

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Calvary Baptist Theological Journal* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_cbtj.php

The Role of Higher Education in Fundamentalism

David L. Burggraff
Dean, Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary

A tension exists within fundamentalism over higher education. That tension seems to increase as we seek to answer sensitive questions. Has fundamentalism become an anti-education movement? Why are we so willing to bypass seminary training? Why do we find it difficult to win a hearing from other scholars and preachers? Why are our people migrating to churches where they claim they can be better fed? Why is it that our people appear well versed on social and political issues, yet struggle with genuine spirituality? Is the problem with the people? Could it be with the pulpits (the pastor-teacher)? If preachers are products of their training, might there be a problem with the training, or lack of it?

The issue of higher education is not a recent development, but one that has spanned the entire history of the fundamentalist movement. What should be the attitude of a Biblical fundamentalist toward higher education?

The list of those who came to make David king at Hebron includes one rather odd reference to "men of Issachar." The chronicler mentions others you might expect from the tribes of Israel: men of Simeon, "ready for battle," others "armed" with weapons, "brave warriors," even "men of Benjamin, Saul's kinsmen -- 3,000, most of whom had remained loyal to Saul's house until then" (I Chron. 12:24-37). But among these thousands were 200 others, "men of Issachar, who understood the times and knew what Israel should do."

Jewish and Christian interpreters alike have sometimes speculated that the tribe of Issachar consisted of astrologers, psychics, philosophers and/or scholars. But such hypotheses are quite unnecessary. The text is straightforward -- a few men of Issachar paid attention to the present and used their knowledge to plan for the future.

The purpose of this study is to discuss how fundamentalism has fared within the world of higher education and to seek to discern what the future may hold. Like the men of Issachar, perhaps the most reliable way to anticipate the future is by understanding the present. Therefore we will briefly reflect upon the past accomplishments of the evangelical tradition and will discuss the present educational trends in American fundamentalism and evangelicalism.

Historical Overview

Identification: Defining Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

It is difficult to define fundamentalism because no one definition seems satisfactory to all fundamentalists or to those outside fundamentalism. George Marsden offers the following definition.

A fundamentalist is an evangelical who is angry about something. That seems simple and is fairly accurate. . . . A more precise statement of the same point is that an American fundamentalist is an evangelical who is militant in opposition to liberal theology in the churches or to changes in cultural values or mores, such as those associated with "secular humanism." In either the long or the short definitions, fundamentalists are a subtype of evangelicals and militancy is crucial to their outlook. Fundamentalists are not just religious conservatives, they are conservatives who are willing to take a stand and to fight.¹

This definition, though initially comical, does ultimately delineate the distinguishing marks of fundamentalism: inerrancy and separation.² Indeed, this definition would be fairly clear if we knew exactly what an evangelical is. However, our task is made more difficult because neither fundamentalism nor evangelicalism is a clearly defined religious organization with a membership list. Rather, both evangelicalism and fundamentalism are religious movements. Each of these movements, though only informally organized, is an identifiable set of groups and individuals with some common history and traits.

The Shaping of Fundamentalism

We must become more historically self-conscious as fundamentalists. It is a sad commentary on our movement but the fact is that too few

fundamentalists can explain accurately how fundamentalism developed. Fewer still are comfortable discussing fundamentalism and higher education. An awareness of three major periods helps us to understand the fundamentalist experience in the world of higher education: Evangelical America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; 1860-1925: The crisis period within evangelicalism -- rise of the modern-theological (liberal) community; 1940-Present: Rise of neo-evangelicalism out of fundamentalism.

Evangelical America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. "Evangelical" (from the Greek for "gospel") eventually became the common British and American name for the revival movements that swept back and forth across the English-speaking world and elsewhere during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Central to the evangelical gospel was the proclamation of Christ's saving work through his death on the cross and the necessity of personally trusting Him for eternal salvation. In America, the way for the revivals had been prepared in part by the strong Puritan heritage of New England. Nevertheless, the revivalists' emphasis on simple biblical preaching in a fervent style that would elicit dramatic conversion experiences set the standard for much of American Protestantism. Since protestantism was by far the dominant religion in the United States until the mid-nineteenth century, evangelicalism shaped the most characteristic style of American religion.

Being a style as well as a set of Protestant beliefs about the Bible and Christ's saving work, evangelicalism touched virtually all American denominations. Most major reform movements, such as antislavery or temperance, had a strong evangelical component. Evangelicals had a major voice in American schools and colleges, public as well as private, and had much to do with setting dominant American moral standards.

Especially in its nineteenth-century heyday, 1860s-1870s, evangelicalism was a very broad coalition, made up of many sub-groups. Though from differing denominations, these people were united with each other and with persons from other nations in their zeal to win the world for Christ.

1860-1925: Crisis within evangelicalism -- the threat of liberalism. The vast cultural changes of the era from the 1860s to the 1920s created a major crisis within this evangelical coalition. Essentially it split in two. On the one hand were theological liberals who, in order to maintain better credibility in the modern age, were willing to modify some central evangelical doctrines, such as the reliability of the Bible or the necessity of salvation only through the atoning sacrifice of Christ. On the other hand

were conservatives who continued to believe the traditionally essential evangelical doctrines. What happened during this period?³

In the late 1800s, German liberalism began to make its push for the hearts and minds of men. This liberalism denied the supernatural, the existence of God, and any notion of an authoritative Bible. This attack came on all fronts: theological, philosophical, scientific, etc. Those influenced by liberalism took huge steps away from the truth of the Bible. Darwinism sprang up and redefined the origin of all living things. William Newton Clarke declared that the Bible was simply a book by men about God. Walter Rauchenbausch helped to usher in the age of the social gospel. The impact on evangelicalism was staggering; liberalism quickly took over every major denomination. The real hotbeds of liberal theology were the universities, many denominationally affiliated.⁴ America in twenty years attempted to catch up with what took Europe two hundred years to develop.

The response to this was the emergence of fundamentalism. The fundamentalist response was fivefold: they held Bible conferences to affirm orthodoxy,⁵ mass evangelism was used to reach thousands for Christ,⁶ schools were begun,⁷ preaching began to attack liberalism,⁸ and defenses of the faith were printed.⁹ During this time the name "fundamentalist" came into being. It was first introduced by Curtis Lee Laws in *The Watchman Examiner* in 1920.¹⁰

By 1920, fundamentalism had developed into a formidable fighting force. The theological and ideological battle raged in universities and denominations with scholarly fundamentalists matching wits with liberals. The "big bang" that marked the decline of fundamentalism and ultimately the demise of orthodoxy in many religious institutions occurred in 1925. In Dayton, Tennessee a much publicized trial pitted these two poles against each other. The Scopes Monkey trial, as it came to be remembered, was over the issue of evolution. John T. Scopes, a high school biology teacher, attempted to teach evolution, though Tennessee had banned the teaching of Darwinism in any public school. Scopes was brought to trial because of his teaching. He was defended by the brilliant Clarence Darrow who personified urban twentieth century man. Darrow destroyed his opponent, folksy William Jennings Bryant, at the trial. The media's portrayal of modern, intellectual man's domination of the backwoods, half-educated, obscurantist fundamentalist sent shockwaves throughout the nation and world. Even though most fundamentalists were not this way, from this point on their influence was minimal. As a result, many pulled out of the denominations and educational institutions in which they had been fighting. The liberals had won the day.

From 1925 to about 1950 fundamentalism retreated into a "dark age" where it withdrew from the outside world.¹¹ Fundamentalism developed a deep-seated distrust against higher education in general.¹² As a result, they started their own schools, Bible colleges, and training centers. During this time, new associations were started (to keep liberals out), youth work rose to prominence, and radio ministries flourished.¹³

1940 - Present: Rise of neo-evangelicalism out of fundamentalism. In the 1940s a new mood began to prevail among some fundamentalists. The new practice of making separation a test of faith did not sit well with them.¹⁴ They felt it was time to return to society and higher education, retake the universities, and "meet the intellectual challenges of the age if the movement was to have a lasting impact."¹⁵ Although this new spirit developed over years, December 8, 1957 was the defining day for New Evangelicalism. On that day, Harold John Ockenga laid down the eight principles of the new movement.¹⁶ These principles sent another shock wave through fundamentalism that is still being felt today. Numerous militant fundamentalists rose up to combat this heresy. They took up a polemic stance that still characterizes most of fundamentalism today. For the past 35 years fundamentalists have been writing and preaching on the dangers of "Neo-Evangelicalism."¹⁷

Higher Education

Caught in the Culture -- Let's Face it, Fundamentalism has Changed!

Formerly, fundamentalism was a world apart. In the years after the Scopes trial of 1925, which convinced fundamentalists that American culture had turned against them, fundamentalists withdrew from institutions they believed had become controlled by liberal ideas and established their own institutions as alternatives. Because the modernists generally prevailed in the fundamentalist-modernist controversies that convulsed American Protestantism -- that is, liberals managed to retain control of denominational machinery and assets -- fundamentalists had to start anew, constructing their alternative organizations from the ground up. Bible institutes and colleges, which originally built upon the revival successes of Dwight L. Moody and others late in the nineteenth century, appealed to fundamentalists for several reasons. First, they provided refuge from the critical scholarship that called into question traditional notions of biblical authorship and cast doubts on the reliability of the Scriptures. Second, they offered an alternative environment for the education of their youth apart from the corrupting influences of secular colleges and

universities. Third, the fundamentalist subculture made possible a wholesale retreat from the larger culture. A fundamentalist could socialize almost entirely among friends at his church, send contributions to trustworthy fundamental agencies and missions, purchase reading materials from a Christian bookstore, attend fundamentalist summer camps and colleges, etc. This sense of envelopment within the cocoon of the fundamental subculture held strong appeal for fundamentalists who believed that the larger culture was inherently both corrupted and corrupting.

In recent years, however, suspicion of "the world" has dissipated considerably. In the last several decades, and especially since the mid-1970s, fundamentalists emerged, albeit tentatively, from their self-imposed exile. The antipathy toward the broader culture so characteristic of fundamentalists in the twenties and thirties has given way to ambivalence.

Fundamentalists and their institutions have moved dramatically into the mainstream of American society. They enjoy more prosperity, education, and cultural sophistication, and they command greater attention from the media. By and large, the fundamentalist community has become comfortable with suburban mores and consumer culture. Even as many fundamentalists retain the old rhetoric of opposition to the world, they are eager to appropriate many of that world's standards of success.

American cultural forces have profoundly influenced fundamentalist higher education. Fundamentalist adolescents are caught up like everyone else in the headlong quest for affluence, and the road to riches seems to lead through colleges, universities, and business schools rather than through a Bible college. Students who were once content to receive a Bible-school degree now want university or even advanced degrees, which are recognized signs of status within the broader culture. Many Bible colleges accordingly have undertaken their own quests for respectability. There has been a price to pay.

There has been a change in the very nature of the colleges themselves. At some point in the process the parietal rules ease a bit, and the name changes from *Bible school* or *Bible institute* to *Bible college*, then simply *college*, and sometimes, with the introduction of advanced degrees, to *university*.

There is a raging debate among fundamentalists over accreditation. Whereas once fundamentalists intentionally spurned higher education as a species of arrogance and compromise with the world, many now openly court such approval. With an eye toward accreditation so that it can offer a secular-approved bachelor's degree instead of merely a diploma, the school will shore up its offerings in the sciences and the liberal arts. This often has

the inevitable effect of de-emphasizing classes in the Bible, which had been at the core of its curriculum.

Facing the Facts

Fundamentalist institutions of higher education face an image problem from within and without fundamentalism. Outside mainstream evangelicalism and fundamentalism, the Bible college movement is little known. And even in these circles, it is often little understood. Bible colleges tend to suffer from an image problem. Many perceive them as extended Bible conferences -- or, at best, "junior" Christian liberal-arts colleges.

Fundamentalist colleges are accurately characterized as being conservative institutions. Therefore, the concept of a liberal-arts Bible college is an oxymoron for many fundamentalists.

Fundamentalist seminaries encounter opposition from within and without fundamentalism. The word "seminary" means a "seed-bed." For centuries it has been used as the name for an institution whose primary function is to train ministers. The word suggests that a seminary experience ought to be one of personal growth, spiritual growth, and intellectual growth. The seminary (i.e., professional education, training) should be committed to providing the best possible soil and environment to enhance a student's growth.

Not everyone views seminary as a seed-bed of positive growth. Sadly, there are those within our fundamentalist movement who have come to view seminary as a seed-bed of compromise, corruption, and spiritual lethargy. They hold it in suspicion and distrust. Some within our movement see seminary training as unnecessary "to do a real work for Jesus." Worse, many outside of our movement seem to believe "fundamentalism" and "seminary training/higher education" are oxymoronic terms.

Fundamentalist institutions are facing another less-than-encouraging fact. Bible colleges are distributed throughout North America, but the strongest concentrations occur in the Southeast and Midwest. The schools situated in rural areas have maintained their insularity, drawing on the Jeffersonian ideal of the virtuous farmer as opposed to the less-virtuous urban dweller. Something happens, however, when a Bible school relocates to the suburbs, as many have done in the past several decades. The fortress mentality gives way to an accommodation to the surrounding culture -- or at least to an uneasy peace.

Fundamentalist institutions find themselves fighting social and demographic trends in the larger culture. More and more households are two-career families; wives are working. Divorce has hit fundamentalism. The percentage of female students in Bible colleges has dropped in recent years as concerned fathers counsel their daughters to seek an education to prepare them for a career. With exception of the period following World War II and the baby-boom of the sixties and early seventies, recruiting students has been a challenge. According to American Association of Bible Colleges standards, half of the evangelical institutions suffer financial stress, and the same is said to be true of fundamentalist institutions.

Looking Toward the Future

The years ahead? It is hard to know where fundamentalist higher education is headed exactly. Nevertheless, it seems fair to suppose that present trends will continue. So what might the future hold?

Cooperation or Competition? In the coming years, centrifugal forces will accelerate. That is the orientation of our fragmented culture, and that is the core of American evangelical/fundamentalist history: entrepreneurial, decentralized, and given to splitting, forming, and reforming.

The evangelical world is a competitive environment, dynamic and uncontrollable. Since 1989, for instance, an estimated 800 different Christian ministries have poured into Eastern Europe. Yet these predominantly American efforts elude any overall coordination or mutual consultation about long-range strategy. This illustrates the dilemmas of a religious free market. How can we maintain theological integrity without veering into sectarian bickering?¹⁸

Fundamentalism, as a movement, has the notoriety of being an individualistic, divisive, vitriolic movement. This has, and may continue to have, a negative affect on higher education. Fundamentalism lacks unity as a religious movement. This is in large part due to its own intrinsic dynamics. Fundamentalist forms of discourse and organization have always been intuitive rather than formal, spontaneous rather than deliberative, pragmatic rather than regulative.

Fundamentalism thrives best when promoted by individuals who are charismatic, seem to be just plain folk and can either speak the popular vernacular or use popular media effectively. The real locus of power in American fundamentalism has been the individual orator, not the church.

Ultimately, fundamentalism is a movement made up of a number of fiefdoms all competing for a larger market share within a specific target

audience. As Marsden has written, the structure of fundamentalism resembles a feudal system where "superficially friendly, somewhat competitive empires" of revivalists and preachers compete for the same audience while professing allegiance to the same Lord.

The market-driven character of fundamentalism has nurtured spiritual individualism and a plurality of leaders and ministers with little cohesion. This state of affairs has in turn prevented fundamentalists from giving adequate attention to the structures and institutions -- churches, colleges, and seminaries -- that sustain belief from one generation to the next.

Ministry Opportunities and Training. Mission agencies look to Bible colleges as a significant source of recruits. While Bible colleges will continue to be a major source of missionary recruits, graduate or seminary credentials are growing in importance.

Christian day schools provide significant opportunities for Bible college graduates. A recent survey of administrators of Christian day schools indicates significant opportunities for Bible college graduates. They do, however, prefer that Bible college programs be professionally approved or state certified.

Fewer pulpits are open to the inexperienced, aspiring Bible college graduate. A seminary degree is becoming the credential of choice. Yet there is an interesting paradox developing within fundamentalism. Just when fundamentalists seem to be reaching their educational goals, increasing numbers of them are abandoning those goals. Colleges and seminaries face increased competition from local churches and other providers of biblical and theological instruction. Indeed, among some larger churches there is a trend toward establishing programs for ministry training within the confines of the local congregation. The senior pastors of many large churches believe not only that they can do a better job of training their staff, but that they can do so more quickly and economically. They believe that the type of education one receives in a seminary does not really prepare one for ministry as it is today, at least not for ministry in their church.¹⁹ They care little about degrees and accreditation. And so, at a time when the members of fundamental churches are moving upward in educational profile, they are being ministered to by clergy-persons with less educational preparation than in the past.

The College Market. Bible colleges (and liberal-arts colleges) must assess their market with a view toward finding those educational niches that they are uniquely qualified to serve. The Bible college movement needs to expand its constituency among minorities. The very nature of a Bible college should make it attractive and beneficial to minorities, especially African-Americans and Hispanics. If anyone should be able to deal with

minorities it should be the fundamentalist. Having had decades of experience as a minority religious group, fundamentalists should be able to relate to minorities. Bible colleges need to provide for ethnic and cultural diversity.

The Life of the Mind. Fundamentalists must be willing to engage the life of the mind. In the major universities, in the arts, in literary circles, the juggernaut of secularism rolls on. While fundamentalists decry the dangers of "secular humanism," they have rarely been in a position to do anything about it. For at least three reasons, fundamentalists have not been heard by twentieth-century intellectuals. First, as pragmatic activists, fundamentalists have never revered the life of the mind. In fact they often are suspicious of the methodical poking around of the scholar. The most common fundamentalist depiction of the history of American higher education is that of institutions like Yale and Princeton which sold their spiritual birthright in the pursuit of academic excellence. To call for academic progress in fundamental circles raises the threat of the slippery slope. Second, the decentralized structure of the fundamentalist world also inhibits the expensive and painstakingly slow task of Christian thinking. Amidst the dozens of fundamentalist colleges and seminaries, none can provide faculty with the time for thought and writing provided at any good research university. Third, the very success of each fundamentalist institution works to make fundamentalists more intellectually insular. Fundamentalists have developed their own constituencies, their own journals, their own media outlets, and their own associations. Instead of addressing the issues of the world, fundamentalists spend most of their intellectual energies in intramural discussion.

In the end one can only guess about the future. From one angle of vision, there are enough unfavorable signs to forecast hard days for fundamentalists and higher education. From another angle, however, it is possible to imagine a brighter intellectual and spiritual day arising from an alliance of deep Christian conviction, self-critical but loyal attachment to biblical traditions and discriminating use of contemporary scholarly resources. I find myself to be an optimistic fundamentalist.

Conclusion

In his discussion of fundamentalism's future, David Beale writes:

Fundamentalism is a tremendous power for good. It is a God-honored and Christ-honoring movement that could not be replaced if set aside. Virtually all spiritual movements have ultimately

diminished in vigor and strength of conviction. . . . Hardly a movement has entirely escaped the deterioration that comes with the passing of time. New leadership emerges that paid no price of suffering. To them the battles have ended. New generations take for granted the truths for which the fathers had to fight. . . . Fundamentalist creeds must grip Fundamentalist hearts if the world is to take note of the fact that Fundamentalism has something to offer. . . . It is not modernism but apathy that stands in the way of revival among Fundamentalist churches. . . . Pursuit of purity is the holy ideal and guiding light of Fundamentalism.²⁰

In building the walls high so as to safeguard the fortress of Christian faith from external attack, fundamentalists all too frequently wall themselves off from the needy world they hope to reach and retreat personally and spiritually to a fundamentalist ghetto in an effort to preserve Christian faith from worldly attack. As a result, the isolationists within fundamentalism tend to develop a vast inferiority complex, religiously and culturally speaking, that renders them incapable of carrying the gospel effectively to an unbelieving world outside the ghetto. Such cultural isolation and anti-intellectualism is irresponsible. Not only does it lead inevitably to loss of faith, but there is something anti-biblical and anti-Christian about such a stance; and it is inconsistent with the commands of the Lord to go into all the world preaching and teaching.

At the other end of the pendulum's swing evangelicalism is dissipating its evangelical heritage. Its motivation is praiseworthy -- it wishes to preserve the spiritual comforts and good feelings of the traditional faith, and an even more noble desire to penetrate the world in ways that will be effective -- but it is not willing to pay the doctrinal and ethical price of an obedient church. The solid substance of biblical orthodoxy ("sound doctrine") is compromised.

Fundamentalism must address the issues of and make an impact upon our culture (Matt. 5:13-16 "salt of the earth, light in the world," penetrating and remaining insulated but not isolated from the world) but in doing so must not find itself placed in a position of choosing between obedient faith and effective outreach.

1George Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991)

²For most fundamentalists separation includes ecclesiastical (separation from apostasy), personal (separation from the cosmos to God), and familial (separation from erring believers). Separation can be defined as fundamentalist's reaction to modernity. In contrast to a humanistic world-view, "the fundamentalist's world-view is one that is extremely aware of modernity. And whatever modernity throws at them, they throw back." (Martin Marty in Debra Ladesro's article, "Is Fundamentalism Fundamentally Changing Society?" *The University of Chicago Magazine* 85:4 (April 1993) 18.

³The writer is indebted to Mark J. Farnham for his concise historical study of fundamentalism in "Limping Toward 2001: Fundamentalism at the End of the Twentieth Century." Paper delivered in a theology class, Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, April 29, 1993.

⁴"Modern religious liberalism with its denial of the supernatural and its rejection of historic Christian doctrine grew apace. It captured great citadels of learning, and began to permeate the denominational structures." Ernest Pickering, *The Fruit of Compromise . . . the New and Young Evangelicals*, 5. Leading schools: University of Chicago, Union Seminary in NY, Rochester Theological Seminary, Boston University, Duke Divinity School, Harvard Divinity School, Yale Divinity School, Garrett Biblical Institute, Crozier Theological Seminary, Hartford Theological Seminary, Oberlin College, Colgate University, Western Theological Seminary.

⁵In 1876 at Swampscott, Massachusetts, men met for the first of the Bible conferences whose themes were the Second Coming. The first important conference (October 30 to November 1, 1878) met at the Church of the Holy Trinity in New York. Out of it came *Premillennial Essays of the Prophetic Conference* edited by Nathaniel West. This conference awakened many to the dangers of liberalism. One of the most historically significant conferences was in Farwell Hall, Chicago from November 16-21, 1886. Clearer positions were stated and like the 1878 conference, this one passed a set of resolutions as to the fundamentalists' position and responsibilities. However, it was out of the Niagara Bible Conference in 1895 that the five fundamentals were set forth as a basis for action in the battle against liberalism: 1) inerrancy of the Scriptures; 2) the deity of Christ; 3) His virgin birth; 4) His substitutionary atonement; 5) His physical resurrection and His bodily return to earth. (cf. *Christianity Through the Century*, 480-481 by Earle E. Cairnes; *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 26-28, by George Dollar.) Men leading these conferences included: A. J. Gordon, James H. Brookes, George C. Needham, L. W. Munhall, W. G. Moorehead, W. J. Erdman, A. T. Pierson, G. N. H. Peters, W. E. Blackstone and D. L. Moody, F. L. Godet, and F. Delitzsch by letter.

⁶Mass evangelism was introduced. From 1875-1900 four evangelists were reaching thousands for Christ: D. L. Moody, B. Fay Mills, Sam P. Jones, and Rodney "Gipsy" Smith. In addition to reaching souls for Christ, they preached biblical truths and repudiated liberalism. They were followed by Billy Sunday, Bob Jones, R. A. Torrey, and others. Liberals criticized these men because they were "uninformed of social advances."

⁷With the defection of schools to liberalism, the following schools were started: Moody Bible Institute (1886), Boston Missionary Training School (Gordon Bible College, 1889), Northwestern Bible Schools (1902), Christian and Missionary Alliance Bible School (Nyack, New York - A. B. Simpson), Wheaton College (1860), Dallas Theological Seminary (1924), Bob Jones University (1927), Columbia Bible College, Westminster Seminary (1929), and others "Nearly forty Bible schools were founded between 1930 and 1940." Earle Cairnes, *Christianity Through the Centuries*, p. 481.

⁸Preaching was aimed at the liberals. Since doctrinal error usually begins in the schools, the fundamentalists who started schools or who held such a position transmitted truth to the man in the pew to counter the liberal influence overseas. Many in their sermons refuted the higher criticism, the evolutionary approach and the rationalistic, naturalistic position of the liberals.

⁹Material was put into print. *The Scofield Reference Bible* (1907) was the major literary work advocating orthodoxy and dispensationalism. Editor -- C. I. Scofield. *Jesus is Coming*, by William E. Blackstone, became a major apologetic for premillennialism. *The Fundamentals* (1910), a compilation of scholarly essays by leading conservatives, stressed the integrity of the Scriptures and served to revive a sagging campaign against liberalism. The publication of fundamentalist materials initiated a new, more militant period in the history of fundamentalism.

¹⁰Fundamentalism took definite form especially in the conflicts within the Northern Baptist and Northern Presbyterian (Presbyterian Church in the USA) denominations. These became centers of the anti-modernist movement because in each of these denominations advanced and aggressive modernism was faced by a conservative counter-force of comparable strength. Curtis Lee Laws captured the essence of the common attitude and motive that gave the diverse groups cohesiveness as a distinct movement. Fundamentalism was a loose interdenominational coalition of "aggressive conservatives -- conservatives who feel that it is their duty to contend for the faith." This definition embraced the main concerns of the fundamentalist premillennialists, conservative Baptists, Presbyterian traditionalists, and the scattered militants in other denominations, who were beginning to

develop a sense of common identity. (cf. George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, p. 165, 169)

¹¹"The period from about 1920 to 1950 became a sort of academic dark age. . . . In place of the network of colleges dominated by evangelicals in the nineteenth century, fundamentalists during the first half of the twentieth century were building a network of Bible Institutes, practical training centers in which the curricula centered on the Bible alone. . . . Fundamentalists still talked about being scientific; but in fact they had become almost thoroughly isolated and alienated from the dominant American scientific culture. Warfare was now indeed the appropriate metaphor for understanding their relationship to the scientific culture." George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*, p. 148-149.

¹²The modern university was a place of danger. Not only its promotion of naturalism, but also its methods of scholarship were suspect. For these Christians, the appeal of scholarship was a faint whisper in comparison to the imperative for action. The 1920s and 1930s witnessed a remarkable outpouring of conservative activity, whether organizing to defend the fundamentals in "mainline" denominations, or establishing separate agencies outside the denominations. The university world may have fallen to enemies, but vast arenas for service still remained in mission work, evangelism, popular publication, the new medium of radio, Christian colleges and Bible schools, and so on. The effects of this activism could be seen everywhere. When J. Gresham Machen died on January 1, 1937, an era seemed to be over. An evangelical scholarship which was supported by formidable institutions, which enlisted scholars of ability, which advocated thorough academic preparation, which was skeptical of exclusively popular interpretations, and which took an interest in the results of professional scholarship seemed to have come to an end. (cf. Mark A. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism*, 60-61).

¹³After fundamentalism lost its initial national prominence by the 1930s, the term "fundamentalism" began to take on a more limited meaning. Many fundamentalists were leaving the mainline Protestant denominations, essentially those associated with the ecumenical Federal (later National) Council of Churches. Having made this move themselves, fundamentalists began to make separation from such denominations a test of true faith. The change in terminology was gradual; but by the 1960s "fundamentalist" usually meant separatists and no longer included the many conservatives in mainline denominations. Such fundamentalists also stayed separate from two related revivalist movements, the holiness

movement and pentecostalism. By this time almost all fundamentalists were Baptists and most were dispensationalists. The major exception was the Southern Baptist Convention, where a large militantly conservative party was often called "fundamentalist," at least by its opponents.

¹⁴"Evangelicals don't like the label 'fundamentalist.' For them, as for most people, the term suggests narrowness, bigotry and intolerance. . . . New evangelicalism was not a repudiation of fundamentalism, only a new and improved version of it. New Evangelicals had also learned a few lessons since the Scopes trial. They saw that the fundamentalist polemics of the '20s had been ineffective and had taken away precious energy from the more important task of evangelism. . . . The new evangelicals challenged fundamentalists to look beyond their religious world to the social and cultural concerns of the nation. Their subsequent public involvement, academic accomplishments and willingness to cooperate with -- or at least tolerate -- the Protestant establishment were the first signs of a chastened or reformed fundamentalism." D. G. Hart, "The Mid-Life Crisis of American Evangelicalism" *Christian Century* (Nov. 11, 1992) 1028-1031.

¹⁵Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*, 150.

¹⁶They are: 1. A friendly attitude toward science. 2. A willingness to re-examine beliefs concerning the Holy Spirit. 3. A more tolerant attitude towards differing views of eschatology. 4. A shift away from the so-called "extreme dispensationalism". 5. An increased emphasis on scholarship. 6. A more definite recognition of social responsibility. 7. A re-opening of the subject of biblical inspiration. 8. A growing willingness of evangelical theologians to converse with liberal theologians .

¹⁷Some characteristics of Neo-Evangelicalism: 1. Disdain for "old Fundamentalism". 2. A softness toward non-conservative views of the Bible, evidenced by a serious deterioration in their view of biblical inspiration. 3. A friendliness toward contemporary scientific views. 4. A willingness to accept charismatic views and practices. 5. A tolerance toward various eschatological positions. 6. A reaction to dispensationalism. 7. A willingness to cooperate and dialogue with religious liberals, including ecumenical evangelism. 8. Stress on the need for social concern. 9. An optimistic attitude toward reaching the non-conservative. 10. Stress on scholarship and apologetics.

¹⁸N. O. Hatch and M. S. Hamilton "Can Evangelicalism Survive its Success?" *Christianity Today* (October 5, 1992) 28.

¹⁹"Seminaries and/or Teaching Churches: A Report," *NAPCE Newsletter* (Summer 1991) 1.

²⁰David O. Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity* (Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1986) 356-359.