Los Angeles, and editor of *The Methodist Challenge*, noted:

None of the great evangelists had ever before accepted the sponsorship of modernists. Billy himself had not only refused to hold a campaign under their sponsorship but had openly declared that he never would. In his Los Angeles campaign, I personally saw and heard him turn down and politely decline the approval and cooperation of the Church Federation, which represented the Federal Council, now the National Council.¹²⁹

Graham apologized profusely, when president of Northwestern Schools, Minneapolis, that an ad for a book by liberal Harry Emerson Fosdick inadvertently appeared in *The Pilot*, the school's publication.¹³⁰ In reply to Robert T. Ketchum, national representative of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, who in his travels had been asked scores of times about some of the statements and practices of Billy Graham, Jerry Beaven, in an April 20, 1951 letter, said simply, "It grieves me to the very depths of my heart to think that another fellow servant of Christ...could suggest any compromise in his [Graham's] message or ministry."¹³¹ In a letter to John R. Rice (May 10, 1952), Graham said, "We have never had a modernist on our Executive Committee, and we have never been sponsored by the Council of Churches in any city, except Shreveport and Greensboro,... I do not think you will find any man who has sat under my ministry in any of these campaigns who would testify that I ever pulled a punch."¹³² At the 1948 annual Conservative Baptist Association in Milwaukee, when asked about the upcoming World Council of Churches meeting in Copenhagen, the evangelist

¹²⁹Robert P. Shuler, *The Methodist Challenge* (Oct 1957), p. 3, quoted in Brad K. Gsell, *The Legacy of Billy Graham: The Accommodation of Truth to Error in the Evangelical Church*, revised and expanded edition (Charlotte, NC: Fundamental Presbyterian Publications, 1996), p. 15.

¹³⁰He said, "We do not condone nor have fellowship with any form of modernism" (*The Pilot* [April 1951], p. 222). On assuming the presidency of Northwestern Schools and the editorship of *The Pilot*, Graham noted that the magazine had "indeed been militant in its stand against Modernism in every form," and he pledged that there would be no change under his leadership (*The Pilot* [March 1948], p. 113.)

¹³¹Robert T. Ketchum, "The Billy Graham Controversy," *The Baptist Bulletin* (December 1952), p. 25.

¹³²Quoted by Robert Dunzweiler, *Billy Graham: A Critique* (Philadelphia: Faith Theological Seminary, n.d.. This booklet is an address by the author given March 4, 1961.), p. 11.

replied, "I believe they are going to nominate the Anti-christ."¹³³ In a reply (May 29, 1951) to a fundamentalist committee who wanted to bring the evangelist to New York for a crusade, Graham said the committee did not represent the churches in the area, and he wanted an "ecumenical spirit," but further stated, "I have never been, nor will I ever be in favor of a modernist being on the committee or in any way having any working fellowship in this meeting."¹³⁴ Replying to Chester Tulga (December 27, 1951), Graham asserted, "My separation and my theology have not veered one iota from that of W. B. Riley."¹³⁵ In a letter to Bob Jones Sr. (June 3, 1952), Graham declared, "The modernists do not support us anywhere.... We have never had a man on our committee that denied the virgin birth, the vicarious atonement, or the bodily resurrection."¹³⁶ John R. Rice, in a letter to Graham (May 2, 1957), recalled an earlier conversation they had had: "You told me about the Atlanta campaign that modernists were put on the committee before you were there and when you had no control of the situation, and you said, 'I promised God I will never let that happen again.'"¹³⁷ After Rice visited Graham at the Scotland Crusade (1954), he reported in the *Sword of the Lord*: "Dr Graham...told me frankly that he felt that he must not have any man speaking for him as an official of the campaign or taking part on the public program of the campaign who is not true on the great fundamentals of the Christian Faith."¹³⁸ After the fracture in fellowship between Rice and Graham, Rice would write:

I talked with Dr. Graham again and again about the danger of yoking up with modernism. Again and again he assured me that he had vowed to God he would never have a man on his committee who was not right on the

¹³³G. Archer Weniger, "The Position of Dr. Graham Before He Embraced Ecumenical Evangelism" (Oakland, CA: Foothill Boulevard Baptist Church, mimeographed, n.d.).

¹³⁴Quoted by James E. Bennett, "The Billy Graham New York Crusade: Why I Cannot Support It," *A Ministry of Disobedience: Christian Leaders Analyze the Billy Graham New York Crusade*, ed. Carl McIntire (Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, n.d.), p. 12. The article first appeared in the *Christian Beacon* (Nov 22, 1956).

¹³⁵Excerpt from the letter to Tulga, a copy of which was sent to Bob Jones Sr., Fundamentalism Collection, Bob Jones University, Greenville, SC.

¹³⁶Fundamentalism Collection, Bob Jones University, Greenville, SC.

¹³⁷John R. Rice, "Billy Graham and Editor Exchange Letters," *Sword of the Lord* (May 24, 1957), p. 2.

¹³⁸Rice, "Questions Answered About Billy Graham," *Sword of the Lord* (June 17, 1955), p. 9. On the same page Rice also said: "As I understand Billy, he has definitely pledged that he will not have any man in leadership in his campaigns to represent him officially who is not true to the inspiration of the Bible, the deity of Christ, His blood atonement and such fundamental truths."

inspiration of the Bible, the deity of Christ, and such matters.¹³⁹

In the same vein, there was constant disavowal of the practice of sending crusade converts back to modernistic and even Roman Catholic churches, the second issue that permanently divided the evangelicals from the fundamentalists in 1957. Rumors and charges abounded already by 1950 about converts being referred to liberal and Catholic churches,¹⁴⁰ but these were routinely denied. Jerry Beaven, for example, secretary to Dr. Graham, wrote to Robert Ketcham: "That you should give any credence to the idea that Mr. Graham would ever turn over any decision cards to the Roman Catholic Church seems inconceivable."¹⁴¹ In November 1957, Walter Smyth, from the Billy Graham headquarters, told a group of Conservative Baptist ministers in the San Francisco Bay Area in view of the upcoming Cow Palace crusade that "the New York crusade was not sponsored by the Protestant Council of New York" and that "Billy Graham has never at any time in history given any cards to the Catholics."¹⁴²

Despite the clarity of the all foregoing disclaimers and assertions, there is evidence that they were at best disingenuous. When John R. Rice finally broke with Billy Graham, the evangelist wrote Rice, somewhat disbelievingly, that "the sponsorship that has disturbed a few was far more liberal in Glasgow than in New York, yet you sensed the presence of God and did not have adjectives enough to describe it."¹⁴³ Graham has implied that there had already been broad sponsorship (i.e., some of which was non-evangelical) for the 1949 Los Angeles

¹³⁹Rice, "Cooperative Evangelism," *Sword of the Lord* (June 20, 1958), p. 12.

¹⁴⁰Robert T. Ketcham documented numerous instances of these charges in *The Baptist Bulletin* (December 1952), pp. 8, 23–24. Carl McIntire also asserted the same: "His [Graham's] ministry is devoid of any recognition or any consciousness of the apostasy in the church, and the converts which are led to the Lord in the campaigns are left to go to 'the church of their choice' without any instruction or indoctrination. They go into the modernist, apostate churches, into the National Council of Churches, and some even, as any number have gone, according to reports, into the Roman Catholic Church itself" ("Graham, Sockman Meet on America's Town Meeting: Sockman Wins Round," *Christian Beacon* [Jan 18, 1951], p. 8.

¹⁴¹Letter from Jerry Beaven to Robert T. Ketcham, April 20, 1951, "Graham-Ketcham Correspondence" (distributed by R. T. Ketcham, 431 S. Dearborn, Suite 1205, Chicago, IL), p. 12.

¹⁴²Letter of inquiry about these and other assertions by Pastor G. Archer Weniger to Walter Smyth, December 20, 1957, Fundamentalism Collection, Bob Jones University, Greenville, SC.

¹⁴³This was "Dr. Graham's Kindly Letter" to Rice, April 27, 1957, reproduced in the *Sword of the Lord* (May 24, 1957), p. 2. Regarding Rice's effusiveness over the Scotland Crusade, which Rice attended and had private conversations with the evangelist, Graham is correct. But the admission of liberal involvement is telling.

campaign.¹⁴⁴ Also the Los Angeles practice with reference to convert referrals was to direct them to the church of choice, a fact that does not seem to have been known or at least comprehended by fundamentalists at the time. Nevertheless, J. Edwin Orr was quite forthright about the policy as he wrote shortly after the campaign:

The Christ for Greater Los Angeles committee handled the distribution of the cards, sending cards to the pastor of any church specified, or to the nearest co-operating church of any denomination specified, or to the nearest co-operating evangelical church if no denomination were specified.¹⁴⁵

The response of the Roman Catholic Church to the 1950 Boston Crusade was “heartening” to the Graham team, as the evangelist now recalls.¹⁴⁶ In the 1950 ecclesiastical atmosphere, to fundamentalists and conservatives this would have been an upsetting comment. In 1950, Graham considered Jesse Bader, then the evangelism secretary of the Federal/National Council of Churches, and later the chairman of Visitation Evangelism that followed up the New York Crusade, a “wise older friend.”¹⁴⁷ Willis Haymaker joined the Graham team for the 1950 Columbia, SC Crusade. “He would also call on the local Catholic bishop or other clerics to acquaint them with Crusade plans and invite them to the meetings.” Graham notes that this was pre-Vatican II, “but we were concerned to let the Catholic bishops see that my goal was not to get people to leave their church; rather I wanted them to commit their lives to Christ.”¹⁴⁸ In an interview of Graham before the 1954 Paris campaign, the evangelist was asked:

If Catholics made decisions at your meetings will you encourage them to return to the faith they were born into? Answer: My objective is to get the people to accept Jesus Christ. The names of the converts will be turned over to the Evangelistic Alliance which invited us to France. Question: Are there any Catholic members of the Alliance? Answer: No. (A member of the Alliance interrupted to say that cards of people requesting reaffirmation in the Catholic faith would be turned over to the Catholic church).¹⁴⁹

In an interview concerning Graham’s 1954 European Crusade, the

¹⁴⁴Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 144.

¹⁴⁵J. Edwin Orr, “Preparing For Revival,” *Revival In Our Time* (Wheaton: Van Kampen, 1950), p. 38.

¹⁴⁶Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 161.

¹⁴⁷*Ibid.*, p. 186.

¹⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 163.

¹⁴⁹George Burnham, *Billy Graham: A Mission Accomplished* (Westwood, NJ: Revell, 1955), p. 113.

evangelist stated: "If a person in one of these campaigns makes a commitment to Christ, we don't drop him. He is followed up. The ministers all do that. His name and address and a lot of information about him is taken, and within 24 hours that is sent to a minister of the church of his choice, regardless of denomination."¹⁵⁰ Jerry Beaven sort of summed up the referral policy:

Billy has always adopted the view that he is merely the messenger boy. He delivers God's message and what happens to those who receive it is not his responsibility.... Following each meeting when the invitation to make a commitment to Christ was given, [the] counselors met with those who responded. They conducted careful interviews and in turn referred those who responded to the church they indicated they preferred.¹⁵¹

So then by the time of the preparations for the 1957 New York Crusade, when the new inclusive policy was officially acknowledged, announced, and implemented, it appears that there was a pattern regarding sponsorship and referrals already well in place. For whatever reason, it seems that this pattern was not generally known. Carl McIntire, however, was perceptive at this point, declaring that "Billy Graham has been building up to this position over a period of years. The New York campaign, under the modernist-inclusivist Protestant Council of New York City, the voice of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., has brought all these matters into focus."¹⁵²

Antecedents for the first New York Crusade can probably be dated to 1951 when a group of fundamentalist preachers invited the Graham team for an evangelistic campaign in 1952. They had heard and seen what had happened in Los Angeles (1949) and Boston (1950). A committee of 87 was formed, 66 at a breakfast and 21 chosen later by the 66, "largely at the selection of Billy Graham."¹⁵³ John Sutherland Bonnell, a liberal Presbyterian, among other liberals, was chosen for the committee. Jack Wyrzten, a popular and influential youth evangelist in New York City, objected to the heterogeneous composition of the committee, and a group of about 10 ministers drew up a statement of faith for the committee members to sign. Bonnell and others refused to sign. Graham then felt that the committee no longer represented the area churches. In a letter of May 29, 1951 he indicated he wanted the committee to

¹⁵⁰"Billy Graham's Story: New Crusade in Europe," *U. S. News and World Report* (August 27, 1954), p. 89.

¹⁵¹Jerry Beaven, "The Billy Graham I Know," *Christian Herald* (August 1966), p. 72.

¹⁵²Carl McIntire, "The Graham Debate," *A Ministry of Disobedience*, p. 35.

¹⁵³James E. Bennet, "The Billy Graham New York Crusade: Why I Cannot Support It," *A Ministry of Disobedience*, p.11.

endorse an “ecumenical spirit,” but that he had never been in favor of having a modernist on the committee or of having a working relationship with modernists.¹⁵⁴ The group dropped its efforts to bring Graham to New York. In 1954 Wyrzten proposed to his friends that Graham again be invited to New York, and drew up a petition asking him to come. At about the same time the New York Protestant Council also asked the Graham team to come. After a long delay, Wyrzten was turned down and the Protestant Council’s invitation was accepted, reversing Graham’s position in his May 29, 1951 letter to the committee of 87. These maneuverings, however, were still behind-the-scenes and not public knowledge.

The year 1956 proved to be the year of unveiling for inclusive evangelism as Graham went public with his new policy and precipitated a final and complete break with separatist fundamentalists. This public disclosure was occasioned by two principal events: Graham’s open support of the Cooperative Program of the Southern Baptist Convention in April, and an interview with him in *Christian Life* magazine in June.

Liberalism in the Southern Baptist Convention’s schools, denominational machinery, and some churches was rampant and well-known in the mid-1950s. The fundamentalist response inside the Convention was either to withdraw or, more popularly, simply to withhold support of the Cooperative Program which funded the denominational machine, including the schools. John R. Rice, who himself had come out of the Convention in the 1930s but still had an affinity for and close friends within the Convention, counseled the latter tactic of not supporting the Cooperative Program. It was quite a blow to Rice, therefore, when Billy Graham openly announced his loyalty to the Convention and his support of the Cooperative Program. Rice, an evangelist with a heart for mass evangelism and personal soulwinning, had been defensive of Graham in the face of seemingly incontrovertible evidence of the evangelist’s straying from separatism into inclusivism.¹⁵⁵ But support of the Cooperative Program was finally too much.

A letter over Graham’s signature appeared in *The Baptist Standard* (April 7, 1956), an organ of the Texas Baptist Convention. It said in part:

I am proud to be a member of the State Baptist Convention of Texas....
My heart was always with the convention.... I have come to believe that it
is nearer the New Testament church than any other denomination....

¹⁵⁴Ibid.

¹⁵⁵For example, “Questions Answered About Billy Graham,” *Sword of the Lord* (June 17, 1955), p. 1. See also Butler, “Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity,” chapter 5, “The *Sword* and Billy Graham” (pp. 66–91) for an excellent chronicle and analysis of the relationship between Rice and Graham.

Concerning the Cooperative Program, I believe it is the greatest means ever devised by the church for giving one's tithe.... In private and public conversation I support the Cooperative Program without hesitation.... I am proud of our convention and I take my stand with it with an undying loyalty.¹⁵⁶

This produced a rift between Rice and Graham that saw Graham resign from Rice's board, the removal of his name from the masthead of the *Sword*, and a number of articles by Rice that were anti-new evangelical and anti-inclusivist. For all practical purposes, the *Sword* turned anti-Billy Graham as well, although Rice tried to give the impression that he was not against Graham personally nor his crusade message of salvation in Jesus Christ alone.¹⁵⁷ Butler observed correctly that when Billy Graham broke with John R. Rice over supporting the Cooperative Program, "Graham had severed his last tie with separatist fundamentalism." This was far more than a personal thing. "Graham would emerge as the chief public spokesman of the new evangelicalism, and the division of conservative evangelicalism would follow."¹⁵⁸

In an interview with Billy Graham in *Christian Life*, the evangelist seemed to be making a public declaration of his new inclusive policy of ecumenical evangelism.¹⁵⁹ He noted the "full retreat" of "extreme liberalism" as well as the "fighting, feuding and controversies among God's people, even within evangelical circles in the United States and even abroad." He was determined "to stay out of these controversies and divisions among God's people and continue to preach Christ and him crucified to sinful men." In view of the New York Crusade the next year, Graham noted the "deep cleavages among Christians in New York City." When the interview finally came around to sponsorship of the upcoming crusade, the evangelist said, "What difference does it make who sponsors a meeting? It is the message that counts," and he went on to cite Paul at Mars Hill and Christ in the synagogues as examples of the inclusive policy. As to his policy on accepting speaking engagements, he answered, "I shall continue to go wherever I am invited and shall give

¹⁵⁶The letter was reproduced by Rice in "Which Way, Billy Graham?" *Sword of the Lord* (Nov 23, 1956), p. 2.

¹⁵⁷This distinction by Rice that he would not separate from Graham, because the evangelist was a Christian and was winning souls, eventually led to the controversy within the fundamentalist camp in the 1960s of "degrees" of separation. Rice felt that he was not separating from Graham technically, but from the modernists in his inclusivist campaigns. Rice's position on ecclesiastical separation was that one should only separate from modernists, cultists, and infidels (i.e., 1st degree separation), not from fellow Christians who do not separate from modernists (2nd degree separation).

¹⁵⁸Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," p. 160.

¹⁵⁹"What's the Next Step?" *Christian Life* (June 1956), pp. 20-23.

priority to those groups that seem to need the Gospel most.” While there may be a certain amount of cryptic language in the words, fundamentalists who had been following the crusades for five or six years knew what was being said. It was an open announcement of a sea change in evangelism policy.

That policy was made unambiguously clear the next year at the meeting of the NAE in Buffalo, NY, April 3, 1957. There Graham, in an address entitled “The Lost Chord of Evangelism,” said bluntly:

Our New York campaign has been challenged by some extremists on two points. First, as to sponsorship, I would like to make myself quite clear. I intend to go anywhere, sponsored by anybody, to preach the Gospel of Christ, if there are no strings attached to my message. I am sponsored by civic clubs, universities, ministerial associations and councils of churches all over the world. *I intend to continue* [emphasis his].

Second, we have been challenged on what happens to the converts when the crusade is over. Apparently these brethren who make these statements have no faith in the Holy Spirit.... The work of follow up is the work of the Holy Spirit.... We do all we can in follow up, but ultimately they're in the hands of the Holy Spirit. *He is more than able* [emphasis his].

There is a great swing all over the world, within the Church, toward a more conservative theological position. The old terms fundamentalism and liberalism are now passe. The situation is radically changed, since the days of Machen, Riley and other defenders of the faith a generation ago.¹⁶⁰

In so saying, Graham congealed publicly the inclusive policy of ecumenical evangelism which was followed in every Graham crusade thereafter and by all the new evangelical-type evangelists since. The address was especially timed to inform the public, notably the fundamentalist community, of the ecclesiastical infrastructure of the upcoming New York Crusade in May and of the new ongoing policy of sponsorship and convert referral. Granted, the new policy of convert referral is somewhat encoded in Graham's address, but it was easily deciphered by those who were knowledgeable (fundamentalist, evangelical, and liberal) of crusade evangelism.

According to plan, the steering committee for the crusade featured some well-known local evangelicals and fundamentalists such as Jack Wyrzten of Word of Life Fellowship youth ministry; John Wimbish, pastor of the First Baptist Church; Daniel Poling, editor of *The Christian Herald*; John Bradbury, editor of the Baptist periodical *The Watchman Examiner*; Frank Gaebelein, headmaster of the Stoneybrook school; and William Ward Ayer, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church. The

¹⁶⁰Billy Graham, “The Lost Chord of Evangelism,” *Christianity Today* (April 1, 1957), p. 26.

committee also displayed a virtual “who’s who” of prominent New York liberal/neoorthodox churchmen such as Dan Potter, executive director of the Protestant Council; Jesse Bader, executive secretary of the Department of Evangelism of the National Council of Churches; John Sutherland Bonnell, pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church; Norman Vincent Peale, pastor of the Marble Collegiate [Methodist] Church; Robert J. McCracken, pastor of the Riverside [Baptist] Church; Henry Pitney Van Dusen, president of the Union Theological Seminary; and Ralph Sockman, pastor of the Madison Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church. Inquirers/converts were duly routed back to “the church of their choice.” Marble Collegiate church reportedly received the highest number of decision cards (373) with the Riverside Church being second.¹⁶¹

The New York Crusade permanently put in place a fissure between the new evangelicals and the fundamentalists. Fundamentalists could not pull in the harness with modernists and thus they could not collaborate with Billy Graham and the Billy Graham-type of ecumenical evangelism.¹⁶² Graham truly brought an end to evangelical unity. With the New York Crusade, Graham’s position of working with non-orthodox or unorthodox churchmen and churches was clear. “Some working relationship with the neoorthodoxy that was dominant had been arranged, and the pattern of New York was followed in city after city.”¹⁶³

OTHER INCIDENTS

While the New York Crusade was in a real sense the cap sheaf to the formation of the new evangelicalism’s distinction from fundamentalism, other contributing phenomena should be mentioned at least briefly because they were also part of the historical milieu of the emerging new evangelical coalition. These phenomena are the various books and articles that had their influence in flavoring the fundamentalist/evangelical atmosphere of the 1950s. Attention has already been called to the publication of Bernard Ramm’s *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* in 1954, and Carl Henry’s *Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology* in 1957.

¹⁶¹Reported by William Ward Ayer, “Aftermath of the Billy Graham Crusade of New York,” and quoted by Dunzweiler, “Billy Graham: A Critique,” p. 24. Ayer’s review also noted that 159 clergymen reported a total of 3997 referrals, 2552 of which were already members of churches.

¹⁶²A few fundamentalists, such as Jack Wyrzten and William Ward Ayer, did cooperate but did so on principles inconsistent with their fundamentalist separatism and previous concerns about having modernists on the crusade committee.

¹⁶³Butler, “Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity,” p. 13.

In 1956 Vernon Grounds, of the Denver Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, wrote an article entitled, "The Nature of Evangelicalism." After showing how evangelicalism has things in common as well as differences with "the great faiths of humanity" (Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, Confucianism, Judaism, Mohammedanism), liberal Protestantism, neoorthodoxy, and Roman Catholicism, he concluded:

Undeniably evangelicalism is fundamentalism, if by fundamentalism is meant a tenacious insistence upon the essential and central dogmas of historic Christianity. Yet as undeniably evangelicalism is not fundamentalism as fundamentalism is ordinarily construed. A thoroughgoing evangelical recognizes with a wry smile the truth in the liberal jibe: 'Fundamentalism is too much fun, too much damn, and too little mental.'¹⁶⁴

In the opinion of one analyst, this article "contained the first sustained public attempt by an evangelical scholar to dissociate himself from fundamentalism."¹⁶⁵

Another major factor in the fundamentalist/evangelical struggles was the creation in 1956 of *Christianity Today*, a fortnightly publication that carried the new evangelical cause on intellectual and practical, as well as newsy, informative planes. It was designed to be "an evangelical *Christian Century* [the leading liberal mouthpiece]."¹⁶⁶ Carl F. H. Henry was the first editor, and in his maiden editorial he outlined the purposes of the periodical. In forthcoming issues, an enlarging group of evangelical scholars "will expound and defend the basic truths of the Christian faith in terms of reverent scholarship and of practical application to the needs of the present generation."¹⁶⁷ "*Christianity Today* will apply the biblical revelation to the contemporary social crisis, by presenting the implications of the total Gospel message for every area of life. This, Fundamentalism has often failed to do."¹⁶⁸ The new publication "will set forth the unity of the Divine revelation in nature and Scripture," and will further "seek to supplement seminary training with sermonic helps, pastoral advice, and book reviews, by leading ministers and scholars."¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁴Vernon Grounds, "The Nature of Evangelicalism," *Eternity* (Feb 1956), pp. 12, 13.

¹⁶⁵Butler, "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity," p. 116. He reiterated, "With the publication of this article by Vernon Grounds, the process of the division of evangelical orthodoxy into evangelicalism and fundamentalism came into the open" (p. 122).

¹⁶⁶Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*, p. 157.

¹⁶⁷Carl F. H. Henry, "Why Christianity Today?" (Oct 10, 1956), p. 20.

¹⁶⁸Ibid.

¹⁶⁹Ibid.

The original idea for the new magazine was given by Billy Graham who recalled: "During 1953, I was beginning to be attacked from both the left and the right." At 2 a.m. one morning late in 1953, he was awakened and went to his desk and wrote out his ideas for "an evangelical counterpart to *The Christian Century*."¹⁷⁰ The editorial stance had to tread a middle road between the extreme left and extreme right. But while slanted toward evangelicalism, it was a given that "the magazine would be useless if it had the old, extreme fundamentalist stamp on it."¹⁷¹ With money from J. Howard Pew (board chairman of the Sun Oil Co.) and the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, the magazine was launched. Harold John Ockenga was the chairman of the board of *Christianity Today* for the next twenty-five years (1956–1981).

Allusion has already been made to the watershed article, "Is Evangelical Theology Changing?" an evangelical symposium in the March 1956 issue of *Christian Life*. The point of the article was that evangelical theology definitely was changing; "fundamentalism has become evangelicalism."¹⁷² Eight areas of change were listed. (1) "A friendly attitude toward science," (2) "a willingness to re-examine beliefs concerning the work of the Holy Spirit," (3) "a shift away from so-called extreme dispensationalism," (4) "an increased emphasis on scholarship," (5) "a more definite recognition of social responsibility," (6) "a re-opening of the subject of biblical inspiration," (7) "a more tolerant attitude toward varying views of eschatology," and (8) "a growing willingness of evangelical theologians to converse with liberal theologians."¹⁷³ As might be expected, there were numerous responses from fundamentalists, all quite negative in the main.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁰"In the Beginning : Billy Graham Recounts the Origins of *Christianity Today*," *Christianity Today* (July 17, 1981), p. 26. For another of Graham's personal recollections of the origin of the magazine, see his *Just As I Am* (pp. 184–94).

¹⁷¹Graham, *Christianity Today* (July 17, 1981), p. 26.

¹⁷²"Is Evangelical Theology Changing," *Christian Life* (March 1956), p. 17.

¹⁷³*Ibid.*, pp. 17–19. This article was followed by a similar one the next month, "Is Liberal Theology Changing?"

¹⁷⁴Such as, Richard V. Clearwaters, "The Bible: The Unchanging Evangelical Volume," *Sword of the Lord* (May 4, 1956), p. 1; Robert T. Ketcham, "A New Peril in Our Last Days," *Christian Beacon* (May 17, 1956), p. 2; William F. Culbertson, "Swing of the Pendulum," *Sword of the Lord* (May 25, 1956), p. 5; John R. Rice, "Letter To the Editor," *Christian Life* (May 1956), p. 3; Bob Jones Sr, "Letter To the Editor," *Christian Life* (June 1956), p. 4; Chester A. Tulga, "Baptists Are More Than Evangelicals," *The Baptist Bulletin* (June, July, Aug 1956); "Is Evangelical Christianity Changing?" A symposium article edited by Charles L. Feinberg, *The King's Business* (Jan 1957), p. 23; Alva J. McClain, "Is Theology Changing in the Evangelical Camp?" *The Brethren Missionary Herald* (Feb 23, 1957), p. 123; and John F. Walvoord, "What's Right About Fundamentalism?" *Eternity* (June 1957), p. 6.

On December 8, 1957, Harold John Ockenga gave a news release in which he stated that “the New Evangelicalism is the latest dress of orthodoxy as Neo-Orthodoxy is the latest expression of theological liberalism.” He stressed the differences between the new evangelicalism and fundamentalism in that new evangelicalism had “a willingness to handle the social problems which Fundamentalism evaded,” a change of strategy “from one of separation to one of infiltration,” a willingness to “face the intellectual problems and meet them in the framework of modern learning,” and a “positive proclamation of the truth in distinction from all errors without delving into the personalities which embrace the error.” New evangelicalism also had a united front, in Ockenga’s opinion, consisting of a series of factors such as the National Association of Evangelicals articulating for the new movement on a denominational level, the World Evangelical Fellowship which unites national organizations in 26 countries into a world organization, a “stream of apologetic literature” expounding the movement’s point of view, Fuller Seminary and other seminaries committed to orthodoxy, *Christianity Today* to explain further the positions of the movement, and evangelist Billy Graham, “who on the mass level is the spokesman of the convictions and ideals of the New Evangelicalism.” Some 21 years later, Ockenga formulated a slightly different wording for the emergence of the new group, putting more of an onus on fundamentalism than the news release. He thought that “the fundamentalists were not Christian in their attitude toward defending the faith,” the “strategy of the fundamentalists was wrong. He raised a shibboleth of having a pure church, both as a congregation and a denomination,” and the “social theory of the fundamentalists was governed by eschatology.”¹⁷⁵

In 1958 a 100-page book entitled *Cooperative Evangelism*, an apologetic for inclusive evangelism of the Billy Graham variety, appeared and was sent free to thousands of ministers and ministerial students.¹⁷⁶ While there had been attempts to justify the new policy of sponsorship and convert referrals,¹⁷⁷ this was the first, if not only, book-length endeavor to give it some kind of scholastic and intellectual respectability.

¹⁷⁵Harold John Ockenga, “From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism,” pp. 42, 43.

¹⁷⁶Robert O. Ferm, *Cooperative Evangelism: Is Billy Graham Right or Wrong?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958).

¹⁷⁷Such as those by William K. Harrison, “General Harrison Answers Graham Critics,” *Christianity Today* (Jan 21, 1957), p. 28; Paul S. Rees, “Billy Graham Crusades: What About the Criticism?” *Christian Life* (April 1957), p. 14; Carl F. H. Henry, “Opposition to Evangelism A Strange Phenomenon,” *Christianity Today* (Feb 18, 1957), p. 23; Joe Bayly, “Editorial on the Billy Graham New York Crusade,” *His* (Oct 1957), pp. 39–40; and Donald Grey Barnhouse, “Billy in Manhattan,” *Eternity* (May 1957), p. 7.

Again, fundamentalist and even some evangelical response was unfavorable.¹⁷⁸

In 1959 a book written by Fuller Seminary professor Edward John Carnell, *The Case For Orthodox Theology*,¹⁷⁹ came as a bombshell in the evangelical and fundamentalist communities, creating all manner of concern and question to fundamentalists and considerable anxiety and headache to evangelicals. The book was an intemperate, bitterly caustic attack against fundamentalism. Westminster Press put out a trilogy of “case” books, and Carnell was to present the case for orthodoxy.¹⁸⁰ In many minds, Carnell, for whatever reason, not only did not make a case for orthodoxy, he did not even make a case. He especially was unclear on where he stood on the linchpin doctrine of fundamentalism and conservative orthodoxy—verbal inerrancy,¹⁸¹ and this was the main problem that inerrantists (fundamentalist and evangelical) had with the book. So dissatisfied was Cornelius Van Til with Carnell’s contribution that he wrote his own volume critiquing the trilogy of case books and presenting his own case for orthodoxy under the title, *The Case For Calvinism*.¹⁸² Carnell’s *Case* book stirred up enough controversy among evangelicals

¹⁷⁸Gordon H. Clark, “Letter To the Editor,” *Christianity Today* (May 26, 1958), p. 18; John R. Rice, “Cooperative Evangelism,” *Sword of the Lord* (June 20, 1958), p. 1; Phil Foxwell, “Book Review: Cooperative Evangelism,” *Bible Presbyterian Reporter* (June–July 1958), p. 15; Gary G. Cohen, *Biblical Separation Defended: A Biblical Critique of Ten New Evangelical Arguments* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1966), and William Culbertson, “Review of *Cooperative Evangelism*,” *Moody Monthly* (Aug 1958), pp. 54–55.

¹⁷⁹Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959.

¹⁸⁰The other two were *The Case For A New Reformation Theology* [neoorthodoxy] by William Hordern, and *The Case For Theology in Liberal Perspective* by L. Harold DeWolf.

¹⁸¹For example, he maintained that “orthodoxy has never devised an official view of inspiration” (p. 99), or “orthodoxy may never officially decide whether the Holy Spirit corrected the documents from which the Chronicler drew his information” (p. 111). This point was not lost on non-evangelical theologians. John B. Cobb Jr. noted it in his review of Carnell (*Interpretation* [June 1960], pp. 94–96). L. Harold DeWolf himself thought the new evangelicals were in a “noticeable, though indecisive change” on inspiration and biblical authority and cites Carnell’s *Case* as evidence (*Present Trends in Christian Thought* [New York: Association Press, 1960, pp. 45, 55–56]. More pointedly, DeWolf felt that with the *Case* book, Carnell “advanc[ed] to a new position which [had] brought him into opposition, not only to the self-declared fundamentalists but also to many of the more conservative representatives of the new evangelicalism. In fact he might not now care to be identified as a new evangelical at all” (letter to Pastor Vernon Lyons, Ashburn Baptist Church, Chicago, dated May 11, 1962). William Hordern observed: “It has been evident for some time that the new conservatives have had difficulties with their concept of inerrancy,” citing Carnell, among others, as evidence (*New Directions in Theology Today* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966], pp. 80–89).

¹⁸²Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1963.

that in December 1959 Wheaton College hosted a roundtable discussion of the book consisting of George Ladd (Fuller Theological Seminary); Arthur Holmes, Robert D. Culver, and Samuel J. Schultz (Wheaton College); and John C. Whitcomb (Grace Theological Seminary), among others. Grace Theological Seminary's faculty had its own evaluation session of the book that same month, concluding that Carnell's work was inadequate and disappointing.¹⁸³ Other negative scholarly analyses of the book were also made.¹⁸⁴

Donald Grey Barnhouse figures largely in the emergence of the new evangelicalism in the 1950s. One historian/biographer noted that "theologically, Barnhouse will be remembered as one...who late in life contributed to the early development of twentieth century neo-evangelicalism."¹⁸⁵ Barnhouse was the pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, from 1927 to his death in 1960 at age 65. He studied at the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, the University of Chicago, Princeton Theological Seminary, the University of Grenoble (France), and the University of Pennsylvania. He was a Presbyterian fundamentalist of the general vintage of J. Gresham Machen, though a non-separatist. In 1932 he was "admonished" by the Philadelphia Presbytery for breaking the ninth commandment about bearing false witness and for breaking his ordination vows by charging fellow clergymen with heresy without going through the designated ecclesiastical channels to register his protest.¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, he retained a life-long affiliation with the Presbyterian Church in the USA.

Barnhouse's personality was difficult to take. His intellectual genius made him at least appear somewhat arrogant and high-minded both to conservatives and liberals. However, in his early years he was a great defender of the faith. He showed support for Dr. Machen by having him preach at Tenth Church, ignoring the presbytery's edict against Machen.¹⁸⁷ He stood against liberalism in his preaching, as editor of *Revelation*, later *Eternity*, magazine, and on his national radio program, The Bible Study Hour. He opposed error and unbelief in his own denomination, and was vocal against the liberal conciliar movements.

¹⁸³*The Brethren Missionary Herald* (Jan 23, 1960), pp. 59–62. See especially the analysis of John C. Whitcomb, "Present Trends in Evangelical Theology," pp. 61–62.

¹⁸⁴Robert E. Nicholas, "Review of *The Case For Orthodox Theology*," *Westminster Theological Journal* 22 (Nov 1959); J. Oliver Buswell, "Book Review: 'The Case For Orthodox Theology,'" *Bible Presbyterian Reporter* (Dec 1959, p. 16, and Jan 1960, p. 15); and John F. Walvoord, "A Trilogy of Theology," *Moody Monthly* (Feb 1960), p. 70.

¹⁸⁵C. Allyn Russell, "Donald Grey Barnhouse: Fundamentalist Who Changed," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 59 (Spring 1981): 54.

¹⁸⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 45–48.

¹⁸⁷*Ibid.*, p. 47.

However, in 1953 he issued a "New Year's Resolution,"¹⁸⁸ and took a decided turn in his attitude and actions toward fundamentalists and liberals. He noted about his early ministry: "I conceived the idea that I must strike out against all error wherever I saw it." He now wanted to have "Christian fellowship with a much wider circle of people." He wanted to "make his circle of fellowship on the basis of the fact that a man is going to be in Heaven with me." He also confessed that he "did not recognize that some of the things that have been accomplished by the National and World Councils are truly magnificent achievements for the Lord Jesus Christ." Barnhouse went from there to apologize to the Presbyterian Church (USA) and to the National Council of Churches for his past belligerence and bellicose attitude toward them. As a result the National Council offered to sponsor an opportunity for him to preach a series of national television messages.¹⁸⁹ He found fellowship with Seventh-day Adventists,¹⁹⁰ declaring them to be evangelical Christians. He discovered a oneness with the Assemblies of God Pentecostals.¹⁹¹ He defended the National and World Councils of churches.¹⁹² He castigated fundamentalists' practice of separation over Bible doctrine as completely unbiblical, Pharisaical, and sinful.¹⁹³ He printed an article in *Eternity* by Vernon Grounds that charged the fundamentalists with

¹⁸⁸*Eternity* (Jan 1953), inside front and back covers.

¹⁸⁹He as much as announced this forthcoming series in "Where Am I Going?" *Eternity* (June 1954), pp. 39–40. Later that year he accepted the invitation. See also his "One Church," *Eternity* (July 1958), p. 20.

¹⁹⁰Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?: A New Look at Seventh-day Adventism," *Eternity* (September 1956), p. 6. Also his "Postscript on Seventh-day Adventism," *Eternity* (November 1957), p. 22, and "One Church," *Eternity* (July 1958), p. 20.

¹⁹¹Barnhouse, "Finding Fellowship With Pentecostals," *Eternity* (April 1958), p. 8. This was actually the first celebrated new evangelical contact of fellowship with Pentecostals. While the Pentecostal-oriented Assemblies of God was in the National Association of Evangelicals, Pentecostals were second class citizens in the minds of some elements of the NAE. As late as 1967 Carl F. H. Henry lamented the number of Pentecostals in the NAE (35%), and went so far as to suggest starting another movement separate from the NAE (*Evangelicals At the Brink of Crisis* [Waco, TX:Word, 1967], pp. 107–108). Pentecostals received formal welcome into the new evangelical ranks when Oral Roberts was officially invited to the 1966 Berlin World Congress on Evangelism and Billy Graham was the featured speaker at the dedication of Oral Roberts University in 1967.

¹⁹²Barnhouse, "Evanston: What It Was," *Eternity* (Oct 1954), p. 8; "Who's Putting Religion Off the Air?" *Eternity* (April 1957), p. 14; and Walter R. Martin, "Oberlin Report: The World Council of Churches and Christian Unity," *Eternity* (Nov 1957), p. 14.

¹⁹³Barnhouse, "Twentieth Century Pharisaism," *Eternity* (Aug 1957), p. 6; "Thanksgiving and Warning," *Eternity* (Sept 1957), p. 9; and "One Church," *Eternity* (July 1958), p. 20.

not believing in the great commandment to love.¹⁹⁴ Though a loner by instinct, Barnhouse's influence in the changing evangelical scene in the 1950s was pronounced.

The 1950s decade of the turbulent struggles between the new evangelicals and the fundamentalists was capped with some articles by evangelicals in the liberal *Christian Century*. The symbolism as well as the content of these announcements must not be missed. It is not only what was said, but where it was said. Here were nationally-known evangelical leaders declaring to the liberal community through its own mouthpiece their change in status from fundamentalism to a more progressive and irenic new evangelicalism. Edward John Carnell noted that "through a series of subtle internal changes, fundamentalism shifted from an affirmation to a negation. The result was a cunning pharisaism that confused possession of truth with possession of virtue." "Fundamentalism often took on the mannerisms of a pugnacious cult." "Fundamentalism made its crowning error when it enlisted the doctrine of the church in its quest for negative status.... It was by discovery of this pompous theological error that I awoke from dogmatic slumber."¹⁹⁵

Billy Graham, in the *Christian Century* series, "How My Mind Has Changed," noted seven areas where his mind had changed.¹⁹⁶ He began by stating, "How I wish I could take back some of the statements made in those early days because of immaturity or a lack of knowledge and experience." He listed some of the changes as being the narrow limits of evangelism, the realistic results of mass evangelism, and his "increasing confidence in the ultimate triumph of the kingdom of God." Also his "belief in the social implications of the gospel [had] deepened and broadened.... (Naturally, there are some statements that I made a few years ago on socio-political affairs that I would like to retract)." He also noted:

My concept of the church has taken greater dimension. Ten years ago my concept of the church tended to be narrow and provincial,... I am now aware that the family of God contains people of various ethnological, cultural, class, and denominational differences. I have learned that there can even be minor disagreements of theology, methods and motives but that within the true church there is a mysterious unity that overrides all divisive

¹⁹⁴Vernon Grounds, "Is Love In the Fundamentalist Creed?" *Eternity* (June 1954), p. 6. He wrote: "This supreme fundamental [to love one another] has been grossly ignored. And perhaps that neglect explains to a large degree why fundamentalism in many quarters degenerated into a legalistic Phariseism, hard, frigid, ineffective, unethical and loveless."

¹⁹⁵Carnell, "Post-Fundamentalist Faith," *Christian Century* (Aug 26, 1959), p. 971.

¹⁹⁶Graham, "What Ten Years Have Taught Me," *Christian Century* (Feb 17, 1960), pp. 186-89.

factors.... I have also come to believe that within every visible church there is a group of regenerated, dedicated disciples of Christ.¹⁹⁷

The words in and of themselves are evangelical and right-sounding; but given the historical and literary context in which they were written, a discerning reader, whether liberal or conservative, could not fail to hear the still small voice of ecumenical inclusivism.

Edward John Carnell, in another bitter, whining, first-person singular parting shot at fundamentalism, wrote in the *Christian Century* an article entitled, "Orthodoxy: Cultic vs. Classical." Fundamentalism, he said, was "cultic." "A cult lives by mores and symbols of its own devising; it makes no effort to join fellowship with the church universal."¹⁹⁸ After criticizing fundamentalism for its view of a pure church and separatism, he closes with what must be one of the most pompous and condescending diatribes in all the fundamentalist-modernist and fundamentalist-new evangelical controversies.

Perhaps the day will come when the fundamentalist will temper his separatism by the wisdom of the ages. Perhaps not. But in the meantime let us not be too disturbed by his vanity. The fundamentalist means well. He wants status in the church, but he errs in the way he goes about getting it. Having missed the way, he needs our pity, not our scorn.¹⁹⁹

And so in nearly twenty years, i.e., the 1940s and 1950s, fundamentalism endured the new evangelical agitations, birth, and subsequent spasms of childhood and adolescence. It had to abide almost another four decades of tension, acrimony, and criticism from the new evangelical coalition. In the meantime the new movement itself went through upheavals and convulsions that left it in a state of malaise and theological depletion. Measured by its own complaints against fundamentalism in the 1940s for not penetrating and capturing the general culture for Christ, the new evangelicalism at the end of the twentieth century appears to have drifted into irrelevancy. Fundamentalism itself suffered setbacks in its struggles, and has pockets of diminished vitality and an overall diminution in numbers. But it has managed to retain the integrity of its heritage. Having fought off the inroads of modernism in the 1920s, having regrouped itself and made a fresh start in the 1930s, and having suffered the internal upheavals of the 1940s and 1950s, fundamentalism has had to anticipate and prepare for the next in a never-ending series of clashes with the enemy of the Cause and everyone's eternal soul.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., p. 188.

¹⁹⁸Carnell, "Orthodoxy: Cultic vs. Classical," *Christian Century* (March 16, 1960), p. 377.

¹⁹⁹Ibid., p. 379.