

The Transformation of the Fundamentalist Movement, 1925–1942

By **Niels Bjerre-Poulsen**

Copenhagen Business School

Heave an egg out of a Pullman window, and you will hit a Fundamentalist almost anywhere in the United States today.

H. L. Mencken, 1926

A quick glance at the historiography of fundamentalism gives the impression that the term describes two separate socio-religious movements in modern United States history: one that occurred between World War I and the Great Depression, committed to fighting modernism, Bolshevism and evolutionary theory; the other being a contemporary movement fighting for the reintroduction of schoolprayer and against abortion, the Equal Rights Amendment, gay rights, and other alleged threats against the holy nuclear family. A substantial amount of scholarly work has been devoted to the first period, just as a substantial amount of unscholarly work has been devoted to the latter. The intervening period, however, has drawn only a minimum of attention. The reason for this is one of the main subjects of this paper.

The basic assumption of the following is that there is a continuity between the two fundamentalist phenomena described; that fundamentalism, in the words of Ernest Sandeen, represents an authentic conservative tradition in American history.¹ In order to see this continuity from the heyday of fundamentalism in the 1920s to its recent resurgence, it is necessary to understand the primarily religious nature of the movement. What has remained fairly constant for more than a century is the commitment to a distinct set of theological doctrines.

It is not within the scope of this paper to dwell on the discussion of the religious and historical roots of fundamentalism. There seems to be a consensus in recent scholarship about the mainly religious nature of the fundamentalist phenomenon, as opposed to earlier socio-political interpretations.² Recent discussion has mainly focused on how narrowly it should be defined with regard to religious origins, and how the movement and its beliefs were conditioned by the cultural struggle of which it became a part. However, since an understanding of fun-

damentalism as a set of distinct theological doctrines, rather than just a synonym for conservative Protestantism, is important for the ideas presented in this paper, a brief summary of the most important fundamentalist doctrines will be helpful.

American fundamentalism can perhaps best be understood as a blend of doctrines taken from several, often divergent, nineteenth-century revivalist traditions. Although fundamentalism can be found within many different religious groups, its major strength is within groups with Reformed origins, such as Baptists and Presbyterians. A central element in fundamentalist doctrines is the sharp distinction between the natural and the supernatural. Unlike liberal theology and Higher Criticism, which in accordance with evolutionary theory postulates a natural process of development – with or without the help of God – the fundamentalists insist upon Creation and the shaping of history by divine forces. The Bible, they argue, is not poetry or a collection of allegories, but the literal, inerrant word of God. They find the justification for this Biblical inerrancy in the principle of "verbal inspiration." The idea that God has dictated the scriptures to the evangelists word for word, is a product of the so-called Princeton Theology, which was adopted by many revivalist groups in America throughout the latter part of the nineteenth century.³ Other fundamentalist doctrines closely related to a strong belief in the supernatural are the Virgin Birth, the miracles of Christ, his substitutionary atonement, and bodily resurrection.

Apart from elements of Princeton Theology, fundamentalism is strongly influenced by "dispensational premillennialism." Dispensational teachings divides history into distinct eras (dispensations), of which the final is the "millennium" where Christ returns to rule the world for one thousand years after having defeated Anti-Christ on Armageddon.⁴

Some of the religious doctrines that were blended in fundamentalism are divergent, a few even contradictory. The fundamentalists, however, are unified by the belief in an eternal, unchanging truth based on the Bible. Contrary to the common perception, leading fundamentalists such as W. B. Riley, J. Gresham Machen and William Jennings Bryan, maintained that their beliefs, not those of their liberal opponents, were "scientific," because they were based on fact and common sense.' J. Gresham Machen, New Testament scholar at Princeton and one of fundamentalism's leading spokesmen in the 1920s, claimed in *Christianity and Liberalism*,⁶ that liberal theology, in contrast to fundamentalism, had separated from the realm of fact and the scientific, in the hope of preserving Christianity by adjusting it to the dictates of modern scientific culture.⁷ His argument was that if the Bible was not based on facts, then it did not make any sense, and Christianity would be nothing but mere faith in humanity. In consequence, the liberals were simply un-Christian

in their human religious aspirations, and had to be separated from the fundamentalists.

To the fundamentalists, the secularization of society was a direct result of the undermining of biblical authority caused by modernism and the theory of evolution. Unless this process was stopped, it would eventually mean the end of Christian civilization. As a guideline for the true faith, a series of twelve pamphlets entitled *The Fundamentals* were conceived between 1910 and 1915.⁸ *The Fundamentals* had contributions from a large number of orthodox Bible teachers and scholars, and were distributed free of charge to pastors, missionaries, theological students and professors, religious editors, YMCA and YWCA secretaries, college professors and Sunday school superintendents.⁹ In all some three million individual volumes were distributed in the English-speaking world.¹⁰ When the term "fundamentalism" was coined in 1920, *The Fundamentals* became a point of reference for the identification of a "fundamentalist movement."¹¹ By that time, however, the fundamentalist reaction to modernism had hardened considerably. In 1919 the World's Christian Fundamentals Association had been founded in an attempt to unite the forces against modernism. The declared goal was now to purge the liberals from the denominations.

While the alleged spread of false religious doctrines remained the main concern of the fundamentalists, the cultural crisis following World War I strengthened other dimensions of the movement. Their alarm over the alleged spread of Bolshevism, their strong defense of prohibition and, most of all, their bitter fight against Darwinism, won widespread support from people who did not necessarily share the fundamentalist's concern for religious doctrine.¹² Riding high on cultural tensions and anti-intellectual sentiments, the fundamentalist movement became closely identified in public opinion with these struggles.

When J. Gresham Machen published *Christianity and Liberalism* in 1923, it did not seem all that impossible that the fundamentalists would succeed in their purge of the liberals from their denominations. In struggles within the Presbyterian Church and the Northern Baptist Convention the fundamentalists proved that they almost matched the liberals in strength.¹³ The liberal Baptist Harry Emerson Fosdick responded with a sermon entitled "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?," in which he appealed to the tolerance of both sides in the struggle. While some challenged fundamentalist doctrine head-on,¹⁴ appeals such as Fosdick's were the most common response from the beleaguered liberals.

The denominational struggle between fundamentalists and liberals finally culminated in 1925, when an apparently trivial and unimportant trial against a young school teacher turned the attention of the entire nation toward Dayton, Tennessee. The Scopes trial became crucial for the transformation of fundamentalism from a national protest

movement, riding high on a widespread support for prohibition and the banning of Darwinism, to a de-centralized, secretarian movement, working through local congregations, Bible schools and mission organizations. More than anything else the trial fostered the perception of fundamentalism as a symptom of southern rural backwardness, obscurantism and intolerance. When William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow offered their assistance in what many considered a decisive battle between creationism and *evolutionism*,¹⁵ the stage was set for a great American drama, a clash between two worlds, city and country.

The legal aspects of the trial were rather simple. Fundamentalist demands for the banning of Darwinism in public schools had gained widespread support in several states. In Oklahoma, Florida, North Carolina and Texas, schools had received official orders to emphasize creationism to counter the growing acceptance of evolutionism. Tennessee went a step further and passed the Butler Anti-evolution Act in March 1925. The American Civil Liberties Union offered to pay the expenses of anyone willing to test the constitutionality of the Butler law, and John T. Scopes – a young science teacher at Central High School in Dayton – volunteered, admitted he had taught evolution and was “arrested”.¹⁶ After the trial the jury returned its expected verdict of guilty after less than ten minutes of deliberation. A \$100 fine was imposed on Scopes.

The opportunity to appeal to the Tennessee Supreme Court was just what Clarence Darrow and his colleagues had hoped for, but even that seemed to be of minor importance compared to what they had achieved during the trial. William Jennings Bryan had been induced to take the stand as an expert on the Bible, which it soon turned out he was not. With the world press watching, the Great Commoner had made fundamentalism a laughing-stock by not being able to answer some of the most basic questions about the Bible, and by being manoeuvred into admitting that he did not accept all scripture literally. Within a week after the trial Bryan died from a stroke, and left fundamentalism as a national movement in shambles.¹⁷ The fundamentalists had perhaps won the legal case, but they had certainly lost in public opinion. By 1925 the common perception of fundamentalism was not that of a distinct religious world view, based on specific doctrines, it simply had become synonymous with American rural or small-town protestantism. This despite the fact that its major strength had been in urban areas, especially in the northern and eastern sections of the country.¹⁸ The fundamentalists had themselves partly to blame for this. As it had become clear that the fight against Darwinism and other aspects of modern culture brought national publicity and appealed to a much larger audience than the movement had previously encompassed, these aspects had been emphasized accordingly.¹⁹ The vociferous anti-evolution crusades of the 1920s

'were worlds apart from the criticism of modern science found in *The Fundamentals*.²⁰ In the years following the Scopes trial, the fundamentalist movement became dominated by increasingly fanatical organizations such as the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, the Bible Crusaders of America, the Bryan Bible League and the Defenders of the Christian Faith (fighting evolution through a squadron of "flying fundamentalists,") whose leaders all claimed to be the true inheritors of Bryan's throne. As George M. Marsden has observed, it was almost as if the fundamentalist movement began in reality to conform to its popular image.²¹ Walter Lippmann, writing in 1929, found that the fundamentalists actually pointed out central issues in modern civilization, but had become "entangled with all sorts of bizarre and barbarous agitations with the Ku Klux Klan, with fanatical prohibition, with the 'anti-evolution laws' and with much persecution and intolerance." To Lippmann this showed "that the central truth, which the fundamentalists have grasped, no longer appeals to the best brains and the good sense of the modern community, and that the movement is recruited largely from the isolated, the inexperienced and the uneducated."²²

As the struggle over modernism and Darwinism lost public attention after the Scopes trial, it was assumed that the fundamentalists, realizing that their cause was doomed, would find their way back and become absorbed in the religious mainstream. However, this was far from the case. No longer a national force, fundamentalism was gradually transformed into a subculture, developing its own institutional structure. While some fundamentalists chose to remain within their denominations, many left to form new churches. A group of Presbyterians led by J. Gresham Machen, formed the Presbyterian Church in America in 1936. Baptists leaving the Northern Baptist Convention established the General Association of Regular Baptists. Others joined a congregation of one of the smaller sects that had remained faithful to biblical literalism, such as the Christian and Missionary Alliance, and the Evangelical Free Church.²³ In many places fundamentalism gradually merged with other religious groups sharing a common evangelical background, such as Holiness and Pentecostal groups.

Contrary to its popular image, the fundamentalist movement continued to grow. In a period that is generally considered bleak for American protestantism, with declining church attendance, smaller contributions to missionary work, and various other symptoms of a religious depression, fundamentalist groups were flourishing.²⁴ The Assemblies of God increased its membership fourfold from 47,950 in 1926 to 198,834 in 1940.²⁵ In the same period, the Southern baptists gained close to 1.5 million new members to total 4,949,174.²⁶

As fundamentalism was transformed from a national movement into a subculture, Bible institutes, radio stations, summer camps and related

institutions gradually emerged as the new bastions of faith. The process of structural development continued, despite the split between separatists and inclusivists, that led to the formation of two separate fundamentalist associations in 1941 and 1942.²⁷ Most of the educational institutions remained neutral in this dispute.

The decades following the Scopes trial was marked by a noticeable boom in fundamentalist education. In seventy fundamentalist schools surveyed, the total enrollment in 1929 was 13,244. In 1940 it had doubled, and by 1948 it had doubled once more to a total of 52,746.²⁸ Following fundamentalism's loss of national leadership, the non-denominational Bible institutes gradually emerged as the major coordinating agencies of fundamentalism. At the turn of the century only nine Bible institutes had existed. Between 1900 and 1930, forty-nine additional institutes had been founded. After the Scopes trial, however, when fundamentalism apparently was in decline as a national movement, Bible institutes spread all over the country. In the 1930s thirty-five institutes spread all over the country. In the 1930s thirty-five institutes were founded, and in the following decade sixty more were added.²⁹

The Bible institutes were originally intended for the education of lay people, who could afterwards serve as Sunday school teachers, youth leaders, personal evangelists or foreign missionaries. Now they faced a demand for many of the services that the denominations had formerly provided, first of all the education of pastors.³⁰

During the 1930s only a few fundamentalist schools offered a liberal arts education, most notably Wheaton College ("the Harvard of the Bible belt"),³¹ Bob Jones College, and Gordon College of Missions and Theology in Boston.³² Hence, many young people within the movement, who wanted to pursue such an education, had to enroll in schools outside the movement. Many chose colleges affiliated with other evangelicals such as Taylor University in Indiana, and Grove City College in Pennsylvania.³³ Facing an increased demand, many Bible schools added liberal arts courses in limited quantity, and some of them gradually evolved into Bible colleges. The increasing resemblance to secular institutions of higher learning, provided a real dilemma for many fundamentalist schools. On the one hand, they wanted Bible-study courses to remain primary in all types of education. Students should become "set" before they were exposed to liberal education, thereby being able to fight off "all attacks of modern infidelity."³⁴ On the other hand there was an increasing demand, first of all from students wishing to continue with further studies after graduation, for educational standards that could give the fundamentalist schools accreditation. Related to this dilemma was the problem of admission requirements. Originally no consideration had been given to academic skills. The capacity for critical judgement was obviously not highly regarded. The general requirements

for admission had been active membership in an evangelical church, and zealous work, either in church or as a personal evangelist.³⁵ As fundamentalism began to shake off its shackles of anti-intellectualism, most Bible institutes began to demand a high-school diploma in addition to the religious qualities of the applicant. The gradual adjustment to the educational demands of the outside world was reflected in a statement by the Dean of women at Moody Bible Institute of Chicago: *There is a dearth of intellectually trained leaders in the Christian world today. Trained minds are necessary to maintain scholarship, and Christian scholarship is necessary to the effective propagation of the fundamentals of faith.*³⁶

In 1946 the first steps were taken toward the establishment of a uniform course crediting system for Bible Institutes, and in October 1947 earlier attempts to create a national association for that purpose were successfully merged into the Accrediting Association of Bible Institutes and Bible Colleges. In order to promote unity in fundamentalist education and avoid a split between separatists and inclusivists, the association was neither affiliated to the National Association of Evangelicals nor to the American Council of Christian Churches.³⁷

The founding of a national association for accreditation of fundamentalist institutions demonstrates attempts to abandon the anti-intellectual image and meet the educational standards of the surrounding society. During the following decade, however, only a few fundamentalist colleges were able to meet the requirements for accreditation.³⁸

On January 2, 1921, the vesper service of the Reverend Edwin J. Van Etten of Calvary Episcopal Church in Pittsburgh was broadcast by "radiotelephony."³⁹ The signal which was sent from the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company in Pittsburgh, was received as much as 400 miles away in Massachusetts, although probably only a few hundred people listened to the Reverend Van Etten that day. The wonders of the radio were still confined to a small number of enthusiasts. This changed very rapidly. In 1922 the estimated number of radios in the USA was 60,000.⁴⁰ By the following year this number had increased to 1,500,000. In 1927 the number was 6,500,000, and by 1932 it had increased to 17,000,000⁴¹ With an estimated average of three listeners to every radio, this meant that more than 50,000,000 Americans could be reached.⁴² The fundamentalists were fast to embrace this new way of spreading the gospel. However, CBS and NBC, the major national networks, had adopted a policy restricting religious broadcasts to ecumenical, non-sectarian and non-denominational programs. The religious messages in these programs should be presented by "the recognized outstanding leaders of the several faiths."⁴³ In practice this meant that the Protestant programs were totally controlled by the Federal

Council of Churches. However, this did not stop the fundamentalists attraction to the new powerful media. They either started their own radio stations or bought time at local stations. Many of the Bible schools established their own stations, among them the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago (WMBI), John Brown University in Los Angeles (KUGA), Bob Jones University in Greenville, S.C. (NMUU), and the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (KBBI). A reader-contributed directory of evangelical broadcasting, published in *Sunday School Times*, January 23, 1932, listed four hundred programs on eighty different stations.⁴⁴ Sixteen years later, in 1948, a partial listing indicated that more than 1,600 fundamentalist programs were broadcast every week.⁴⁵

Among the popular evangelical programs during the 1930s, were Martin R. DeHaan's "Radio Bible Class," Donald Gray Barnhouse's "Bible Study Hour," and the "Miracle and Melodies" programs from Moody Bible Institute of Chicago. However, no other religious programs, not even Harry Emerson Fosdick's or Father Coughlin's sermons, could compete with Charles E. Fuller's "Old-Fashioned Revival Hour."⁴⁶ Fuller, then pastor of Calvary Church in Placentia, California, began broadcasting once a week in 1925. His programs soon became immensely popular, which made him expand his activities to include three weekday broadcasts and three Sunday broadcasts.⁴⁷ In 1933 he became a full-time radio minister, and by 1939 his program was heard every week by an estimated fifteen to twenty million people.⁴⁸ In several ways the success of fundamentalist broadcasters like Charles E. Fuller paved the way for "televangelism" – this peculiar blend of new technology and old-time religion that more than anything else has contributed to the new visibility of fundamentalism in the last two decades.

Other activities that well illustrate the emerging fundamentalist subculture were the increasingly popular Summer Bible Conferences. Among the most notable conferences were the Boardwalk Bible Conference in Atlantic City, the Montrose Summer Gatherings in Pennsylvania Hills, and the camps in Mount HERNON, California and Winona Lake, Indiana.⁴⁹ The summer camp at Winona Lake reportedly attracted more than 2,000 enrollees, joined daily by a similar number of visitors.⁵⁰ The Bible conferences combined biblical teaching with resort style recreation. Programs offered included topics such as prophecy, Bible study, "victorious living," sacred music, and missions.⁵¹

According to the Moody Monthly's annual list of forthcoming conferences, the number of conferences offered from eighty-eight sessions at twenty-seven different locations in 1930, more than two hundred sessions at fifty different locations in 1941.⁵² A poll taken at a small Bible college in 1932 showed that only fifteen out of one hundred and fifty students had not attended a Summer Bible Conference.⁵³ Providing these figures are representative, they suggest that the Bible conferences

tightened the bonds of commitment within the fundamentalist movement. In an article in *Sunday School Times* they were praised as "one of the mightiest mediums of blessing that God has brought to pass in recent generations." It was further stated that the conferences had proved their ability to accomplish "certain vital things that apparently cannot be accomplished in any other way."⁵⁴

This paper has dealt with three central elements in the institutional structure developed by the fundamentalists since the 1920s: Bible schools and colleges, religious broadcasting and Bible conferences. Although other activities, such as publishing, missionary work and the day school movement could have been included, the three elements described above demonstrate the growth and continuity of fundamentalism in a period where it was generally considered a lost cause.

One of the things that the development of fundamentalist institutions most clearly illustrates is the movement's ambiguity towards American culture. Fundamentalists are torn between purity of doctrine and the wish to interact with the surrounding society.⁵⁵ The dilemma between personal salvation through strict separatism, and the commitment to spread the gospel and stem the tide of modernism through social action, has remained an unresolved tension in fundamentalism. The fundamentalists have founded their own institutions and professional organizations in order to withstand the lures of modern life.⁵⁶ In the process, however, as they have taken up competition with their liberal or secular counterparts, they have lost a great deal of their alleged innocence.

CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

The popular perception of fundamentalism as a product of rural backwardness and social maladjustment has to some extent influenced the scholarly treatment of the subject. Two classic works representing this socio-economic interpretation are Stewart G. Cole, *The History of Fundamentalism* (New York, 1931), and Norman F. Furniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931* (New Haven, 1954). The anti-intellectual aspects of fundamentalism have been further explored in Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York, 1962). To Hofstadter, the fundamentalists were a clear-cut example of his status theory. Their loss of influence and respectability resulted in "a desire to strike back at everything modern – the higher criticism, evolutionism, the social gospel, rational criticism of any kind" (p. 121).

The first serious challenge to the social interpretations of fundamentalism was undoubtedly Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism* (Chicago, 1970). Sandeen refuted the consensus idea that fundamentalism had gradually been adapted to American culture. He observed that although fundamentalism had been described as a lost cause and a hopeless crusade in every scholarly analysis, it continued to flourish in defiance of the experts. Sandeen argued that to understand the unexpected efflorescence of fundamentalism in recent years, it was necessary to escape the semantic muddle created during the 1920s and understand fundamentalism as an authentic conservative tradition in American history. In order to show the continuity of fundamentalism from its nineteenth-

century roots to the present, Sandeen used a very narrow theological definition of the movement by arguing that the fundamentalist movement of the 1920s was simply the millenarian movement renamed. Although other scholars have agreed with Sandeen's mainly theological interpretation of fundamentalism, they have objected to his narrow definition and his failure to take the actual historical development of the movement into account. For further discussion of the religious and historical roots of fundamentalism and the nature of the fundamentalist movement, see Ernest R. Sandeen, "Toward a Historical Interpretation of the Origins of Fundamentalism," *Church History*, 36 (March 1967), pp. 66–83; LeRoy Moore, J., "Another Look at Fundamentalism: A Response to Ernest R. Sandeen," *Church History*, 37 (June 1968), pp. 195–202; George M. Marsden, "Defining Fundamentalism," *Christian Scholar's Review*, 1 (Winter 1971), pp. 141–151; Ernest R. Sandeen, "Defining Fundamentalism: A Reply to Professor Marsden," *Christian Scholar's Review*, 1 (Spring 1971), pp. 227–233.

Perhaps the most well balanced interpretation of the fundamentalist movement so far is found in George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture; The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (Oxford, 1980). While sharing Sandeen's view of fundamentalism as a primarily religious movement, Marsden gives a dynamic account of the movement's interaction with other aspects of American culture, and describes how this cultural experience shaped and eventually transformed the fundamentalist movement in the first three decades of the twentieth century. In a separate section, Marsden interprets fundamentalism as a social, political, intellectual, and American phenomenon.

C. Allyn Russells *Voices of American Fundamentalism; Seven Biographical Studies* (Philadelphia, 1976), is a collective biography of some of the most influential fundamentalists. It provides a good understanding of the diversity within the movement.

There is not yet a comprehensive history of the rise of fundamentalist institutions since the 1920s and the transformation of fundamentalism into a subculture, but contributions can be found in Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (The Hague, 1963); Joel A. Carpenter, "Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism, 1929–1942", *Church History* (March 1980); George W. Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America* (Greenville, S.C., 1973). Professor George W. Dollar of Bob Jones University presents a strict separatist perspective of fundamentalism and fundamentalist institutions, in which groups affiliated with National Association of Evangelicals are described as "the enemy within." Despite its strong bias, it is most valuable as an "inside view" and because of its very detailed account of fundamentalist groups in all sections of the United States.

A case study of the evolution of a fundamentalist institution can be found in George M. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism; Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, 1987). The split between inclusivists and separatists in the 1941 and the rise of the *ultrafundamentalists*, who in such organizations as Twentieth Century Reformation and Christian Crusade became actively engaged in right wing politics, is described in Erling Jorstad, *The Politics of Doomsday* (Nashville, 1970) and Gary K. Clabaugh, *Thunder on the Right* (Chicago, 1974). A recent anthology addressing the complex relationship between fundamentalism and politics is John R. Neuhaus & Michael Cromartie (eds.), *Piety & Politics; Evangelicals and Fundamentalists Confront the World* (Washington, D.C., 1987)

Niels Bjerre-Poulsen

NOTES

1. Ernest K. Sandeen, "Fundamentalism and American Identity," *The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science*, 387 (January, 1970), p. 56.
2. For a further discussion of the various interpretations of fundamentalism, see the annotated bibliography below.
3. For further details on Princeton Theology and the principle of "verbal inspiration," see George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 112–118, and Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism* (Chicago, 1970), ch. 5.
4. "Premillennialism" is a more correct term for the beliefs described here. "Post-millennialists" believe that the world will be won to the Lord by preaching of the Gospel and that the one-thousand-year era will be consummated by the return of Christ.
5. On the influence of Scottish Common Sense philosophy on fundamentalist thought, see Marsden, *Fundamentalism* . . . pp. 16–18.
6. J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism* (New York, 1923)
7. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
8. *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth* (Chicago, 1910–1915).
9. Marsden, *Fundamentalism* . . . p. 119.
10. *Ibid.*
11. The movement was probably named by Curtis Lee Laws, editor of the Baptist paper *The Watchman-Examiner*, published in New York. In 1920 Laws suggested in an editorial that "those who still cling to the great fundamentals and who mean to do battle royal for the fundamentals shall be called 'Fundamentalists.' By that name the editor . . . is willing to be called." *The Watchman-Examiner* (July 1, 1920), p. 834. Quoted after LeRoy Moore, Jr., "Another Look at Fundamentalism: A Response to Ernest R. Sandeen," *Church History*, 37 (June 1968), p. 196.
12. Marsden, *Fundamentalism* . . . , pp. 153–164.
13. The struggle was most intense in these two churches. In the Southern Baptist Convention there were too few modernists to cause a struggle, whereas in the Episcopal Church and the Methodist Church there were so many that a struggle was rather useless. For further details, see Marsden, *Fundamentalism* . . . , pp. 171–175.
14. One of the most influential counter-attacks was *The Faith of Modernism* by Shailer Mathews (New York, 1924). Mathews argued that the perception of truth was inevitably shaped by cultural circumstances, and that a Christian agenda should take the needs of society into consideration.
15. Bryan even went as far as to say that the "fate of Christianity hangs on the outcome."
16. Scopes was actually asked to volunteer by a number of prominent citizens in Dayton, among them Fred E. Robinson, chairman of the Rhea County school board. For Scopes own account of the background of the trial, see John T. Scopes and James Presley, *Center of the Storm: Memoirs of John T. Scopes* (New York, 1967), pp. 57–62.
17. Not even in his afterlife was Bryan spared from H. L. Menckens acid pen. In his anti-eulogy Mencken assured his readers that "[Bryan's] place in Tennessee hagiography is secure. If the village barber saved any of his hair, then it is curing gall-stones down there today." Quoted from George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (Oxford, 1980), p. 187.
18. The reason for this was simply that fundamentalism as a *movement* was a direct response to modernism, and therefore had to challenge it where it was most prevalent. In the rural South, orthodox protestantism had not yet been seriously challenged by modernism, and therefore did not have much of an enemy to fight. See Marsden, *Fundamentalism* . . . , p. 188.
19. George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, (Oxford, 1980), p. 188.

20. Two of the articles in *The Fundamentals* allowed that the "days" of creation might have been very long, and that some evolutionary development could have taken place, a view that would have been unthinkable in the 1920s.
21. George M. Marsden, op. cit. . . . , p. 191.
22. Walther Lippmann, *A Preface to Morals* (New York, 1929), pp. 31–32.
23. Marsden, *Fundamentalism* . . . , pp. 192–195.
24. Robert T. Handy, "The American Religious Depression, 1925–1935", *Church History*, 29 (1960), pp. 3–16.
25. Joel A. Carpenter, p. 74.
26. Ibid.
27. The main reason for the split was not disagreements about religious doctrine, but different views on whether membership in a denomination that had dealings with the Federal Council of Churches was acceptable. The hardline separatists formed the American Council of Christian Churches in 1941, others joined the inclusivist National Association of Evangelicals in 1942. For further details, see Louis Gasper, pp. 21–40.
28. Harry J. Albus, "Christian Education Today," *Christian Life* (September, 1948), pp. 26, 46.
29. Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (The Hague, 1963), p. 93.
30. Ibid., p. 94.
31. "Wheaton College, Harvard of the Bible Belt," *Change*, 6 (March 1974), pp. 17–20.
32. Joel A. Carpenter, op. cit., p. 68.
33. Ibid.
34. The Catalog of the Simpson Bible Institute, 1951–52, p. 6. Quoted from Louis Gasper, op. cit., p. 94.
35. Ibid., p. 95.
36. Angelyn G. Dantuma, "The Christian and Education," *The Moody Student* (November 9, 1945), p. 2.
37. Ibid., p. 98.
38. Bob Jones University, one of the largest fundamentalist schools in the United States with a student body of approximately 3,000 in 1953, refused to become a member of the appropriate accrediting agency, allegedly because it did not want its administrative policies controlled. Several factors, however, indicated that the university simply could not meet the requirements. For further details, see Louis Gasper, pp. 104–109.
39. Spencer Miller, Jr., "Radio and Religion," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 177 (January 1935), p. 135.
40. Ibid.
41. Estimates made by CBS, quoted after Herman Hettinger, "Broadcasting in the United States," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 177 (January 1935), p. 3.
42. Ibid.
43. Quoted from Spencer Miller, Jr., op. cit., p. 137.
44. "A Directory of Evangelical Broadcasts," *Sunday School Times* '74 (January 23, 1932). pp. 44–45.
45. Louis Gasper, op. cit., p. 77.
46. Joel A. Carpenter, op. cit., p. 71.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid.
49. "Forthcoming Conferences," *Moody Monthly*, 35 (August 1935), p. 589.
50. Joel A. Carpenter, p. 69.
51. Ibid.
52. "Forthcoming Conferences," *Moody's Monthly*, 30 (June 1930), p. 517, and "Forthcoming Conferences," *Moody's Monthly*, 41 (June 1941), p. 614.

53. "Why Attend a Summer Conference?," *Sunday School Times* 79 (May 15, 1937), p. 348.
54. "Shall I Go to a Summer Conference," *Sunday School Times* 77, (May 18, 1935), p. 352.
55. In its utmost consequence, social actions such as the crusades against evolutionary theory and modernism is an attempt to save the world from the inevitable judgement which is the foundation stone of millenarian thought.
56. Ernest R. Sandeen has called attention to this phenomenon of parallel institutionalism in "Fundamentalism and American Identity," op. cit. For almost every professional or scholarly group in the United States a fundamentalist equivalent exists. Fundamentalist scientists meet in American Scientific Association, fundamentalist historians in the Evangelical Historians, doctors in the Christian Medical Association and so forth.