

2003

Protestantism and Fundamentalism

William Vance Trollinger

University of Dayton, wtrollinger1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/hst_fac_pub



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#), and the [New Religious Movements Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Trollinger, William Vance, "Protestantism and Fundamentalism" (2003). *History Faculty Publications*. Paper 10.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/hst_fac_pub/10

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of History at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

<AU>William V. Trollinger, Jr.</AU>

<A>Definition and Theology

The term “fundamentalism” has been used to describe a host of religious movements across the globe that are militantly antimodernist, aggressively patriarchal, literalist in their reading of sacred texts, and assiduous in their efforts to draw boundaries between themselves and outsiders. While “Islamic fundamentalism” has received the most attention, particularly after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, scholars and journalists have also applied the term to movements within such disparate traditions as Judaism, Sikhism, and Hinduism, as well as to various Christian groups.¹

There are benefits to understanding fundamentalism as a global movement that grows out of deep-seated and intense opposition to (aspects of) modernity, and that is found in a wide array of religious traditions. Among other things, such an approach allows for interesting and often insightful comparative analysis. But there are problems with defining fundamentalism generically and applying it globally. Not only does such an approach not lend itself to definitional precision, it can devolve into derogatory shorthand for reactionary religious groups.

As a result, and for the purposes of this chapter, it is best to understand fundamentalism where it started, as a *religious movement within Protestantism*. Fundamentalism had its origins in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Anglo-American evangelicalism, and it blossomed into a full-fledged religious movement in the years immediately after World War I (see Brereton, 1990: 165-70; Carpenter, 1997: 3-12). To a great degree fundamentalism has been an American phenomenon, with its origins and greatest strength in the United States, although it has had a limited presence in Canada (and although, as George Marsden has observed, it has often been “successfully propagated overseas by its vigorous missions.”) While there are a multitude of evangelical connections between the United States and the remainder of the Anglo-American world, for a variety of reasons -- including a greater commitment to established churches and to ecumenism -- the fundamentalist movement never had the impact in England or even in Canada that it had in the USA.²

Of course, all this leads to matters of definition. The term “fundamentalism” was coined in 1920 by a Baptist periodical editor, Curtis Lee Laws, to refer to conservative evangelicals in the

Northern Baptist Convention who were willing to engage in “battle royal for the Fundamentals” of the faith (Laws, 1920). Fundamentalists shared and share with other evangelicals a commitment to the authority of the Bible, the necessity of a conversion experience for salvation, and the importance of sharing the good news of the gospel with others. What distinguishes fundamentalists from other evangelicals -- and the line here is admittedly quite blurred -- is that they are stridently opposed to “modernism,” including theological liberalism, Darwinism, and secularism.³

It would be a mistake, however, to view fundamentalists merely as conservative traditionalists committed to resisting change and repelling error. In their zeal to combat modernism these contentious evangelicals latched onto two relatively new theological doctrines, both of which reflected their intense antimodernism. Most important is biblical inerrancy, the cornerstone of fundamentalist theology. The modern doctrine of inerrancy was most fully developed in the late nineteenth century by Presbyterian conservatives at Princeton Seminary, including Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, and Benjamin Warfield.⁴ It was an antimodernist response to “higher criticism,” a sociohistorical approach to the Scriptures that was championed by theological liberals, and that raised serious questions about the supernatural character and literal authenticity of the biblical record. In stark opposition, the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy emphasized that the original “autographs” are the infallible product of the Holy Spirit’s guidance. As such, they contain no errors of any sort; they are accurate in all that they have to say, including when they speak on matters of history, science, and the like.

Joel Carpenter has cogently observed that the Princeton theologians “defended biblical authority and inerrancy with a carefully nuanced balancing of the Bible’s divine and human character.” But in their war on modernism the fundamentalists have jettisoned nuance, a point that pertains to their understanding and use of inerrancy. Attacking those who have emphasized the Bible as a human and historical product, fundamentalists have focused almost exclusively on the Bible’s supernatural character. It is thus difficult to distinguish between the fundamentalist doctrine of inerrancy -- with its emphasis that the Bible must be read “literally” -- and the dictation theory of Scripture, in which human beings simply served as recorders of God’s words (Carpenter, 1997: 69-75, quote p.72).

Biblical inerrancy is crucial to dispensational premillennialism, an eschatological system which, for some scholars, is the distinguishing characteristic of fundamentalist theology. Premillennialism holds that the millennium -- the thousand-year reign of God’s kingdom on earth -- will not occur until Christ returns to earth to establish it; it is in stark contrast with postmillennialism, an optimistic view of history that holds that the Spirit-led church will usher in the millennium, followed by Christ’s return. While premillennialism has an ancient lineage,

dispensational premillennialism -- or, simply, dispensationalism -- was developed by Plymouth Brethren founder John Nelson Darby in Great Britain in the mid-nineteenth century. Darby traveled to the United States to make the case for his ideas; his disciples quite successfully promoted dispensationalism in a series of prophecy conferences in the United States in the late nineteenth century. But it was Cyrus Scofield's Reference Bible, a dispensational gloss which first appeared in 1909, that cemented the popularity of dispensationalism among conservative evangelicals.

According to dispensationalism, history is controlled by supernatural forces; if read literally -- hence the importance of inerrancy -- the Bible (particularly the books of Daniel and Revelation) provides a sure guide to the past, present, and future of human history. History is divided into (generally seven) separate segments, or dispensations; in each dispensation God tests human beings, humans fail, and the era ends with a divine judgment on humans (e.g., the Genesis flood). The current dispensation, the "church age," is marked by the increasing apostasy of the institutional church and the increasing decadence of modern civilization. But at the end of the church age -- which will be preceded by the return of Jews to Palestine and the re-establishment of the state of Israel -- Christ will return in the air (the "rapture") to retrieve faithful believers from the world. The world will then endure seven years of "tribulation," which will include the reign of the antichrist and the persecution of Jews who have converted to Christianity. This time of tribulation will end with the return of Christ and the saints, who will defeat the enemy and establish the millennial kingdom headquartered in Israel.⁵

<A>Fundamentalist Movement, 1910s-1950s

Many North American evangelicals in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries accepted both biblical inerrancy and dispensational premillennialism. These protofundamentalists were concerned -- but not surprised, given that dispensationalism had warned them of the increasingly apostate church -- by the spread of theological liberalism in the major Protestant denominations and seminaries. In response, Lyman and Milton Stewart, wealthy California oilmen who were evangelicals, funded the publication of *The Fundamentals*, a 12-volume series of essays that appeared between 1909 and 1915, and that made the case for conservative Protestant theology. While the Stewarts and the editors -- A. C. Dixon, Louis Meyer, and Reuben Torrey -- were dispensationalists, not much was made of dispensationalism or other controversial ideas. Instead, editors and essayists sought to present a united front in defense of the "fundamentals of the faith" (Marsden, 1980: 118-23).

Despite the fact that these 12 volumes contributed to the coining of the term "fundamentalist," it would be a mistake to view these books, with their relatively irenic tone, as

signaling the beginning of fundamentalism. The fundamentalist movement did not come into being until a few years later, out of the cultural crisis engendered by World War I. Woodrow Wilson's holy war against German barbarism convinced many Americans that the very survival of Western civilization and Christian morality were at stake. Conservative evangelicals were caught up in this spirit of alarm, but they had a ready explanation for Germany's devolution, namely its widespread acceptance of higher criticism, theological liberalism, and Darwinian evolutionism. And this explanation carried with it a warning: as Germany went, so would the USA, if it did not change its ways.

In this atmosphere -- further charged by the 1918 British capture of Jerusalem from the Turks, which thrilled dispensationalists as evidence that the last days were at hand -- many conservative evangelicals in the United States were transformed into militant antimodernists. Six months after the war ended, and with the Red Scare gaining momentum, these radicalized evangelicals gathered in Philadelphia to create the World's Christian Fundamentals Association (WCFA), an event hyperbolically described by the organization's first president, William Bell Riley, as "of more historic moment than the nailing up, at Wittenberg, of Martin Luther's *Ninety-five Theses*" (Riley, 1919: 3). The interdenominational WCFA set for itself two primary goals: to promote its understanding of Christian orthodoxy, including inerrancy and dispensational premillennialism, and to aggressively fight the modernist menace. Toward these ends the WCFA concluded its May 1919 convention by dispatching its leaders on a well-publicized campaign throughout the United States and Canada.⁶

The fundamentalist forces began their antimodernist campaign by targeting the spread of theological liberalism in major denominations. While most denominations in the United States were touched by fundamentalism and endured some sort of fundamentalist controversy, the fiercest battles took place among the Northern Baptists (NBC) and the Northern Presbyterians (PC-USA). There were good reasons for this. Both denominations had Calvinist roots, and hence there was a heritage of emphasizing the importance of affirming correct doctrine -- that is, conditions were conducive for a movement that emphasized "fundamentals of the faith." Moreover, and unlike their counterparts in the South, liberalism had made significant inroads among Northern Baptists and Presbyterians -- that is, there was an enemy for the fundamentalists to fight. Led by Riley in the NBC and J. Gresham Machen and William Jennings Bryan in the PC-USA, the fundamentalists sought to rid the seminaries and mission fields of theological liberals and to commit their respective denominations to fundamentalist creedal statements.

While large numbers of Northern Baptists and Presbyterians were theologically conservative, many of them were also denominational loyalists who were unwilling to engage in the

militant action demanded by fundamentalists. Frustrated by these “fearful compromisers,” William Bell Riley in 1922 joined with other militants to create the Baptist Bible Union, which sought to unite all Baptist fundamentalists in North America in the war on modernism. Joining Riley from the South was J. Frank Norris, the firebrand pastor of Fort Worth’s First Baptist Church who tirelessly blasted the Southern Baptist Convention for its laxity on modernism. From the North came Canada’s most visible fundamentalist, T. T. Shields, pastor of Toronto’s Jarvis Street Baptist Church and leader of an aggressive campaign in the early 1920s to rid McMaster Divinity College of modernism. Not only was Shields chosen as the BBU’s first president, but he served as president of the organization’s short-lived and controversy-ridden Des Moines University (Elliott, 1995: 364-9; Stackhouse, 1993: 23-34).

The Baptist Bible Union notwithstanding, it was clear by 1925 that fundamentalists had failed to capture control of either the NBC or the PC-USA.⁷ But the WCFA had already turned its attention from ridding denominations of modernist theology to ridding America’s schools of Darwinian evolutionism. With a commonsensical understanding of science as limited to observable facts and demonstrable laws, fundamentalists considered evolution to be a speculative “unscientific” theory. Moreover, fundamentalists viewed Darwinism, with its rejection of the Genesis creation account and its emphasis on natural processes, as inimical to orthodox Christianity. Finally, Darwinian evolutionism, with its emphasis on human beings as but highly developed animals, was a grave threat to the moral foundations of Western civilization; again, the obvious example was the World War, caused and fueled by a Germany inspired to dastardly aggression by its acceptance of the Darwinian “survival of the fittest.”

In response to this deadly threat, the WCFA and other fundamentalists -- most prominently William Jennings Bryan -- embarked on a campaign designed to pressure state lawmakers to ban the teaching of evolution in the public schools. One state to pass such legislation was Tennessee, which in 1925 made it illegal “to teach any theory that denies the Story of Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animal.” When schoolteacher John Thomas Scopes and the American Civil Liberties Union challenged the law, William Jennings Bryan volunteered his services to the prosecution. The result was the famous Scopes Trial, conducted in July 1925 in Dayton, Tennessee to great media fanfare, including a live broadcast on a Chicago radio station. While Scopes was ruled guilty of violating Tennessee’s antievolution statute (a judgment that was eventually reversed on a technicality), ACLU attorney Clarence Darrow and reporter H. L. Mencken successfully portrayed Bryan and his fundamentalist supporters as rural hicks who were woefully ignorant of modern science and ridiculously out of touch with modern urban culture.

The Scopes trial and William Jennings Bryan's death one week later took the steam out of the antievolution crusade. While some southern state legislatures proceeded to pass bills banning the teaching of Darwinism, there was little enthusiasm for such legislation in the North, a point emphatically driven home in 1928, when an antievolution law pushed by William Bell Riley in his home state of Minnesota suffered an ignominious defeat.⁸ The national fundamentalist crusade had collapsed, having failed to cleanse the public schools of Darwinian evolutionism, and Protestant denominations of theological modernism. Contemporary commentators and scholars over the next half-century were convinced that this failure signaled the death of fundamentalism. While this reactionary movement might survive for a while in benighted pockets of the North American landscape, the march of progress ensured that modernity would triumph, and fundamentalism would disappear.⁹

The experts could not have been more wrong. Fundamentalism proved to be a remarkably resilient and dynamic force. Despite the failed crusades of the 1920s and the attendant negative publicity, fundamentalists successfully regrouped at the local level in the United States and Canada. Some fundamentalists formed independent (often "Bible" or "independent Baptist") churches. Some controlled churches that were, at least nominally, affiliated with a mainline denomination. Others brought churches together to create fundamentalist denominations, including the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, the Bible Presbyterian Church, the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (which emerged from the Baptist Bible Union), the World Baptist Fellowship and Baptist Bible Fellowship (both of which grew out of the J. Frank Norris empire), and the Conservative Baptist Association. In Canada, there was T. T. Shields' Union of Regular Baptist Churches, the Fellowship of Independent Baptist Churches, and the Convention of Regular Baptists of British Columbia, all of which eventually merged. In all these forms -- independent, nominally mainline, or part of a fundamentalist denomination -- fundamentalist churches flourished. Their success was due in great part to a rapidly expanding web of nondenominational organizations, including publishing houses, mission agencies, and, most important, Bible institutes. The numerous Bible schools scattered across the United States and Canada, Chicago's Moody Bible Institute being the most prominent, provided churches in their region with fundamentalist ministers, secretaries, Vacation Bible School workers, Bible conferences, and Sunday School materials, as well as home and foreign missionaries.

By the 1940s fundamentalists began to move beyond the local level, seeking -- as good evangelicals -- to bring the gospel to the masses. They proved to be quite adept at making use of radio, evinced by Charles Fuller's "Old-Fashioned Revival Hour" and the various programs broadcast over Moody's WMBI. They also conducted evangelistic campaigns and created

evangelistic organizations such as Youth for Christ, out of which came such future luminaries as Billy Graham. In the years immediately after World War II, when Americans and others in the West were anxious about the spread of Communism and the possibility of nuclear war, the fundamentalist message proved quite appealing.¹⁰

This emphasis on revival, as opposed to antimodernist crusades, aggravated tensions that existed just below the surface in the fundamentalist movement. In response to the 1920s debacle some fundamentalists committed themselves to “separation,” adding as a doctrinal requirement the refusal to cooperate with those who did not fully share their theological commitments (some went further by insisting on noncooperation with those who shared their theology but who did not fully separate from those who did not). But in the 1940s and 1950s a group of less militant (and often younger) fundamentalists emerged who rejected this extreme separatism while also de-emphasizing dispensational premillennialism. The separatists were appalled by such compromises. The first crack in the movement appeared in the early 1940s, with the creation of two competing fundamentalist organizations: the American Council of Christian Churches, established by the militant Presbyterian Carl McIntire, who insisted that fundamentalists separate completely from denominations affiliated with the World Council of Churches; and the National Association of Evangelicals, organized by moderate fundamentalists, including J. Elwin Wright and Harold J. Ockenga, who emphasized “positive outreach” more than negative attacks (Carpenter, 1997: 141-232). But the real explosion in the fundamentalist ranks came in the 1950s, with the evangelist Billy Graham as the focal point. Graham’s willingness to cooperate with mainline Protestants in his revival campaigns infuriated McIntire, Bob Jones, Jr., and other separatist leaders, and they began to turn on Graham and his supporters as traitors to the faith.

When the dust had settled by the end of the decade, the fundamentalist movement had split into two groups: the neo-evangelicals, who were the much larger group, and who over time simply came to call themselves “evangelicals,” and the much smaller group of separatists, who boldly retained the label “fundamentalist.”¹¹ While our focus here is the fundamentalist side of this division, it seems important here to point out that a significant and influential segment of contemporary evangelicalism, particularly in the United States, has its roots in fundamentalism and has been shaped by its fundamentalist heritage. This becomes clear when one observes, as Harriet Harris has pointed out, the “ongoing preoccupation with inerrancy” on the part of many evangelicals; it is also clear when one compares evangelical and fundamentalist institutions of higher education in the USA, given that both generally require faculty members to sign (often similar) faith statements, and both often engage in boundary maintenance, removing faculty members who have strayed in their theology or their lifestyle (Harris, 1998: 43; Trollinger, 1996:

519-42). While there are whole segments of evangelicalism that were not greatly affected by the fundamentalist controversies of the 1920s, and while many evangelicals have worked very hard to distance themselves from the opprobrious label “fundamentalist,” there is no question that contemporary evangelicalism, especially in the North American context, has been greatly influenced by fundamentalism.¹²

<A>Politicized Fundamentalism: 1960s to the Present

In the years after the movement divided, separatist fundamentalists once again concentrated their efforts at the grass-roots level, establishing and growing churches (some of which became quite large), supporting fundamentalist “faith” missions, building up their colleges (most prominently, Bob Jones University and Tennessee Temple University), and engaging in revival work. While the media occasionally noticed the fundamentalists, most of the time they were beneath the cultural radar. But in the late 1970s fundamentalists surprisingly returned to the spotlight. Appalled by the dramatic social changes that had taken place in the United States -- including the sexual revolution; the feminist, antiwar, and civil rights movements; and the increasing secularization of American life -- many fundamentalists became politically mobilized, driven to restore “Christian America.” Fundamentalism had always been associated with militarism, market economics, and patriotism; such ideas were popular in post-Vietnam, post-Watergate America, and politically energized fundamentalists played a central role in what became known as the Religious Right.

In fact, it was a fundamentalist Baptist minister and radio preacher, Jerry Falwell, who in 1979 established the first important Religious Right organization. Describing itself as “prolife, profamily, promoral and pro-America,” the Moral Majority played an important role in the election and re-election of President Ronald Reagan, a fundamentalist icon even though he was only nominally religious. While the Moral Majority collapsed in the mid-1980s, primarily because it lacked a grass-roots base, fundamentalists played an active role in televangelist Pat Robertson’s 1988 presidential campaign (the candidate’s arch-conservative political ideology and moral rhetoric allowing fundamentalists to overlook the fact that he was a charismatic). Out of this failed campaign came the most important Religious Right organization to date, the Christian Coalition. Led by right-wing wunderkind Ralph Reed, the Christian Coalition reported one million members in the early 1990s, and played a crucial role in the 1990 re-election of North Carolina’s Jesse Helms to the Senate, the 1991 confirmation of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court, and the 1994 Republican takeover of Congress. While the Christian Coalition, too, faded away by the end of the decade, fundamentalists have continued to be very aggressive politically, having established themselves as an essential and very active part of the Republican coalition.¹³

It is a point of pride for many Canadians that they have not seen anything comparable to the Moral Majority and Christian Coalition. But there are some interesting historical precedents in Canada, and there are indications at the beginning of the twenty-first century that a Canadian version of the Religious Right may be emerging. In the 1930s, "Bible Bill" Aberhart, dispensationalist preacher and founder of the Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute, was elected premier of Alberta as head of the Social Credit party, which Aberhart founded, and which unsuccessfully sought -- as a response to the Depression -- to reorganize the province's credit system and to give each resident \$25 a month.¹⁴ At his death in 1943 Aberhart was succeeded as premier by Ernest Manning, a graduate of Aberhart's Bible Institute who moved the Social Credit party toward mainstream conservatism (and who also took over Manning's "Back to the Bible Hour" radio show). Manning's son, Preston, an evangelical, founded the federal Reform Party, which in 2000 evolved into the Canadian Alliance. Lay Pentecostal preacher and independent Christian school principal Stockwell Day -- also from Alberta -- was chosen to lead the new organization; in a moderate version of Religious Right campaigns in the United States, Day pushed a socially conservative, "prolife, profamily" agenda that resonated with some Canadians but frightened many others. Responding to the furor, in 2002 the Alliance replaced Day with a fiscal conservative who has evinced less interest in social issues (Hoover, 2000; Spendlove, 2002).

In the States, fundamentalists have not just voted for "prolife, profamily" candidates; they have also actively worked against the Equal Rights Amendment, gay rights, and, most important, abortion rights. Regarding the latter, it is remarkable that once politically quiescent fundamentalists are now engaging in lobbying, picketing, civil disobedience, and, at the movement's edges, violence. Fundamentalists have also become quite involved in the campaign to halt what they see as the rapid and dangerous spread of immorality, socialism, and secularism in the public schools; they have hence worked to eliminate or restrict sex education classes, to remove material critical of America and capitalism from textbooks, and to re-establish officially sanctioned prayer (ruled unconstitutional by the American Supreme Court in 1962). Returning to an old issue, contemporary fundamentalists have also fought the spread of Darwinian evolutionism; this time, they have sought to force public schools to give equal time for "creation science," which propounds that all life appeared on earth less than 10,000 years ago, and that all life was created in six 24-hour days.¹⁵

More in keeping with their separatist heritage, American fundamentalists have established thousands of fundamentalist primary and secondary schools; in the 1990s they also became prime movers in the "home schooling" movement. Still, militant fundamentalists such as Bob Jones III have criticized politically active fundamentalists for violating the premise of strict separation. Of course, the critics are correct: politicized fundamentalists have worked with nonfundamentalists,

including Catholics and evangelicals. The latter cooperation points to a narrowing of the gap between activist fundamentalists and conservative evangelicals that has taken place with the emergence of the Religious Right in the USA. One indication of this can be found within the Southern Baptist Convention, where fundamentalists and conservative evangelicals joined to capture the levers of denominational power, the result by the 1990s being a purge of SBC agencies and seminaries of noninerrantists. As in the 1920s, fundamentalism has sparked controversy and conflict in a major Protestant denomination, but in this case fundamentalists have won (with some moderates leaving the SBC fold).¹⁶

Fundamentalist theology, with its commitments to inerrancy and dispensational premillennialism, and the fundamentalist movement, in both its separatist and its politicized forms, will not be disappearing from Protestantism any time in the near future. In fact, as fundamentalists remain more committed to the traditional missionary enterprise than almost any other group within Protestantism, its influence will continue to spread across the globe. That fundamentalism survives and thrives will continue to baffle many nonfundamentalists. But its success is really not that surprising. Fundamentalism -- and here we can move beyond Protestantism to the host of other groups who have been labeled "fundamentalist" -- has successfully tapped into the deep reservoir of discontent with modernity, offering to its adherents certainty, community, and, of course, salvation.

<X>Notes</X>

- 1 The Fundamentalism Project, administered by Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, has produced the most important scholarship involving fundamentalism in a variety of religious traditions. See Marty and Appleby (1991, 1993a, 1993b, 1994, 1995). For a valuable discussion of comparative fundamentalism, see Harris (1998: 325-6).
- 2 Regarding fundamentalism (or lack thereof) in Great Britain, see Marsden (1980: 221-7; 1977); Bebbington (1989); Rennie (1994, esp. pp. 336-42). Regarding Canada, the notion of Canadian fundamentalism has provoked a fascinating academic conversation, focused on two questions: To what degree did/does fundamentalism exist in Canada? To what degree is fundamentalism in Canada simply an American export? For our purposes here, it is enough to say that fundamentalism has had a limited impact on Canadian religious life, and that -- particularly in the early movement -- there were some very interesting connections between Canadian fundamentalists and American fundamentalists. For an introduction to this discussion, see Elliott (1995); Lipset (1990), esp. p. 16; Rennie (1994: 342-5); Stackhouse (1993, esp. pp. 11-12, 21-3, 33-4).

- 3 Marsden (1988). While I contend that Marsden's "militant antimodernism" remains the best way to understand fundamentalism, I am also quite aware that this definition lacks precision. See Trollinger (2001: 264-8, 280-1).
- 4 For a classic discussion of the Princeton Theology and its connection with fundamentalism, see Sandeen (1970, esp. pp. 103-31). See also Noll (1988).
- 5 For dispensationalism and fundamentalism, see Boyer (1992); Marsden (1980, esp. pp. 48-71); Weber (1987).
- 6 For more on the World's Christian Fundamentals Association and the origins of the fundamentalist movement, see Trollinger (1990: 33-44).
- 7 For more on the denominational crusades, see Marsden (1980: 164-85); Trollinger (1990: 52-9).
- 8 For more on the antievolution crusade, see Larson (1985); Trollinger (1995).
- 9 For examples of this interpretation, see Cole (1931: 35-40, 336-7); Hofstadter (1962: 117-36); Furniss (1954: vii, 177-9); McLoughlin (1967: 45).
- 10 For fundamentalism in the 1930s and 1940s, see Carpenter (1997). For the role of Bible Schools in fundamentalism, see Brereton (1990). For fundamentalist Baptists in Canada and their organizations, see Burkinshaw (1995, esp. pp. 91-9, 131-5, 165-9); Stackhouse (1993: 29-31).
- 11 For a look at a key "neo-evangelical" institution as a window into the fundamentalist split, see Marsden (1987).
- 12 There is an ongoing argument over the degree to which fundamentalism has shaped and is central to twentieth-century evangelicalism in the United States. Donald Dayton, in particular, has criticized George Marsden and others for overemphasizing the importance of fundamentalism and de-emphasizing the importance of the holiness and Pentecostal traditions. See Dayton (1993). In that same issue Marsden and others respond to Dayton. See also Carpenter (1997: 236-8).
- 13 Much has been written on the Religious Right, but most important is William Martin (1996). For more on Jerry Falwell, see Susan Friend Harding (2000) and Frances FitzGerald (1981).
- 14 John Stackhouse (1993: 22, 35-45) convincingly argues that by the time Aberhart had become premier he was moving -- in theology and practice -- "beyond fundamentalism, and out of evangelical leadership" (p. 22). See also Elliott and Miller (1987).
- 15 For a comprehensive study of creationism in the United States, see Numbers (1992). As Numbers points out, the early fundamentalist movement contained a great variety of creationist theories, the most popular of which all wed for an ancient earth: the day--age theory, in which

each day of creation was actually a great expanse of time; and the gap theory, in which a vast amount of time separated the original creation and the six days of Genesis. But in modern fundamentalism creationism has become virtually synonymous with “young earth” theories of creation.

16 For the fundamentalist controversies in the Southern Baptist Convention see Ammerman (1990); Hankins (2002); Leonard (1990).

<X>References</X>

- Ammerman, Nancy (1990). *Baptist Battles: Social Change and Religious Conflict in the Southern Baptist Convention*. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bebbington, David W. (1989). *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. London: Unwin.
- Boyer, Paul (1992). *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brereton, Virginia Lieson (1990). *Training God's Army: The American Bible School, 1880-1940*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Burkinshaw, Robert (1995). *Pilgrims in Lotus Land: Conservative Protestantism in British Columbia, 1917-1981*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Carpenter, Joel (1997). *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cole, Stewart (1931). *The History of Fundamentalism*. New York: Richard Smith.
- Dayton, Donald (1993). The Search for the Historical Evangelicalism: George Marsden's History of Fuller Seminary as a Case Study. *Christian Scholar's Review*, 23: 12-33.
- Elliott, David R. (1995). Knowing No Borders: Canadian Contributions to American Fundamentalism. In George A. Rawlyk and Mark A. Noll (eds.), *Amazing Grace: Evangelicalism in Australia, Britain, Canada, and the United States*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 349-74.
- Elliott, David R. and Miller, Iris (1987). *Bible Bill: A Biography of William Aberhart*. Edmonton: Reidmore.
- FitzGerald, Frances (1981). A Disciplined, Charging Army. *New Yorker*, May 18.

- Furniss, Norman (1954). *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hankins, Barry (2002). *Uneasy in Babylon: Southern Baptist Conservatives and American Culture*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama.
- Harding, Susan Friend (2000). *The Book of Jerry Falwell: Fundamentalist Language and Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Harris, Harriet A (1998). *Fundamentalism and Evangelicals*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hofstadter, Richard (1962). *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Random House.
- Hoover, Dennis (2000). A Religious Right in Canada. *Religion in the News*, 3, online.
- Larson, Edward (1985). *Trial and Error: the American Controversy over Creation and Evolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Larson, Edward (1997). *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion*. New York: Basic.
- Laws, Curtis Lee (1920). Convention Side Lights. *The Watchman-Examiner*, 1 July.
- Leonard, Bill (1990). *God's Last and Only Hope: The Fragmentation of the Southern Baptist Convention*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin (1990). *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*. New York: Routledge.
- McLoughlin, William (1967). Is There a Third Force in Christendom? *Daedalus* 96.
- Marsden, George M. (1977). Fundamentalism as an American Phenomenon, a Comparison with English Evangelicalism. *Church History* 46: 215-32
- Marsden, George M. (1980). *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marsden, George M. (1987). *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Marsden, George M. (1988). Fundamentalism. In Charles Lippy and Peter Williams (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience: Studies of Traditions and Movements*, 3 vols. New York: Scribner, vol. II, pp. 947-8.
- Martin, William (1996). *With God on Our Side: The Rise of the Religious Right in America*. New York: Broadway.

- Marty, M. E. and Appleby, R. Scott (eds.) (1991). *Fundamentalisms Observed*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marty, M. E. and Appleby, R. Scott (eds.) (1993a). *Fundamentalisms and Society: Reclaiming the Sciences, The Family, and Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marty, M. E. and Appleby, R. Scott (eds.) (1993b). *Fundamentalisms and the State: Remaking Politics, Economics, and Militance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marty, M. E. and Appleby, R. Scott (eds.) (1994). *Accounting for Fundamentalism: The Dynamic Character of Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marty, M. E. and Appleby, R. Scott (eds.) (1995). *Fundamentalisms Comprehended*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Noll, Mark A (ed.) (1988). *The Princeton Defense of Plenary Verbal Inspiration*. New York: Garland.
- Numbers, Ronald (1992). *The Creationists*. New York: Knopf.
- Rennie, Ian S. (1994). Fundamentalism and the Varieties of North Atlantic Evangelicalism. In *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1990*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Riley, William Bell (1919). *The Great Divide; or, Christ and the Present Crisis*. Philadelphia: Bible Conference Committee.
- Sandeel, Ernest (1970). *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Spendlove, Paul (2002). After Party Election, Canadians Have Less Faith in Politics. *Christian Science Monitor*, April 11.
- Stackhouse, John S. Jr. (1993). *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century: An Introduction to Its Character*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Trollinger, William Vance Jr. (1990). *God's Empire: William Bell Riley and Midwestern Fundamentalism (Religious Higher Education in the United States)*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Trollinger, William Vance Jr. (1995). Introduction. In *The Antievolution Pamphlets of William Bell Riley*. New York: Garland, pp. xii-xviii.
- Trollinger, William Vance Jr. (1996). Independent Christian Colleges. In Thomas Hunt and James Carper (eds.), *Religious Higher Education in the United States*. New York: Garland.

Trollinger, William Vance Jr. (2001). How John Nelson Darby Went Visiting: Dispensational Premillennialism in the Believers Church Tradition and the Historiography of Fundamentalism. In Loren Johns (ed.), *Apocalypticism and Millennialism: Shaping a Believers Church Eschatology for the 21st Century*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald.

Weber, Timothy (1987). *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1982*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

<X>Further Reading</X>

Bendroth, Margaret Lamberts (1993). *Fundamentalism and Gender: 1875 to the Present*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Boone, Kathleen (1989). *The Bible Tells Them So: The Discourse of Protestant Fundamentalism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.