

## R.H. BOLL: FUNDAMENTALIST?

Steve Wolfgang  
University of Kentucky

“Heave an egg out of a Pullman window,” wrote H. L. Mencken during the 1920's, “and you will hit a fundamentalist anywhere in the United States today.”<sup>1</sup> Though Mencken exaggerated as usual, what he wrote in jest decades ago has too often been taken as gospel truth by scholars as well as the general public.

Not even the formidable Mencken, however, attempted to define what was and is commonly labeled “Fundamentalism.” Nor was he alone. Even today, after more than half a century, the term “Fundamentalism” remains a loosely-defined and carelessly-used term. Such definitional fuzziness is not limited to the term Fundamentalism. As a well-known intellectual historian, John C. Greene, has observed, “Isms are the stock in trade of scholars who study the history of ideas. But, although their discourse is full of isms – Marxism, Cartesianism, Newtonianism, Freudianism, Spencerianism, Darwinism – they have no established rules for defining them. Everyone uses these terms as seems best, defining them precisely or loosely (if at all) as the occasion or the argument seems to demand.”<sup>2</sup>

As we shall see, the previous definitions are diverse, some even contradictory. However, the core of most definitions of fundamentalism is intellectual assent to a body of doctrines. As expressed in a series of

pamphlets issued from 1910-1915, entitled the Fundamentals, the major doctrines composed five, seven, nine, twelve, fourteen, or more "points," depending upon whose list one consults.<sup>3</sup> Other historians have described people dubbed Fundamentalists as a rural, Southern ignoramus. Some historians have portrayed Fundamentalists as losers in a warfare with a modern sort of science – a war which, by some accounts, Fundamentalists were predestined to lose.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, some avowed Fundamentalists have insisted that Fundamentalism could best be defined as institutional loyalty to such visible symbols as Moody Bible Institute or Bob Jones University. Some authors seek to broaden the description of Fundamentalists to include everyone fitting their definition of "Biblical literalists."<sup>5</sup> Others attempt to narrow the definition by identifying the particular strands out of which their version of Fundamentalism was woven – premillennialism<sup>6</sup> a particular form of Baconianism;<sup>7</sup> the "Princeton theology,"<sup>8</sup> or other peculiarities common to many self-described "Fundamentalists."<sup>9</sup> The better scholars writing about Fundamentalism have interpreted it as "anti-modernism," a reaction to the acids perceived to be corroding the central pillars of a traditional worldview. Others have emphasized that Fundamentalism included various combinations of the above components, becoming a more visible movement as it grew increasingly politicized and motivated to enter the public arena. 11

Perhaps the most interesting definitional question pertains to those who are excluded by one or more (perhaps all) of the above descriptions: Who is left out? What of the Pentecostal and Holiness groups who do not fit neatly into any of the cubbyholes proposed? Where does one place conservative Roman Catholics? What about the miscellaneous European denominations (the Christian Reformed churches might be an example) who do not seem to fit neatly into any of the above scenarios? And what of the churches of Christ – one of the largest indigenous American religious bodies? Its members assented to most of the tenets of Fundamentalist theology, although as vehement in their rejection of avowedly Fundamentalist organizations as they were of their modernist counterparts. If one defines Fundamentalism to encompass them, does this require a more inclusive definition of Fundamentalism – and thus, to some extent, render the label less discriminating? 12

As noted earlier, many historians have defined Fundamentalism solely by a set of beliefs which they could list.<sup>13</sup> Such definitions pose problems for conventional usage. As Martin Marty rightly protests, self-proclaimed Fundamentalists “never even agreed on exactly what made up the fundamentals, differing in their acceptance of five or nine or fourteen of them, depending on who was counting – and often not bothering to count.” Marty contends that “such a coalition of people who agreed on some all-purpose test doctrines but disagreed on other fundamentals, people of many different

theological positions and purpose. They did best when united by a common despised object.” He proceeds to argue that the label “Fundamentalist” should be “applied to a loosely organized cluster of allies that could unite for certain causes in America. . . . It was born in reaction to modernity.” 14

A more common depiction (really, a caricature) of Fundamentalists is as religiously-oriented, rural, southern “hayseeds.” Portrayed as ignorant, uneducated country bumpkins fresh off the turnip truck from Podunk, fundamentalists often were caricatured as ignoramuses who had never even seen a city, could not spell “scientist” (much less define it), and were probably card-carrying members of the Ku Klux Klan or the local temperance union. 15

In truth, the better literature on variously defined types of Fundamentalism reveals that several varieties of it flourished – indeed, originated – as much in the cities of the industrial Northeast and Midwest as in rural or southern areas. J. Gresham Machen, the best-known among avowedly Fundamentalist theologians, was, after all, an urbane Princeton professor who wrote his works on the Virgin Birth and the inspiration of Scripture from his home in suburban Philadelphia. Probably the single most famous self-described Fundamentalist institution was the Moody Bible Institute, situated near downtown Chicago, serving and drawing significant support from the poor-to-middle-class inhabitants of urban and suburban Chicago. Even perceptive historians such as Paul A. Carter seem to have been shocked to discover that self-proclaimed Fundamentalists were “thriving everywhere,

including such unlikely places as southern New England and Suburbia.”<sup>16</sup> Indeed, as the inimitable Mencken noted, one could egg a Fundamentalist “*anywhere* in the United States today.”<sup>17</sup>

Perhaps the most vocal individuals enlisted under the banner of Fundamentalism were in independent congregations (although these often formed alliances such as the Baptist Bible Fellowship, which a generation later would produce “Mr. Fundamentalist” himself – Jerry Falwell).<sup>18</sup> Drawing from disenchanted members of a variety of denominational bodies, these independent groups patronized and supplied financial support for an impressive array of parachurch organizations: Bible institutes, colleges, theological seminaries, missionary societies, publications, broadcasting companies, and more.

Thus, on a practical level, identifying oneself as a Fundamentalist might mean identifying which parachurch organizations one could support as much as passing a litmus test of doctrinal questions. Indeed, one historian suggested a “half-serious” definition of Fundamentalism as “all those churches and persons in communion with Moody Bible Institute.”<sup>19</sup> Of course, such a definition may also seem “half-baked,” since it would exclude many more self-proclaimed Fundamentalists than it would include. It does provide, however, a sense of the futility felt by anyone who presumes define “Fundamentalist” in such a way as to include all those who have used it

descriptively, or who have been so described by historians, journalists, theologians, philosophers, or others.

Within the last quarter-century, the resurrection to public prominence of what is popularly styled Fundamentalism has been accompanied by a renewed discussion among scholars about the Fundamentalist Phenomenon (as the title of one book phrased it).<sup>20</sup> Among the more responsible and insightful studies has been Ernest Sandeen's The Roots of Fundamentalism (1970).<sup>21</sup> As the book's subtitle implies, Sandeen seeks to isolate what to him seem two major sources: British and American Millenarianism. Perhaps as important for Sandeen is the correlation of premillennialism with the inerrancy doctrine of the so-called "Princeton theology" promulgated by Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, Alexander Hodge, B.B. Warfield and J. Gresham Machen. While there can be no doubt that many self-styled Fundamentalists embraced some combination of these doctrines, perhaps nearly as many did not. Were they not then Fundamentalists? Are these the indispensable or defining doctrines for Fundamentalists?

For most other scholars, the answers to these questions have been "Yea" and "Nay," respectively. Sandeen's thesis has been criticized as too narrow (that is, excluding too many who considered themselves, and were so considered by others, to be Fundamentalists) by several historians, both those who identify with the label "Fundamentalist," and those who labor in more secularized domains.

One of the most vigorous participants in the dialogue with Sandeen and others has been George Marsden. By all accounts, his Fundamentalism and American Culture (1980) has become the standard work.<sup>23</sup> Arguing that “the meaning of ‘fundamentalism’ has narrowed considerably since the 1920’s,” Marsden concurs that “if one traces dispensationalist ‘fundamentalism,’ Sandeen’s central argument [is] basically correct,” but contends that Fundamentalism was a “larger phenomenon [having] wider roots” than Sandeen or others have described. As Marsden uses the word, Fundamentalism included “militantly anti-modernist Protestant evangelicalism,” and those “who in the twentieth century militantly opposed both modernism in theology and the cultural changes that modernism endorsed.” But “Fundamentalism was a movement” only in the sense of “a patchwork coalition of representatives of other movements” which “never existed wholly independently of the older movements from which it grew.” Some of those older movements, as enumerated by Marsden, included evangelicalism, revivalism, pietism, the holiness movements, millenarianism, Reformed confessionalism, Baptist traditionalism, and other denominational orthodoxies. In short, Fundamentalism was “a loose, diverse, and changing federation of co-belligerents united by their fierce opposition to modernist attempts to bring Christianity into line with modern thought.”<sup>24</sup>

Another element identified by those who have described avowed Fundamentalists has been their insistence on “separation” or withdrawal from

“the world.” While theirs was not as “radical or conspicuously distinct” as “other ‘peculiar people’ in twentieth-century America, notably Hasidic Jews, the Amish, or even some Pentecostal groups that forbade jewelry and many other innocent amusements such as baseball and Coca-Cola,” still, fundamentalists’ lifestyles were “markedly different.”<sup>25</sup> To borrow a novelist’s description, Fundamentalists “simply spurned the world’s frenetic search for empty pleasure. They did not smoke or drink or dance or attend the theater or concern themselves unduly with fashions and fads.”<sup>26</sup>

In truth, such prohibitions were only “the minimum behavioral restraints for the separated life – and in order to preserve them, Fundamentalists built separate communities [colleges, magazines, parachurch institutions, etc. – JSW] where such practices would be enforced.”<sup>27</sup> In Marsden’s view, Fundamentalism took on the role of “beleaguered minority with strong sectarian or separatist tendencies.”<sup>28</sup>

At least one other related factor complicating any attempt to define Fundamentalism is worth considering: the very fractiousness of those so describing themselves. It is fairly simple to enumerate a list of “X” characteristics defining a certain phenomenon, and then to dismiss from inclusion in the group any who disagree with some portion of the delineated characteristics. However, as several of the more perceptive authors who have discussed various Fundamentalists have discovered, one of the prime characteristics (perhaps even a prerequisite) of those who called themselves

**“Fundamentalists” was their refractory nature. Not only did they advocate separation from “the world” (often defined as any person or group not seeing things as they did); often they could not or did not get along with those who agreed with them. 29**

**Finally, Marsden is emphatic in including a passion for evangelism as a distinctive criteria of Fundamentalism. While not all evangelicals are Fundamentalists, as numerous authors have stressed, Fundamentalists are Evangelicals, and thus share one of the distinctive characteristics of that group – an evangelistic fervency to share the Good News with those who are seen as lost without it.<sup>30</sup> Marsden, in fact, places revivalism “at the center of the traditions carried on by fundamentalism.”<sup>31</sup> In his view, while Fundamentalism was “a mosaic of divergent and sometimes contradictory traditions and tendencies that could never be totally integrated,” Marsden is emphatic that “a major element in the movement . . . was the subordination of all other concerns – including concern for all but the simplest ideas – to soul-saving and practical Christianity.” 32**

**A working definition of Fundamentalism useful for this investigation (and drawn largely from Marsden's description), consists of: (1) militant anti-modernism, often expressed in conflict and separation even from those whose beliefs were quite similar ; (2) intellectual assent to a list of “Fundamentals,” variously expressed; (3) a “high view” of the Bible, including, or sometimes derived from variants of the Princeton doctrine of “inerrancy” of Scripture; (4)**

variegated strands of several premillennial views which, for some Fundamentalists (but by no means for all), took primacy over nearly all else; (5) an emphasis on evangelizing (or proselytizing, depending upon one's view); and (6) the devoted quest for personal and social moral purity or "holiness."

More recent work on "Fundamentalisms" has applied the term quite broadly in contexts including Islamic, Jewish, and other religious systems to which the term may, or may not, be fairly and accurately applied. The loose usage of the term extends, to cite only two of many examples, to political reactions to flag-burning by so-called "Flag Fundamentalists," and even Harvard biologist Steven J. Gould recently labeled some dissenting fellow biologists "Darwinian Fundamentalists."<sup>33</sup>

The development of Churches of Christ, and their relationships to Fundamentalist thought and behavior, have been described elsewhere in considerable detail. Along with Michael Casey, this author's research has challenged the long-held, and wrong-headed, notion, advanced by authors such as William S. Banowsky and reiterated most recently by Leroy Garrett, that Churches of Christ either ignored or were ignorant of the Fundamentalist movement.<sup>34</sup> Even a cursory reading of the primary sources written and consumed by members of Churches of Christ puts the lie to such allegations. For the purposes of this paper, suffice it to say that, Churches of Christ believed much of what Fundamentalists believed (though dissenting, as many

Fundamentalists did, from several beliefs held by other Fundamentalists), shared many of the central concerns of avowed Fundamentalists, and behaved culturally in ways nearly identical to those of professed Fundamentalists.

To cite only a few examples, Jesse P. Sewell, president of Abilene Christian College, willingly spoke the language of Fundamentalism in advertising the school. "Infidelity, skepticism, sin, loose living, lack of reverence for things sacred," which were abroad in the land had produced nothing but "economic, academic, moral, and spiritual chaos." Sewell concluded his jeremiad by insisting that "this is no time for letting up in the preaching and teaching of the great fundamentals of our holy religion."<sup>35</sup>

Sewell was joined by many other preachers and church members in endorsing many of the basic doctrines of Christianity stressed by self-proclaimed Fundamentalists who felt that such doctrines had been denied by modernism. <sup>36</sup> In 1920, A.C. Dixon, conservative Northern Baptist minister and editor of The Fundamentalist, and Charles Blanchard, author of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association's doctrinal platform, appeared at a Bible conference in Chattanooga. Flavil Hall, a well-known preacher from a prominent family among Churches of Christ, attended the conference and sent a report of the proceedings to the Christian Leader, published at Cincinnati. Hall was generally complimentary of the work of Fundamentalist leaders like Dixon and Blanchard. While acknowledging that

Fundamentalism included some “speculation,” an in-group code-word among Churches of Christ for premillennialism, he challenged his audience with this question: “Does this invalidate all their work or their general plea, based upon the solid rock of divinely revealed truth?” By 1935, Hall had become active enough in defending members of the Churches of Christ who favored premillennialism that he was willing to do so even in the Christian Standard, a Christian Church paper active in the broader Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. So active was he that the Gospel Advocate complained that Hall had “worn himself out” on “this foolish position of the premillennialists.” 37

While the fuller story of the general relationship of Churches of Christ to Fundamentalism is told elsewhere in some detail, a brief summary would note that Churches of Christ, first, shared a common Baconian orientation toward the Scripture with many of their Fundamentalist counterparts.<sup>38</sup> Second, they displayed most, if not all, of the basic components of Fundamentalism as defined above (militant anti-modernism; assent to various “fundamental doctrines,” including inerrancy; an emphasis on evangelism and the quest for moral purity; and, at least for a vocal minority, acceptance of various premillennial interpretations of Scripture).<sup>39</sup> Furthermore they behaved in similar fashion to their Fundamentalist neighbors, including conducting a “heresy trial” of sorts, the founding of journals, colleges, lectureships and various parachurch agencies in order to keep themselves unspotted from the world, or even from any taint of denominationalism.<sup>40</sup>

The focus of this paper is to explore the career of Robert H. Boll, who became known as a leader among the Churches of Christ which accepted one form or another of premillennial doctrine, and to place him in the context of relationships between Churches of Christ and the broader Fundamentalist movement. In many ways, Boll may be arguably the most "Fundamentalistic" of any preacher among Churches of Christ in the early twentieth century. Boll's biographical story as a young German immigrant who graduated from Nashville Bible School and spent most of his life preaching in Louisville, has been related in detail elsewhere.<sup>41</sup> Thus this paper will concentrate on his activities which relate to Fundamentalism, and pose the question, "Was Boll actually a Fundamentalist?"

Boll certainly was in greater agreement with more of the Fundamentalist agendas than many members of Churches of Christ, most of whom rejected many aspects of the premillennial doctrines so characteristic of many Fundamentalists. Boll, by contrast, became a spokesman for a vocal minority among Churches of Christ who agreed with the premillennial aspects of the Fundamentalist position. He became a regular writer for the Gospel Advocate under the column heading "Word and Work," possibly borrowed from a paper, The Christian Word and Work, issued from New Orleans. The editorial staff included Stanford Chambers, E.L. Jorgenson, S.H. Hall, John E. Dunn, and others who later joined Boll in espousing various shades of premillennial

theories and shared, to a greater or lesser extent, his willingness to address Fundamentalist issues and use Fundamentalist language. In 1915, as The Fundamentals were being completed, Boll began to discuss premillennial themes in his column. When his promotion of premillennialism and prophetic themes led to his dismissal from the Advocate, he became the editor of Word and Work, issued from Louisville, attracting a small but steady clientele until his death in 1956. 42

Like many other members of Churches of Christ, Boll commended the publication of The Fundamentals for attacking the “camouflaged infidelity which is most certainly Teutonic in its origin, [and] which has eaten the heart out of Germany.” Boll quoted with approval the analysis by a leading avowed Fundamentalist writer, R.A. Torrey. Denying the possibility of any middle ground, Torrey insisted, “if you have an exact and logical mind, you must take your choice between Verbal Inspiration and bald infidelity.” Using typical Fundamentalist terminology, Boll added his own personal affirmation that the Bible was “absolutely inerrant.” Boll, perhaps the most consistently pro-Fundamentalist writer among Churches of Christ – willing to accept even the premillennial tenets of Fundamentalism and to use the term “fundamentals” – stated the case boldly:

I will waste no time over the case of men who are not straight on the fundamentals . . . of any who will not receive the Bible as the Word of God; or who do not believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God . . . who deny the virgin birth, the atoning death, the resurrection, miracles, etc. I can consider no man a

Christian teacher in any sense who wobbles on . . .  
the divine inspiration and truth of the scriptures.<sup>43</sup>

Indeed, even a cursory analysis of the books Boll was reading and accumulating in his personal library reveals an affinity for Fundamentalist writers. The list of authors reads like a “Fundamentalist Hall of Fame.” Multiple titles from William E. Biederwolf, William Jennings Bryan, Arno C. Gaebelein, Adoniram Judson Gordon, James M. Gray, Isaac M. Haldeman, Howard Kelly, Samuel H. Kellogg, J. Gresham Machen, James Orr, George McReady Price, William Bell Riley, Rueben A. Torrey, Charles G. Trumbull, Robert Dick Wilson, and other Fundamentalist authors occupy significant shelf space among those books which Boll accumulated. <sup>44</sup>

Boll’s books are occasionally inscribed with date of acquisition, and demonstrate that he was reading the works of avowed Fundamentalists as early as “the autumn of 1902,” when he bought R.A. Torrey’s What the Bible Teaches while in Nashville. (Under the original inscription, Boll wrote in 1946: “Forty-four years have passed since then, and I still find this book good and helpful.”) In May, 1904, he acquired A.J. Gordon’s Ecce Venit: Behold He Cometh, and after moving to Louisville, he obtained in 1905 a copy of R.A. Torrey’s Fulness of Power. The following year, none other than M.C. Kurfees, ironically enough, gave Boll a copy of Torrey’s How to Pray.

While it is likely true that such writers may well have been commonly read by religious conservatives of whatever flavor during the early twentieth century, Boll was not only reading such Fundamentalist writings; he regularly

quoted them with approval in his paper. The "Book Review" column in Word and Work often featured favorable reviews of many leading Fundamentalist authors, urging his readers to buy and read such works. Torrey's What the Bible Teaches frequently was featured on the Recommended Book list in Word and Work. Nor were such endeavors one-sided; the Sunday School Times, characterized by Joel Carpenter as "Fundamentalism's paper of record," reviewed with approval the book Where Christ Has Not Gone, Don Carlos Janes' account of missionary activity supported by Churches of Christ. On at least one occasion, Philip Mauro, one of the authors of The Fundamentals, sent Boll at least one of his books for review.<sup>45</sup>

In defense of the literal interpretation of Scripture, help from almost any source was welcomed. An article from The Fundamentals by professor Howard A. Kelly of The Johns Hopkins University summarized the feelings of many preachers among Churches of Christ, and was reprinted in several journals circulated among members of Churches of Christ. Boll himself reprinted articles or quoted extensively from leading Fundamentalists as Kelly, Reuben A. Torrey, and others. His books column favorably reviewed, and recommended that readers buy, the works of other Fundamentalists including James Gray, William Jennings Bryan, Kelly, and others.<sup>46</sup>

Like many members of Churches of Christ, Boll had no trouble enthusiastically adopting the anti-evolutionary stance common to Fundamentalists. Unlike many of his counterparts, however, Boll's beliefs

were strong enough that he was led to found a private school so that young people could obtain an education free of the taint of teachings which might erode their faith. Unlike some of his contemporaries – to say nothing of modern religious conservatives – Boll refused to countenance the forced reading of Scripture or teaching of Biblical doctrines in the public schools. Boll argued against the teaching of “The Bible in Public Schools” on three grounds: First, because it is unconstitutional.

If then my neighbor, be he Jew, Catholic, Mohammedan, or atheist, is opposed to the reading of the Bible to his child, no matter how regrettable such an attitude may seem, and really is – yet, he pays his taxes, he has equal rights to the public institutions supported by common taxation, with the rest of us. Those rights must be respected if a free government is not to perish from the earth.

Boll’s second objection, derived from the first, was that “If any majority may force their religious preference on a minority today, that minority may become strong enough tomorrow to turn the tables; and with the precedent in their favor, will have no difficulty doing so.” The third objection was practical: “It is by no means certain that such compulsory reading will always be helpful and desirable. Not every teacher is fitted to handle the word of God, even to this extent.”<sup>47</sup>

Boll’s solution was for Christian parents and teachers to form their own schools in which the Word of God could be taught by believers. Portland Christian school, begun in 1924, was Boll’s personal answer to the problem of unbelief in the schools. Those knowledgeable about the beginning of the

school point to Boll's antipathy toward the teaching of evolution in particular as an impetus for his beginning the endeavor the year before the Scopes Trial. Indeed, it may have been incidents such as the unsuccessful attempt by Christian Church preacher R.C. Foster to force the Washington County public schools, only 65 miles east of Louisville in Springfield, to remove the teaching of evolution and Gruenberg's Elementary Biology text from the curriculum, which provided incentive for the beginning of Portland Christian School. In 1923, Foster, a Transylvania graduate who earned graduate degrees from Yale Divinity School before going on to Harvard, had begun commuting to Louisville to teach in the newly inaugurated McGarvey Bible College, which merged in 1924 with a similar effort up-river to form Cincinnati Bible College.<sup>48</sup>

Whatever the impact of others' efforts, by all accounts, the teaching of Darwinian biology and the resultant evolutionary methodologies in other disciplines "had much to do with the establishment of Portland Christian School"<sup>49</sup> which opened during the same academic year during which John Thomas Scopes was brought to trial for allegedly using Hunter's Civic Biology to teach evolutionary theories. Boll's antipathy to evolutionary thought was strong enough to compel him to publish his objections to Darwinian biology, first as an article in Word and Work, later reprinted in tract form.<sup>50</sup> Without doubt, evolution was one of the main issues on which Boll expressed himself most harmoniously with Fundamentalist and other creationist authors. To cite

only one example, Boll published in 1926 an extremely positive review of one of George McCready Price's anti-evolutionary works, urgently suggested that his audience buy and read such books.<sup>51</sup>

Boll was by no means alone among his fellow preachers in opposing evolution – even if it meant cooperation with conservative denominational leaders. To cite only one such example, A.B. Barrett, well-known preacher and former president of Abilene Christian College, openly worked with those in other denominations who shared his views on evolution. For example, he reported an incident during one of his preaching trips for readers of the Firm

Foundation:

The Baptists and Methodists in Franklin [Texas] combined their services at the Methodist church Sunday night and invited me to speak for them on Evolution. We had a full house and excellent interest. I appreciated this opportunity . . . I think it great for all who yet profess to believe the Bible to come together in one service to oppose our common enemy."<sup>52</sup>

Boll also frequently expressed addressed the problems of the broader culture in a manner indistinguishable from his Fundamentalist counterparts. In an article titled "Bathing Suits and Nudity Cults," Boll cited the Nashville Banner's observation that "bare legs are all the go in the fashionable resorts of Europe. The transition was made easy by the flesh-colored and meshwork stockings that were so popular last season." After Boll opined, "Thus does the country rush to judgment," he proceeded to cite a New York newspaper, declaring that "a 'Nudity Cult' is sweeping Europe, and some of the

information the article contains is not repeatable.” Describing such activities as a “nasty moral epidemic bred in the reeking and purient moral disease-centers of rotting Europe,” Boll concluded with the observation that any church interested in “self-preservation” would be “compelled to exclude from her fellowship any member who shares in and helps forward the moral defilements of the age.”<sup>53</sup>

Boll found other cultural targets closer to home. In a city where corporate tobacco interests reigned, and in a state where tobacco wars replete with night riders were fresh in memory, Boll launched this salvo in 1926. Observing that “The cigarette manufacturers have been conducting a tremendous advertising campaign,” he offered this description:

At first the posters portrayed young *men* smoking . . . Then came a step forward; the woman appeared on the poster. But not the girl of the extreme flapper type; no—young women pictured in manifest respectability, modestly dressed within prevailing fashion, even conservative, with sweet, winsome, noble young faces . . . They have not dared as yet to put the cigarette in the girl’s mouth. That will come later. They must proceed cautiously. But they are edging up to the real point. . . And would they care if they debauched the whole womanhood of the land, so long as they can sell their stuff and increase the inflow of gold? Would they not cheerfully stick a cigarette in the mouth of every man and woman, boy or girl, in the entire country, and all countries, in order to see their business grow and more dollars roll in? Is it anything to them what becomes of the boys and girls of the nation so long as their sales prosper?

Spreading the blame around, Boll concluded with the plaintive questions:

“Who will protest against this public education? Will papers that reap their

income from such advertisers? Will any public men, or institutions who tremble at the sway of the money sceptre?"<sup>54</sup>

Boll also was willing to openly cooperate with leading Fundamentalists and fellow-travelers in appearing on venues such as the Winona Lake campground in Indiana, characterized by Marsden as the "principal means of evangelical expression."<sup>55</sup> At the invitation of James DeForest Murch, an Independent Christian Church minister who had developed an open relationship with Fundamentalist leaders, Boll was a featured speaker at Winona Lake encampments.<sup>56</sup>

In Boll's relationship with Murch we find much that explains the underground, indeed, often invisible character of Fundamentalism between the World Wars. A short digression here may enlarge our understanding of the situation. In the decades following the Scopes Trial, Fundamentalists of various sorts seemed to many observers to disappear into oblivion, along with their sympathizers and allies. In fact, as recent studies have shown, they had simply sunk beneath the surface of American society and were becoming stronger by building their own loose but extensive network of colleges, Bible institutes, mission agencies, radio ministries, and other parachurch organizations. While they had lost much public support, they constructed a subculture which allowed informal communication through a network of publications and other venues. Still, a chief characteristic of Fundamentalism has always been an argumentative militancy, frequently expressed most

vociferously toward fellow Fundamentalists or sympathizers. One result of this fractiousness has been the development of an array of overlapping, sometimes competing, organizations extensive enough to bewilder even the participants, to say nothing of outsiders attempting to decipher the signposts of unfamiliar territory. This chapter describes the growth of some of those agencies and organizations which emerged as Fundamentalism developed into varieties of Evangelicalism in the decades before and after World War II. As Fundamentalists continued to grapple with the challenges to faith presented by various aspects of modern science, and as some Fundamentalists became better educated in the canons of mainstream science, their interaction with scientific and religious issues produced still other agencies and forms of response. Like other Fundamentalist fellow-travelers, Christian Churches and Churches of Christ continued to agree with some basic Fundamentalist tenets while rejecting others. Nonetheless, as this chapter describes, they made significant contributions of their own to the common cause of addressing scientific concerns from the standpoint of Biblical faith. 57

In some ways, the affinities felt by many in Churches of Christ for several aspects of Fundamentalism, including its anti-evolutionary components, were reflected in the course taken by conservatives in many denominations. Similarly, the disturbances among the Christian Churches not only over evolution but the perceived liberalism of their colleges and

missionary agencies caused them to behave in many ways exactly as Fundamentalists did. Rather than driving the modernists from their denominations, religious conservatives, whether they wore the label “Fundamentalist” or not, were themselves evicted from or unwelcome in several “mainstream” denominations by the 1930’s. Historians have long pondered the state of religious decline in America during the 1930’s. In retrospect, it is not difficult to see that this “American Religious Depression” was in large measure simply the withdrawal of many religious conservatives from denominations in which they no longer felt at home. 58

While this militant anti-modernist tendency was most evident denominationally among mainstream Presbyterians and Baptists, many other religious organizations were torn with fratricidal combat following the First World War. When the religious conflict spilled over onto the front pages of daily newspapers or was carried live over the new technology of radio, as it was during the Scopes Trial, even non-religious Americans were amazed, annoyed, or alarmed. Although the Scopes Trial was not at first perceived by either side as a victory for the pro-evolutionary forces, eventually the perception emerged of a resounding defeat for opponents of evolution. Perpetuated not so much by reality as by fictionalized accounts such as the theatrical drama, Inherit the Wind, the image of Darrow slaying Bryan, and of educated, enlightened evolutionists routing their blindly ignorant opponents became a semi-official public version of the event. John T. Scopes was

convicted of teaching evolution, but the deliberations produced an additional verdict. "In the trial of public opinion and the press," George Marsden argues, "it was clear that the twentieth century, the cities, and the universities had won a resounding victory." By contrast, it was equally evident that "the country, the South, and the fundamentalists were guilty as charged." Humiliated by the disgrace and vilification heaped upon them by the national media, and by some in their own denominations, after Dayton the once-proud religious traditions which held sway in much of nineteenth-century Protestant America seemed, tattered, forlorn, and abandoned.<sup>59</sup>

"Scopes had lost, but in another sense, Scopes had won," argues William E. Leuchtenberg. Indeed, as Ray Ginger observes in his history of the Scopes case, "To the loser belongs the spoils." But whatever the spoils may have been, they did not include increased popularity for the teaching of evolution. As several studies of science textbooks readily demonstrate, the teaching of evolution in schools, and its inclusion in biology texts, was also a casualty of the trial. Scopes eventually won in the sense that his conviction was eventually overturned, and he may have prevailed in the court of public opinion, at least in some quarters. In the South, however, the victory was Pyrrhic. Certainly, the effect of ridicule flung at ignorant anti-evolutionists was negligible, especially since, as Edward Larson observes, Southerners were frequently "the butt of the joke." <sup>60</sup>

Thus, while the Scopes Trial is often seen as the climax of the evolution controversy of the 1920's, as Ferenc Szasz persuasively documents, "instead of being the apex, it was really just the beginning of the concerted antievolution agitation."<sup>61</sup> But lacking a national champion like Bryan, and ever-suspicious of politicians generally, legal and political remedies did not long prove attractive to religious conservatives in the wake of the Scopes Trial. Largely unsuccessful in influencing the larger society through legislation or litigation, and with an equally dismal record in purging their denominations of modernism, religious conservatives, including avowed Fundamentalists and their occasional allies, spent much of the next generation rebuilding their own infrastructure of small denominations and various parachurch agencies. In fact, this nondenominational and unobtrusive network of colleges, mission agencies, radio ministries, publishing houses, Bible camps and retreats provided Fundamentalists and their allies and sympathizers with much of their vitality in the period between the Wars. Almost invisible to anyone not involved or actively looking for it, this social movement had submerged, but had not by any means drowned in the sea-change of modern, secularistic public attitudes which they saw inundating modern America. Often portrayed by opponents and some historians as a deviation in the development of American religious history, it in fact was one significant way by which "average Americans invested their lives with meaning," as historian R. Laurence Moore has argued. <sup>62</sup>

By the early 1940's, at least two newly-formed organizations represented not only the continued vitality of Fundamentalists and their allies, but the emergence of a new generation of leaders as well. The National Association of Evangelicals and the American Scientific Affiliation, described later in this chapter, represented in differing ways the renaissance and development of conservative Protestantism. Unwilling to be bound by the obscurantist, Menckenesque image which had hounded them since the 1920's, the new generation preferred the broader, more historic label, "Evangelical." The term has been defined many ways, but perhaps the most succinct is offered by Grant Wacker: it was a broad movement in British and American Protestantism which insisted that "the sole authority in religion is the Bible and that the sole means of salvation is a life-transforming experience wrought by the Holy Spirit through faith in Jesus Christ."<sup>63</sup>

Still, like many who could perhaps be called "Evangelical," many restorationists were not directly involved with such formal organizations, even while sharing many of their goals and general orientation. The author of the most recent study of the formation of the NAE found only one representative of the Christian Churches or Churches of Christ present at the 1943 Chicago convention which formally organized the NAE.<sup>64</sup> That sole representative was James DeForest Murch, formerly of the editorial staff of Cincinnati's Standard Publishing Company, which published the Christian Standard. But Murch was extremely influential among the NAE, becoming the editor of its

journal, United Evangelical Action, and later managing editor of the influential journal, Christianity Today. Launched as the evangelical rival to the Christian Century, a former Disciples periodical which after 1918 became the mainstream voice of liberal Protestantism, Christianity Today played a prominent role in the emergence of modern evangelicalism.<sup>65</sup> Later, Murch wrote the first history of the organization, Cooperation Without Compromise. Murch points out that he was not, in fact, totally alone in his efforts to involve Christian Churches in the affairs of NAE, naming several other of the group's ministers who were present at the beginning. Clearly, though, he and the few others he could persuade to join him were a distinct minority among Christian Churches and Churches of Christ. Thus, while the independent Christian Churches were not significantly involved as a group in cooperative Evangelical efforts any more than they were with cooperative efforts among the Disciples, at least one of their ministers, Murch, was indispensable to their early organizations, and others were without doubt sympathetic to the general evangelical outlook.<sup>66</sup>

James DeForest Murch was a native of southern Ohio whose father, a Christian Church minister, had studied under J.W. McGarvey at the College of the Bible. One of young Murch's childhood memories was meeting the aged McGarvey at the 1909 Centennial Convention of the Christian Churches in Pittsburgh, where events included a mass meeting at the new Forbes Field. Educated at the University of Illinois and at Ohio University, from which he

graduated in 1915, Murch was introduced by his father to the writings of Alfred Fairhurst, which the younger Murch used in animated discussions in the Ohio University biology classes of professor W.F. Mercer. Murch went on to a long and distinguished career among Christian Churches, favoring the “independent” side in their attempts to keep the Christian Churches from restructuring themselves into a fully formed denomination, replete with denominational agencies and bureaucracies. Like many Disciples, he maintained contact both with those on the “cooperative” side, and with the opponents of restructure or “independents,” throughout the controversy.<sup>67</sup>

In 1924, while living in Cincinnati, Murch played a central role, joining R.C. Foster, Henry J. Lutz (one of only two or three “expert scientific witnesses” Bryan planned to call at Dayton) and others, in the organization of the Cincinnati Bible Seminary as a conservative attempt to replace the loss of the College of the Bible in Lexington. For many years he occupied editorial positions with the Standard Publishing Company and its publications, including the Christian Standard. Internal disagreements within the company in the 1940’s caused Murch, suspect to staunch conservatives because of his ties with more liberal Disciples, to be ousted from the company. Utilizing his contacts of many years with the editorial staffs and denominational leadership of other conservative denominations, Murch then began his extensive involvement with the editorial projects of the NAE.<sup>68</sup>

Murch may have felt very much alone in his work with Evangelical agencies and publishers, as Joel Carpenter's recent history of those organizations argues. Churches of Christ did not cooperate any more openly with the newly emerging network of Evangelical organizations than they had with avowed Fundamentalists. However, Churches of Christ during the Great Depression and World War II followed a trajectory similar to that of many other groups whose Biblical views caused them to oppose evolutionary teachings and favor some form of creationism. In instances where they agreed, they were often willing to make common cause against a mutual enemy.

At the end of the day, however, the question still remains: Were Churches of Christ Fundamentalists? Was Boll truly a Fundamentalist? If not, what would he have had to do to be considered one? As indicated above, the answers depend upon how loosely one defines terms – and how many contradictions one is willing to tolerate. In a strict sense of proudly wearing the label, "Fundamentalist," or advertising himself widely and loudly as a self-proclaimed "Fundamentalist," or joining an avowedly Fundamentalist group, the answer is: evidently not. Although he was willing to use the term "Fundamentals" when others among Churches of Christ blanched at the term, and though he might meet the "all those in communion with Moody Bible Institute" definition,<sup>69</sup> it is still true that most card-carrying Fundamentalists would have considered Boll's Fundamentalist credentials suspect, to say the

least. Furthermore, while he might have more in common with self-proclaimed Fundamentalists than most others among Churches of Christ, his rejection of denominationalism precluded his whole-hearted embrace of any Fundamentalist group. While his acceptance of premillennial concepts,<sup>70</sup> and a more pronounced emphasis upon "grace" than was generally found among other restorationists (though still too works-oriented and insistent upon ordinances such as baptism to suit a Calvinistic sovereign-grace advocate) place him closer along the spectrum toward Fundamentalism than most of his counterparts among Churches of Christ, it still feels uncomfortable to stamp him with such a label. From my reading of him, I think Boll would agree.

A related, and potentially more useful, line of questions might be: Was Boll's premillennialism and attendant disposition toward some forms of Fundamentalism stronger than his restorationist tendencies? Does his premillennialist or other quasi-Fundamentalist characteristics trump his avowed non-denominational restorationism? Would he rather have his premillennial fellow-travelers become "Christians only," or would he prefer that his brethren among Churches of Christ adopt premillennialism?

Psychologists will testify to the frequent difficulties of diagnosing the living, and psychoanalyzing the dead is no doubt nigh impossible. Truly, there is danger as well as distortion in committing psycho-history in public.

Answering the questions posed above may not be possible. Was R.H. Boll,

and the Churches of Christ which in which he claimed membership, truly Fundamentalist? Fundamentalist sympathizers (to use Singleton's categories), or "under Fundamentalist influence?" As my old church history professor, Lester McAllister, used to say: "You pays your money, and you takes your choice."

#### NOTES

1 H.L. Mencken, quoted in William Manchester, H.L. Mencken, Disturber of the Peace (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), 206.

2 John C. Greene, Science, Ideology, and World View: Essays in the History of Evolutionary Ideas (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 128. British theologian James Barr begins his book Fundamentalism by observing: "Readers like to begin with a clear and simple definition of the subject, but such a clear and simple definition cannot always be given. Complex social and religious movements cannot be defined in a few words: what has to be offered is not a definition, but an extended description" (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978, 1).

3 Of course, such definitional problems are not limited to the term Fundamentalism. Other examples of such problem terminology in American religious history include Puritanism, for example, and, from the political history contemporaneous with Fundamentalism, the term Progressivism.

4 Recently, historians of science (including James R. Moore, The Post-Darwinian Controversies [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979], chapter 1, and Ronald L. Numbers, "Science and Religion," in Sally Gregory Kohlstedt and Margaret W. Rossiter, eds., Historical Writing on American Science: Perspectives and Prospects [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985], 59-80), have effectively challenged the basic premises of Draper, White, and others such as Maynard Shipley's The War on Modern Science: A Short History of the Fundamentalist Attacks on Evolution and Modernism (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927). Among other things, such interpretations (parroted in the "standard histories" of Fundamentalism such as Stewart G. Cole, The History of Fundamentalism [New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931], and Norman F. Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931 [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954]) overlook the extensive usage of Baconian

orientations toward scientific thought, made by the Fundamentalists in their defense of the faith (see chapter 6, "Dispensationalism and the Baconian ideal," in George M. Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture [New York: Oxford University Press, 1980]; Marsden, "Understanding Fundamentalist Views of Science," in Ashley Montagu, ed., Science and Creationism [New York: Oxford University Press, 1984], 95-116). The warfare scenario is also used (albeit with somewhat more perception) in Edward A. White, Science and Religion in American Thought: The Impact of Naturalism (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1952), especially chapter 7, "Fundamentalism Versus Modernism 1920-30" (110-117).

5 Some might challenge the self-descriptions of some Fundamentalists as "Biblical literalists" (James Barr argues that "The customary plain man's definition, that a fundamentalist is a person who takes the Bible literally, is far from exact" (Fundamentalism, p. 1). However, I believe Emory University sociologist Nancy T. Ammerman is correct when she describes Fundamentalists in the Modern World as Bible Believers and declares that "Fundamentalists are considerably more sure [even than other conservative Christians – JSW] that every word of Scripture (often as found in the King James Version) is to be taken at face value" and that many doctrines espoused by Fundamentalists are in actuality "key test[s] of whether a person 'really believes the Bible'" (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987), 5.

6 On premillennialism, see Ernest R. Sandeen, Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1870-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970). Useful in separating the various strands of millennial thought (premillennial, postmillennial, amillennial, dispensational, pre-tribulational, post-tribulational, etc.) are: Robert G. Clouse, ed., The Meaning of the Millennium: Four Views (Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1977), which contains chapters by leading Evangelical scholars George Eldon Ladd (Historic Premillennialism), Herman A. Hoyt (Dispensational Premillennialism), Lorraine Boettner (Post millennialism), and Anthony J. Hoekema (Amillennialism); Hoekema, The Bible and the Future (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979); Millard J. Erickson, Options in Eschatology: A Study of the Millennium (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977). Older, but still useful, works include Clarence Bass, Backgrounds to Dispensationalism (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960), and C. Norman Kraus, Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1958). An interesting exchange between representatives of various schools of evangelical millennial thought is found in the "Christianity Today Institute" entitled "Our Future Hope: Eschatology and Its Role in the Church," CT 31 (February 6, 1987):1/1 -14/1. More recent developments, such as the

emergence of “progressive dispensationalism,” is described by Darrell L. Bock in “Charting Dispensationalism,” CT 38 (September 12, 1994): 26-29. See also Bock and Craig A. Blaising, Progressive Dispensationalism (Victor Books, 1994), and Robert L. Saucy, The Case for Progressive Dispensationalism (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994). See also Stanley J. Grenz, The Millennial Maze: Sorting Out Evangelical Options (Downer’s Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992); John H. Gerstner, Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth: A Critique of Dispensationalism (Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth and Hyatt, 1991); David L. Turner, “‘Dubious Evangelicalism’? A Response to John Gerstner’s Critique of Dispensationalism,” Grace Theological Journal 12 (1992): 263-277; and Wesley R. Willis and John R. Master, eds., Issues in Dispensationalism (Chicago: Moody Press, 1994).

7 On Baconianism, see works by Marsden and Numbers, previously cited, as well as background information in Theodore Dwight Bozeman, Protestants in An Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum Religious Thought (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977); E. Brooks Holifield, The Gentleman Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture, 1795-1860 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1978), chapters 4 and 5; Marsden, The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), chapter 7; Herbert Hovenkamp, Science and Religion in America: 1800-1860 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978), chapters 2-4; James Turner, Without God, Without Creed: The Origins of Unbelief in America (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), chapter 2; George H. Daniels, American Science in the Age of Jackson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), 62-85; and Henry F. May, The Enlightenment in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976). See also Mark A. Noll, “The Common Sense Tradition and American Evangelical Thought,” American Quarterly 37 (Summer 1985): 213-238.

8 On the “Princeton Theology,” see Mark Noll, The Princeton Theology, 1821-1921 (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1983); Noll, “Introduction,” in The Princeton Defense of Plenary Verbal Inspiration (New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1988); and David F. Wells, Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1985).

9 C. Allyn Russell, Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), summarizes insights regarding leading Fundamentalists which had been previously published in a half-dozen historical journals another perspective on some of the same men is provided by Ferenc M. Szasz, “Three Fundamentalist Leaders: The Roles of William Bell Riley, John Roach Straton, and William

Jennings Bryan in the Fundamentalist Modernist Controversy" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1969). Robert E. Wenger, "Social Thought In American Fundamentalism, 1918-1933" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1973) provides an appendix of useful short biographical sketches of prominent figures involved in the so-called Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy.

10 Harvard theologian Harvey Cox depicts present-day Fundamentalism as "opposition to modernity" and predicts for the Fundamentalism he describes an increasingly visible role "in a postmodern world in which science, philosophy, and theology have once again begun to communicate with each other" (Religion in the Secular City: Toward A Postmodern Theology [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984], 59, 61) see chapter 2, "Fundamentalism and the Tradition of Antimodernism." Ammerman agrees with Cox that "Fundamentalism can be interpreted as an essentially antimodern movement" (op. cit., p. 214). On modernism as a theological category in the twentieth century, see William R. Hutchinson, The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976).

11 Among works which are helpful in understanding of Fundamentalism by dealing with its later expressions include Louis Gaspar, The Fundamentalist Movement, 1930-1956 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1963 [reprint, 1981]); and George Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), in some ways a sequel to Marsden's previous-work. These earlier works are now superseded by Joel Carpenter's outstanding work, Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

12 Cornell University historian R. Laurence Moore states the problem in this manner: "No matter how one defines Fundamentalism, one risks joining together in Christian fellowship a lot of people who would prefer to remain apart. . . . Neither the Churches of Christ, nor the Church of the Nazarene, nor the Missouri Synod Lutherans, all militantly anti-liberal in their theology, are very close in their historical origins to each other or to the specifically Fundamentalist movement that was launched by the World's Christian Fundamentals Association in 1919." Yet it seems self-evident to Moore and others, myself included, that any definition of Fundamentalism omitting these groups is flawed. After discussing similar problems of definition relative to Northern and Southern Baptists as well as Pentecostalism, Moore concludes that "one has to live with a fairly loose definition of Fundamentalism and be somewhat-indulgent about the lines that common usages of the word blur" (Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans [New York: Oxford

University Press, 1986], 151-152). See also Moore, "Insiders and Outsiders in American Historical Narrative and American History" with "Comments" by Edwin Scott Gaustad and Gene Wise, American Historical Review 87 (April 1982): 390-423.

13 See Kenneth K. Bailey, "The Anti-Evolution Controversy of the Nineteen-Twenties" (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1953), 36. See also Bailey, Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 83.

14 Martin E. Marty, Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America (New York: The Dial Press, 1970), 214-16.

15 Stewart G. Cole, for example, in "The Psychology of the Fundamentalist Movement" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1929, 61-62) depicts Fundamentalists as unenlightened rural dullards whose lives were "untouched by the thrilling cosmopolitan appeals which daily challenge their urban neighbors." As R. Laurence Moore correctly points out, however, "Fundamentalism was not in its origins or in its development confined to the South and to rural people" and that "In the 1920's Fundamentalism enjoyed its greatest numerical strength, both in leadership and following, in the Middle Atlantic and East North-Central states. The Protestants who grew most alarmed by evolutionary theory were not Southern ministers, who after all rarely encountered a real Darwinist, but relatively sophisticated Northerners." Moore, Religious Outsiders, 160). Other examples of the rural caricature include John D. Hicks (Republican Ascendancy, 1921-1933 (New York: Harper and Row, 1960) 168, 182; William E. Leuchtenberg, Perils of Prosperity, 1914-1932 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 218-219, 223; and Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), 117-136. See also Hofstadter's The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966), 66-92 especially. A useful insight into the disdain with which academics and intellectuals often confront various forms of conservative Christianity is found in R. Stephen Warner, "Theoretical Barriers to the Understanding of Evangelical Christianity," Sociological Analysis 40 (Spring 1979): 1-9.

16 Paul A. Carter, "The Fundamentalist Defense of the Faith," in John Braeman, Robert H. Bremner, and David Brody, eds., Change and Continuity in Twentieth-Century America: The 1920's (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1968), 179-214. See also the chapter on Fundamentalism in Carter's The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel: Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920-1940 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1956).

17 Mencken, op. cit., 206. In his analysis of "Fundamentalism as an Urban Phenomenon," Gregory Singleton offers a most perceptive precaution. He argues that since definitions of Fundamentalism "range from 'Biblical literalism' to 'devoutly religious,' obviously we need more rigorous classifications which will allow us to combine various denominations into confessional groups and correlate membership with various social indices. Unfortunately, however, the state of religious statistics in the United States is such that most of the inferential tools that have proven most valuable in population studies cannot be used." Singleton proceeds to argue that, instead of a single classification, those who have been called Fundamentalists should be divided into three subsets: 1. Definitely Fundamentalist; 2. Fundamentalist sympathizers; and 3. Those under "Fundamentalist influence." (Gregory Singleton, "Fundamentalism and Urbanization: A Quantitative Critique of Impressionistic Interpretations," in Leo F. Schnore, ed., The New Urban History: Quantitative Explorations by American Historians (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 205-227.

18 See "insider" histories by Fundamentalist authors, such as George Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1973) and David O. Beale, In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850 (Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1986).

19 Daniel B. Stevick, Beyond Fundamentalism (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1964), 45. Discussion of the infighting between various professedly Fundamentalist groups is found in Edward Dobson, In Search of Unity: An Appeal To Fundamentalists and Evangelicals (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985).

20 Edward Dobson, Ed Hindson, and Jerry Falwell, The Fundamentalist Phenomenon (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986).

21 Sandeen carefully demonstrates how earlier interpretations, particularly those of Cole and Furniss, had misapprehended several characteristics of avowed Fundamentalists (for instance, that the 1895 "Niagara creed" which Furniss assumed to have been adopted in 1895 was in actually composed in 1878 and contained not five but fourteen points). Other works by Sandeen on similar themes include "Fundamentalism and American Identity," in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences 387 (January, 1970): 56-65; and "The 'Little Tradition' and the Form of Modern Millenarianism," in The Annual Review of the Social Sciences of Religion 4 (1980): 165-182.

22 Sandeen, *Roots*, xvii-xix, 73-74, 130-131, 134-135; and Sandeen, "Toward A Historical Understanding of the Origins of Fundamentalism," *Church History* 37 [June 1968]: 67, 82. "Sandeen also sought to correct many of the older stereotypes about the movement: its supposed agrarian, rural, anti-intellectual tendencies as its doctrinal uniformity based on a set of consistent 'points'" (Bill J. Leonard, "The Origin and Character of Fundamentalism," *Review and Expositor* 79, no. 1 [Winter, 1982]: 8).

23 Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, op. cit. But Marsden has not by any means been the only historian to register dissent with Sandeen's heavy emphasis on premillennialism as the central tenet of Fundamentalism. The exchanges with Sandeen on how best to define Fundamentalism includes Marsden, "Defining Fundamentalism," *Christian Scholar's Review* 1, no. 2 (Winter 1971): 141-151, and Sandeen, "Defining Fundamentalism: A Reply to Prof. Marsden," *Christian Scholar's Review* 1, no. 3 (Spring 1971): 227-233.

24 Quotations from Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, pp. 3-5, 102-103, 178-179. Marsden also argues that "theological conservatism . . . created in Southern religion many characteristics that resembled later fundamentalism" and which developed in "parallel ways." Noting that "several important Fundamentalist leaders came from the South," Marsden argues that by the 1920's, religious conservatives in the South "were beginning to find in Northern fundamentalists and identifiable group of outsiders who might be trusted." Although Marsden's account "neglect[s] Southern [religious] developments" and is thus somewhat oversimplified, I concur with his judgment that many largely Southern religious groups developed most of the same features which he enumerates as characteristics of what-he calls "Fundamentalism." See John B. Boles, "The Discovery of Southern Religious History," in Boles, *Interpreting Southern History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 541, and Samuel S. Hill, "Fundamentalism and the South," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 13, no. 4 (Winter 1986): 47-65.

25 Joel A. Carpenter, "Contending for the Faith Once Delivered: Primitivist Impulses in American Fundamentalism," in Richard T. Hughes, ed., *The American Quest for the Primitive Church* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 102-103. See response by Mark Noll, *ibid.*

26 Shirley Nelson, *The Last Year of the War: A Novel* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), p. 5 (quoted in Carpenter, "Contending For the Faith," p. 102).

27 Carpenter, "Contending for the Faith," p. 102. See also Carpenter's "The Renewal of American Fundamentalism, 1930-1945" (Ph.D. dissertation,

The Johns Hopkins University, 1984). Carpenter's recent magnum opus, Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism, describes the post-Scopes developments during the "American Religious Depression" which resulted as Fundamentalists withdrew from mainstream culture and churches to forge their own religious infrastructures.

28 Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, 6-7. See also the chapter on the "Independent Fundamentalist Family" in J. Gordon Melton, ed., The Encyclopedia of American Religions (2nd ed.; Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1987), 69-76, various creedal statements and primary documents are reproduced in Melton, ed., The Encyclopedia of American Religions: Religious Creeds (Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1988), 565-584.

29 The concept of "exclusivism" is prominent in A.V. Murrell, "The Effects of Exclusivism in the Separation of the Churches of Christ from the Christian Church" (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1972). One of the most astute observers of this sort of "exclusivism" (albeit from a non-academic perspective) is found in Garrison Keillor, who parodies a situation repeated in thousands of independent congregations in all parts of the United States in Lake Wobegon Days (New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1985), 105.

30 Joel A. Carpenter, "Fundamentalism," in Samuel S. Hill, ed., Encyclopedia of Religion in the South (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984), 275ff. See also the photographically reproduced volumes in Joel A. Carpenter, ed., Two Reformers of Fundamentalism: Harold John Ockenga and Carl F.H. Henry (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1988). This title is one of a series of 45 volumes edited by Carpenter and others, including George Marsden. Reproducing many of the primary source documents of some self-designated Fundamentalists, this series is indispensable for anyone wishing for more than superficial acquaintance with Fundamentalists.

31 Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, 7. Since the publication of this book, Marsden has published a series of essays and encyclopedia articles, refining and elucidating various strands of Fundamentalism and the development of some Fundamentalists into "neo-evangelicals." Several of these essays are collected in Marsden, Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1991).

32 Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, 43. Undoubtedly, the increasing visibility of present day Fundamentalism in the last decade is due to two developments: the growth of the television evangelists of the "electronic church," and the increasingly political involvement of some Fundamentalists who seemed willing to abandon, to some degree at least, this

basic emphasis on "soul-saving and practical Christianity." Among the works exploring the politicization of Fundamentalism, Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, Danger on the Right (New York: Random House, 1964), include a chapter on George S. Benson's National Education Program at Harding College among the various strains of Fundamentalist religion feeding the political "far right." Harding and the NEP have been described as "one of the more prolific sources of rightist propaganda" by Jerry Lee Bonham, "Fundamentalism and the Radical Right" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1975), pp. 454-455.

33 Michael D'Antonio, "Flag Fundamentalism," Louisville Courier-Journal, Sunday, July 23, 1989, D-1 ("Special to Newsday"); and Stephen Jay Gould, "Darwinian Fundamentalists," New York Review of Books 44 (June 12, 1997): 34-37.

34 For a fuller examination of the relationship of similarities between Churches of Christ and the broader Fundamentalist movement, see James Stephen Wolfgang, "Fundamentalism and Churches of Christ, 1910-1930" (M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1990; and Michael Casey, "The Interpretation of Genesis One in the Churches of Christ: The Origins of Fundamentalist Reactions to Evolution and Biblical Criticism in the 1920s" (M.A. thesis, Abilene Christian University, 1989). While these two works agree upon the central thesis that Churches of Christ had much greater affinity for various Fundamentalisms than previously supposed, I would not go so far as to say that Churches of Christ "were moving into the loosely organized fundamentalist movement" or that generally they "embraced the fundamentalist label and agenda in the 1920's" and subsequently "left the fundamentalist movement in the 1930's" and yet "remained loyal to the Fundamentalist ideal" (Casey, pp. 54, 81-82, 115). The definitions are more complex and the story more nuanced.

Taken together – or separately – these works dispute the accounts of Fundamentalist relations by members of Churches of Christ (or lack thereof) alleged by William S. Banowsky, Mirror of a Movement: Churches of Christ as Seen Through the Abilene Christian College Lectureship (Dallas: Christian Publishing Company, 1965), pp. 40-43; and Leroy Garrett, The Stone-Campbell Movement: The Story of the American Restoration Movement (Joplin, MO: College Press, 1984; rev. ed., 1991), p. 482.

35 Jesse P. Sewell, ("An Open Letter," FF 39:32 [August 8, 1922], p. 5). The growth and development of independent "Bible Colleges" among Churches of Christ, established so that the church's young people could obtain an education free from the taint and/or temptations of secular (or rival denominational) colleges, in many ways parallels similar developments

among avowedly Fundamentalist Bible schools. See Virginia Lieson Brereton, "Protestant Fundamentalist Bible Schools, 1882-1940" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1981); Brereton, "The Bible Schools and Conservative Evangelical Higher Education, 1880-1940," in Joel A. Carpenter and Kenneth W. Shipps, eds., Making Higher Education Christian: The History and Mission of Evangelical Colleges in America (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987: 110-136. See also William Vance Trollinger, God's Empire: William Bell Riley and Midwestern Fundamentalism (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).

36 To cite only a few examples, see U.G. Wilkinson, "Is the Story of Creation, Fall, and Redemption of Man a Legend or Myth?" FF 34 (June 19, 1917), p. 2.; G.H.P. Showalter, "The Bible, The Word of God," FF 36:19 May 13, 1919), p. 2; A.B. Lipscomb, "Edifying as the Need May Be," GA 61 (April 17, 1919), pp. 301-302. For further examples, see Wolfgang, "Fundamentalism and Churches of Christ."

37 Flavil Hall, "Field Notes and Helpful Thoughts," CL (March 20, 1920), p. 6; F.B. Srygley, "Flavil Hall in the Christian Standard," GA 77:39 (September 26, 1935), p. 916. See also M. C. Kurfees, "Transylvania University and Destructive Criticism - The Situation at Lexington, Kentucky," Gospel Advocate 59 (June 7, 1917), p. 554; George C. Klingman, "The Bible - The Word of God," Firm Foundation 34 (July 24, 1917), p. 1; Klingman, "Destructive Criticism," Christian Leader (November 6, 1918), p. 8. See also J.C. McQuiddy, "Are the Germans A Chosen People?" GA 59:28 (July 12, 1917), p. 672; and McQuiddy, "Rationalism," GA 64:31 (August 3, 1922), 734.

38 Marsden's description of dispensationalists as Baconians is so typical of philosophical underpinnings of members of Churches of Christ that he could just as well have been describing them: "They were absolutely convinced that all they were doing was taking the hard facts of Scripture, carefully arranging and classifying them, and thus discovering the clear patterns which Scripture revealed." (Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 56). See C. Leonard Allen, "Baconianism and the Bible in the Disciples of Christ" Church History 55 (1986), pp. 65-80; Bozeman, Protestants in An Age of Science; and Bozeman, "Inductive and Deductive Politics: Science and Society in Antebellum Protestant Thought," Journal of American History 64 (December 1977): 704-722. See also Allen and Richard T. Hughes, Illusions of Innocence: Protestant Primitivism in America, 1630-1875 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), chapter 7; Hughes, ed., The American Quest for the Primitive Church (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), chapters 5-7; and Allen and Hughes, Discovering Our Roots: The Ancestry of Churches of Christ (Abilene, TX: ACU Press, 1988).

Infusion of Baconian modes of thought in the Restoration Movement was not limited to the Campbells; it is no coincidence that the Stone-Campbell movement's first college (established at Georgetown, Kentucky in 1836, four years before Alexander Campbell inaugurated Bethany College), was named Bacon College in honor of Francis Bacon. See Dwight E. Stevenson, Lexington Theological Seminary, 1865-1965 (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1964), pp. 401-415; and John D. Wright, Jr. Transylvania: Tutor to the West (revised ed.; Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1980), pp. 190ff. In addition to Lamar's Organon of Scripture: Or, The Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1860), a popular hermeneutics text (still in print and used by Church of Christ ministers after more than a century) is David R. Dungan, Hermeneutics (reprint; Delight, AR: Gospel Light Publishing Company, n.d.), which contains short sections on "common sense" and "Bacon" (although Roger Bacon, rather than Francis Bacon, is discussed – so "magical" was the name Bacon among some nineteenth-century restorationists).

39 An examination of just one journal, the Biblical Educator, reveals the following articles: S.O. Pool, "The Educator's Second Year," Biblical Educator 2:1 (Wenatchee, WA; January 1910), p. 1. See also "Whence Came the Law of Moses?" BE 3 (May 1911): 149-153 "Corroborative Evidence of the New Testament," BE 3 (November 1911): 331-340; and Charles Greig, "A Review of the Work of the Higher Criticism and Its Bearing on New Testament Christianity," ibid., 341-349; "Jesus' Birth and Resurrection," BE 4 (February 1912): 33-34; "Modern Inspiration," BE 4 (March 1912): 67; D.A. Sommer, "The Decline and Fall of Evolution," BE 4 (April 1912): 103-109; "Supposed Contradictions of the Bible," BE 4 (August 1912): 225-230; J.W. Chism, "God's Existence and Intelligence," BE 4 (August 1912): 241-243; D.A. Sommer, "Does the Chronology of Egypt Contradict the Chronology in the Bible?" BE 4 (September 1912): 258-262; "Dr. Charles A. Briggs' Recantation (from Herald and Presbytery)," BE 4 (September 1912): 276-278; and "Atheism and Religious Inventions," BE 4 (October 1912): 291-296. The journal quotes with approbation articles and speeches of Fundamentalist spokesmen, from George McGready Price to Harry Rimmer to William Jennings Bryan. It even quotes allies from the Disciples such as J.W. McGarvey of the College of the Bible in Lexington, Kentucky – despite the recent and rancorous disputes which separated the two groups.

40 The story of William Webb Freeman, a graduate of the southern Baptist Theological Seminary and doctoral student at Yale University who was purged from the faculty of Abilene Christian College for allowing that the "days" of Genesis might be longer than 24 hours and other heterodox views, is related by both Casey and Wolfgang (note 34 supra).

See William Webb Freeman, "Why Give Support to Christian Education," FF 36:23 (June 17, 1919), p. 6; 14 Freeman, "Use and Abuse of the Bible, No. 1," FF 39:24 (June 6, 1922), p. 3.; G.H.P. Showalter, "The Bible and Science," FF 39:29 (July 18, 1922), p. 2.; Freeman, "Use and Abuse of the Bible, No. 2," FF 39:28 (July 11, 1922), p. 4; Jesse P. Sewell, "Just What Do You Mean, Brother Freeman?" FF 39:33 (August 15, 1922), p. 2; Freeman, "Use and Abuse of the Bible, No. 4," FF 29:37 (September 12, 1922), p. 4; Showalter, "Concerning the Use and Abuse of the Bible," FF 29:36 (September 5, 1922), p. 2; W.F. Lemmons, "Moses or Darwin," FF 40:5 (January 30, 1923), p. 3; Ernest C. Love, "Christian Education," GA 64 (May 4, 1922), pp. 409-410.

Information on Freeman derived from C.R. Nichol, Gospel Preachers Who Blazed the Trail (Austin, TX: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1911; n.p.; alphabetical listing of biographical sketches, unnumbered pages); Lloyd Cline Sears, For Freedom: The Biography of John Nelson Armstrong (Austin, TX: R.B. Sweet Publishing, 1969), p. 126; and "Preface" in Freeman, "Was Paul A Sacramentarian?" (Th.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1926). On the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, consult William E. Ellis, "A Man of Books and A Man of the People:" E.Y. Mullins and the Crisis of Moderate Southern Baptist Leadership (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985); and James J. Thompson, Jr., Tried As By Fire: Southern Baptists and the Religious Controversies of the 1920's (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1982).

See also A.B. Lipscomb, "A Theory and a Fact," GA 61:11 (March 13, 1919), p. 1. A.B. Lipscomb, a graduate student in sociology at Vanderbilt University, was a nephew of David Lipscomb and served briefly as editor of the Gospel Advocate. For parallel developments in Fundamentalism generally, see Ronald L. Numbers, "The Dilemma of Evangelical Scientists," in George Marsden, ed., Evangelicalism and Modern America (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1984), pp. 150-160; Marsden, "Understanding Fundamentalist Views of Science," in Ashley Montagu, ed., Science and Creationism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), pp. 95-116; and Marsden, "Everyone One's Own Interpreter?: The Bible, Science, and Authority in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America," in Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll, eds., The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 79-100.

41 Much of the information about Boll is ultimately drawn from a biographical sketch by Elmer Leon Jorgenson, published in Boll's collection of articles, Truth and Grace: Writings of R.H. Boll (Cincinnati: F.L. Rowe, Publisher, 1917), pp. 6-12, and reprinted several times in tract form. This and other material which shed light on Boll's early life and work can be found on Hans Rollman's useful and interesting Restoration Movement website; the URL is <http://www.mun.ca/rels/restmov/index/html> (the site also contains a

bibliography by Terry J. Gardner and a broadcast interview with Boll conducted by R.B. Boyd, as well as other Boll-related documents).

Accounts of Boll's conflicts with the editors of the Gospel Advocate and others over premillennialism are related from a "mainstream" viewpoint in accounts such as R.L. Roberts, "Premillennialism: An Historical and Restoration Perspective," in Premillennialism: True or False? The First Annual Brown Trail Lectures, ed. Wendell Winkler (Ft. Worth, TX: Winkler Publications, 1978), pp. 159-171; and William Woodson, Standing For Their Faith: A History of Churches of Christ in Tennessee, 1900-1950 (Henderson, TN: J&W Publications, 1979), chapter 11, "Premillennialism," pp. 107-130. This privately published work is based upon Woodson's Th.D. dissertation at New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary.

An account of the conflict from a viewpoint more sympathetic to Boll is Thomas G. Bradshaw, "R.H. Boll: Controversy and Accomplishment Among Churches of Christ," M.Div. Thesis, Emmanuel School of Religion, 1992. See also David Owen, "The Premillennialist Movement Among Churches of Christ," M.A. thesis, Murray State University, 1991.

42 See Douglas A. Foster, "Sectarian Strife in the Midst of the Fundamentalist-Modernist Crisis: The Premillennial Controversy in the Churches of Christ, 1910-1940," in Methodism and the Fragmentation of American Protestantism, 1865-1920: Papers from the Wesleyan Holiness Studies Center Conference, September 29-30, 1995 (Wilmore, KY: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1995). An account of Boll by an outspoken premillennial opponent is Robert C. Welch, "R.H. Boll: Premillennialist," in They Being Dead Yet Speak: Florida College Annual Lectures, 1982 (Tampa, FL: Florida College, 1982). In a frequently-challenged interpretation, Welch asserts that Boll had become enamored of the premillennial teachings of Charles T. Russell, one of the early leaders of the Jehovah's Witnesses, during a debate Russell had with L.S. White, a Church of Christ minister, in Cincinnati in 1908 (see F.L. Rowe, ed., the Russell-White Debate [Cincinnati, 1908], and Earl West, "L.S. White," Restoration Quarterly 20 [Third Quarter, 1977], pp. 151-155). Other insights into the premillennial conflict can be gleaned from R.H. Boll and H. Leo Boles, A Debate on Unfulfilled Prophecy (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1927); and Foy E. Wallace, Jr., "Brother Boll Withdraws His Hand," GA 75:3 (January 19, 1933: 60-61, and "Premillennialism," GA 75:4 (January 26, 1933): 84. Several preachers among Churches of Christ debated well-known premillennialists (and self-proclaimed Fundamentalists) on the doctrine: Foy E. Wallace, Jr., debated J. Frank Norris in Ft. Worth in 1934 (Norris-Wallace Debate [n.p.; Fundamentalist Publishing Company, 1935]); see also Foy E. Wallace, Jr., The Story of the Fort Worth Norris-Wallace Debate (Nashville: Foy E. Wallace Jr. Publications,

1968); W.L. Oliphant debated John R. Rice (The Oliphant-Rice Debate [Austin, TX: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1935]).

43 R.H. Boll, "Safe and Unsafe Teachers," FF 37:24 (June 15, 1920), p. 3; Boll, "A Critic of Premillennialism," Word and Work 11 (November 1918), 373; Boll, "Verbal Inspiration," WW 12 (March, 1919), 80, 82.

44 The list is drawn from my own examination of Boll's library, now at Portland Christian School in Louisville. A useful, though incomplete, printed catalogue of Boll's library is available at PCS. Eva Estelle Moody, Catalog of the Boll Memorial Library (Louisville, n.p., n.d.).

45 Carpenter, Revive Us Again, p. 26; "Book Reviews," WW 18 (November 1925): 337;

46 Dr. Howard Kelly's article was reproduced directly from The Fundamentals. Other examples of articles by noted Fundamentalist authors include A.J. Gordon, "Orthodoxy Without Life," WW 19 (June 1926):183; [From Sunday School Times], "Was Jesus a Jew?" WW 19 (March 1926): 85f.; T.T. Shields, "The Prodigals' Brother," WW 18 (August, 1925): 238ff; [Sunday School Times], "Burning the Bible," WW 13 (April, 1919): 133; Philip Mauro, "The Tares of the Field," WW 19 (May 1919): 143f.; William Jennings Bryan, "Prophecies and Their Interpretation," WW 11 (July 1917): 314f., with reply;

47 R. H. Boll, "The Bible in Public Schools," WW 18 (June 1925):161-162. For similar developments in private schools and Bible colleges among Fundamentalism generally, see Brereton, Carpenter, Revive Us Again, and Trollinger, God's Empire, *infra*.

48 Foster's involvement in the affair at Springfield is gleaned from accounts in the local paper, the Springfield Sun, and from documents published by Foster in A Crisis in Our Public Schools: Should Evolution Be Taught in Springfield High School? (copy at Lexington Theological Seminary). On Gruenberg and various pre-Scopes biology texts, see Philip J. Pauly, "The Development of High School Biology Texts," ISIS 82 (December 1991): 669ff., and relevant passages in Edward J. Larson, Trial and Error (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985, 1989), and Larson, Summer for the Gods: America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion (New York: Basic Books, 1997). For fuller documentation and a more detailed account of Foster and his role in the Springfield hearing and at McGarvey Bible College and Cincinnati Bible College, see James Stephen Wolfgang, "Science and Religion Issues in the American Restoration Movement," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1997, pp. 98-107.

49 Earl Calvin Mullins, Sr., "An Historical and Analytical Investigation into Purposes and Needs for Establishing Portland Christian School and Its Subsequent Development" (M.A. thesis, University of Louisville, 1967), p. 19. This point was also made to me in conversation Alex Wilson, present editor of *Word and Work*, at Portland Christian School, June 25, 1998. See also R.H. Boll, "The Bible In Public Schools," *op.cit.*; Charles Neal, "The Christian and Education," *WW* 18 (March 1924): 72; Boll, "Teaching the Children the Only Hope," *WW* 18 (May, 1924): 163; and Boll, "Portland Christian School," *WW* 18 (August, 1924): 242. An account of the college founded at Winchester, KY, and supported by premillennial churches, is found in Paul A. Clark, "An Emerging Church Sponsored College" (Ed.D. thesis, University of Kentucky, 1959).

*Word and Work* frequently reported news of other such schools: see "Pacific Christian Academy," *WW* 13 (October 1919):340; "Harper College Opening," *WW* 13 (September 1919): 273;

50 R.H. Boll, "The Appeal of Evolution," *WW* 20 (January 1927): 12-15. The tract reprint of this article is still available today from the *Word and Work* office 2518 Portland Avenue, Louisville, KY 40212.

51 Boll, review of GM Price Boll, "The Work of Modernism," *WW* 19 (November, 1926): 331ff.; Advertisement of Bryan's Last Speech and Dr. Howard Kelly's A Scientific Man and the Bible, *WW* 19 (June 1926): 192; "Book Reviews: The Modern Triangle (Biola Book Room, Los Angeles," *WW* 19 (June 1926): 269; Stephen D. Eckstein, in "News and Notes," *WW* 19 (February 1926):39 [reporting on G.C. Brewer lecture on "Evolution"]; "Philip Mauro's Kingdom Books," *WW* 13 (July 1919): 192; "Book Reviews: A Text on Prophecy [J.M. Gray], *WW* 13 (June 1919): 181;

52 A.B. Barrett, "Notes of Travel," *FF* 40:22 (May 29, 1923), p. 3. G.C. Brewer, often called "The Bryan of the Southwest" – especially after Bryan's death – included a lecture on "Evolution" as the lead sermon in a series preached in the First Baptist Church of Ft. Worth, Texas in 1928. For more on this and similar examples, see Wolfgang, "Science and Religion Issues in the Restoration Movement" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1997), pp. 124-125, 138-140. On Brewer specifically, consult Warren S. Jones, "G.C. Brewer: Lecturer, Debater, and Preacher" (Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1959); note Appendix C, transcriptions of "News Clippings From Brewer's Scrapbook," pp. 148ff., especially pp. 153, 155, 160 and elsewhere.

53 R.H. Boll, "Bathing Suits and Nudity Cults," *WW* 18 (September, 1925): 260. For more examples of similar comments reflecting "cultural Fundamentalism" among Churches of Christ, see Wolfgang, "Fundamentalism

and Churches of Christ, 1910-1930," (M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1990), pp. 103-112.

54 R.H. Boll, "A Smoking Education," WW 19 (September 1926), p. 276.

55 Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 132.

56 James DeForest Murch, Adventuring for Christ in Changing Times: An Autobiography of James DeForest Murch (Louisville, KY: Restoration Press, 1973), pp. 117-120. Murch also reported that, in addition to speaking at the Winona Lake encampment, Boll also "gave under his own auspices a series of afternoon lectures on these themes [prophecy and the Second Coming of Christ] in the Winona Lake Presbyterian Church" (p. 120). Murch characterized Boll as "undoubtedly the greatest expository preacher of the day in the Restoration Movement" (ibid).

57 See, for example, Joel A. Carpenter, "A Shelter in the Time of Storm: Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism," Church History 49 (March, 1980), 62-75; and Carpenter, "The Renewal of American Fundamentalism, 1930-1945" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1984). See also George Marsden, "From Fundamentalism to Evangelicalism: A Historical Analysis," in David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, eds., The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Going (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977), 142-162.

58 On the decline of mainstream Protestantism, see Robert T. Handy, "The American Religious Depression, 1926-1935," Church History 29 (March 1960), 4-5; and Thomas C. Reeves, The Empty Church: The Suicide of Liberal Christianity (New York: Free Press, 1996). On the matter of "insider status" and terms such as "mainstream," or "mainline," see Leonard I. Sweet, "Wise as Serpents, Innocent as Doves: The New Evangelical Historiography," Journal of the American Academy of Religion 56 (1988), 397-415. For an account of the controversy in two of the main denominations, see Bradley J. Longfield, The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); and Roland Nelson, "Fundamentalism and the Northern Baptist Convention," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964).

59 On the perceptions of which side(s) "won" or "lost" the Scopes Trial, see Rollin Lynde Hartt, "What Lies Beyond Dayton," The Nation 121 (July 22, 1925): 111-112; Editorial, "Dayton and After," The Nation 121 (August 5, 1925):155-156; and "Dayton's Amazing Trial," Literary Digest 86 (July 25, 1925):5-7. All of these articles, and many others similar in content, are found in

the Clarence Darrow Papers, Containers 5 and 15, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress. The Literary Digest article includes photographs of the judge, jury, defendant, lawyers from both sides, and Tennessee legislator John W. Butler, who introduced the Tennessee anti-evolution statute. See also Larson, Trial and Error, 73-75; Paul M. Waggoner, "The Historiography of the Scopes Trial," Trinity Journal 5 (1984): 156-161; and Donald F. Brod, "The Scopes Trial: A Look at Press Coverage After Forty Years," Journalism Quarterly 42 (1965):219-26. The Marsden quotation is from Fundamentalism and American Culture, 185-186.

60 William E. Leuchtenberg, Perils of Prosperity, 1914-1932 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 218-2129, 233; and Ray Ginger, Six Days or Forever? Tennessee vs. John Thomas Scopes (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958; reprint, New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 190-217. The facile rural-urban explanation as a basis of the conflict is perpetuated also in John D. Hicks, Republican Ascendancy, 1921-1933 (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), 168, 182; Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), 117-136; and Hofstadter, The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966), 66-92. This paragraph follows closely the interpretation of Edward Larson in Trial and Error, 73-75. See also Edwin Scott Gaustad, "Did the Fundamentalists Win?" in Mary Douglas and Steven M. Tipton, Religion and America: Spirituality in Secular Age (Boston: Beacon Press, 1983), pp. 169-178; and "The Impact of the Scopes Trial," in Samuel Walker, In Defense of American Liberties: A History of the ACLU (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 75ff.

61 Szasz, The Divided Mind of American Protestantism, 123. The long struggle in many state legislatures is chronicled in detail by Richard David Wilhelm, "A Chronology and Analysis of Regulatory Actions Relating to the Teaching of Evolution in Public Schools," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1978, and in more succinct form in Larson, in Trial and Error.

62 Moore, Religious Outsiders, 149.

63 Grant Wacker, Augustus H. Strong and the Dilemma of Historical Consciousness (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), 17. On the development of American Scientific Affiliation, see Numbers, The Creationists, 153ff.

64 Joel A Carpenter, Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). See also Carpenter, "From Fundamentalism to the New Evangelical Coalition," in

George Marsden, ed., Evangelicalism and Modern America (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1984), 3-16.

65 Murch, Adventuring for Christ. Other accounts of developments among Disciples and Independents during the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversies, covering similar chronology and some of the same events recounted by Murch, include James B. North, "The Fundamentalist Controversy Among the Disciples of Christ, 1890-1930" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1973); and North's Union in Truth: An Interpretive History of the Restoration Movement (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1994). Kevin Kragenbrink, "Dividing the Disciples: Social, Cultural, and Intellectual Sources of Division in the Disciples of Christ, 1919-1945" (Ph.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1996), covers some of the same ground but extends chronologically beyond North's dissertation.

66 On the role of Christianity Today, see chapter 13, "New Evangelicals, Old Fundamentalists," in William Martin, A Prophet With Honor: The Billy Graham Story (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1991), 211-217; Billy Graham, Just As I Am: The Autobiography of Billy Graham (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1997), 284-294; the perspective of Graham's father-in-law, a retired Presbyterian medical missionary, is found in John C. Pollock, A Foreign Devil In China: The Story of Dr. L. Nelson Bell, An American Surgeon in China (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1971), 237-243. See also Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987), 158-165.

67 Murch, Cooperation Without Compromise: A History of the National Association of Evangelicals (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956). A later history of the group is Arthur H. Mathews, Standing Up, Standing Together: The Emergence of the National Association of Evangelicals (Carol Stream, IL: NAE, 1992).

68 Murch, Adventuring for Christ, chapters 6, 11-13, 18, and 21. Among Murch's many publications was his history of the Restoration told from the standpoint of the independent Christian Churches. See Murch, Christians Only: A History of the Restoration Movement (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1962); details of Murch's opposition to centralization among Christian Churches, and that of one of his benefactors, is found in Murch, B.D. Phillips: Life and Letters (Louisville, KY: privately published, 1969).

69 I have heard the allegation several times that Boll attended Moody Bible Institute, but cannot document this despite various unsuccessful attempts. Several explanations are possible. One is that fading memories have confused Boll with others among his co-workers who *did* attend Moody.

A more likely explanation, it seems to me, is that Boll may have enrolled in one of the many Moody extension or correspondence programs. Indeed, one such course is reproduced as a part of the 1995 Garland Press reprint series, Fundamentalism in American Religion, 1880-1950, edited by Joel Carpenter. (This particular volume bears the cumbersome title, First Course – Bible Doctrines, Instructor – R. A. Torrey, Eight sections with Questions). According to the “Editor’s Note,” the correspondence course is actually “a unique, school study edition of Reuben A. Torrey’s major theological statement, What The Bible Teaches.” Given Boll’s appreciation for Torrey in general and this 1898 work in particular, one wonders if this may not be the means by which Boll became exposed to premillennial Fundamentalism – while at the same time “taking MBI courses.” A further item of interest is the conclusion to Carpenter’s editorial note: “this work epitomizes fundamentalists’ faith in the Baconian, inductive method of dividing and classifying data as the one sure, scientific method of getting the truth.”

70 Premillennialism was, of course, a significant aspect of Fundamentalism for many – but by no means all – Fundamentalists. It is true that anti-premillennialism was a flash point for many who reacted against modernism; according to Marsden, the Biblical World carried dozens of anti-premillennial articles between 1917 and 1921 (Fundamentalism and American Culture, pp. 147-148, 271). The secondary literature on the development of premillennialism and the concomitant decline of postmillennialism is extensive; perhaps the best place to begin is with Timothy Weber, Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1982 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2nd. ed., 1982), or Paul Boyer, When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).

It must be emphasized, however, that “Millennial interpretations varied widely” among Fundamentalist leaders (C. Allyn Russell, Voices of American Fundamentalism, p. 19); see also David E. Harrell, “Dispensational Premillennialism and the Religious Right,” in Joseph Bettis and S.K. Johannesen, eds., The Return of the Millennium. Barrytown, NY: New ERA Books/ International Religious Foundation, Inc., 1984, pp. 9-34. A prime example of non-premillennial fundamentalism is, of course, Machen; see Darryl G. Hart, Defending the Faith: J. Gresham Machen and the Crisis of Conservative Protestantism in Modern America (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994).

Despite attempts by Elmer Leon Jorgenson in Faith of Our Fathers or LaVern Houtz, The Origins of Premillennialism in the Churches of Christ (Hammond, LA: Church of Christ Bible Chair, n.d.) to find as many sentences as possible from early restorationists which could be construed as favorable

to premillennialism, such attempts may remind those unsympathetic to the viewpoint of the efforts of earlier premillennarians to find compatriots everywhere since the Reformation (Weber, Shadow, 31-32).