

8-2010

Christian Fundamentalism: Militancy and the Scopes Trial

Michael Smith

Clemson University, MSmith4795@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_theses

 Part of the [History of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Smith, Michael, "Christian Fundamentalism: Militancy and the Scopes Trial" (2010). *All Theses*. 962.

https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_theses/962

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses at TigerPrints. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses by an authorized administrator of TigerPrints. For more information, please contact kokeefe@clemson.edu.

CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALISM:
MILITANCY AND THE SCOPES TRIAL

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate School of
Clemson University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
History

by
Michael Adger Smith
August 2010

Accepted by:
Dr. Rod Andrew, Jr., Committee Chair
Dr. Abel A. Bartley
Dr. H. Roger Grant
Dr. James B. Jeffries

ABSTRACT

The Scopes Trial held in Dayton, Tennessee, lasting for eight days in 1925, is one of the seminal events in American history. Its importance has little to do with the place, but much to do with cultural, political, scientific, and religious trends of the times. Historians extensively studied these trends and volumes were written filled with their analysis of these trends and why the Scopes Trial represented such an interesting snapshot of history.

One of the first media events of this stature, the extensive coverage of the Scopes Trial resulted in thousands of words of print, interviews, and commentary sent from Dayton which helped to shape the public perception of what occurred there. How these reports was received, of course, depended on the worldview of the reader or hearer. Religious conservatives took note of any anti-religious bias aimed at those who chose the literal interpretation of the Bible. Others no doubt responded favorably to the exposure of Fundamental religious views as outdated and not in step with the times.

Christian Fundamentalism, arguably the most significant religious movement of the twentieth century, was a product of chaotic times. It reflected the concerns of many believers regarding the diminishing role of religion in everyday life, and the Scopes Trial embodied those concerns. Coming on the heels of great social, political, and scientific upheaval, those individuals who would naturally turn to religion for comfort, found the same questions about modernity, science, and the Bible debated there as well, adding to their sense of uncertainty.

Most conventional definitions of Fundamentalism cite the movement's strong stand for doctrinal purity and its anti-modernity position, coming from the fight over evolution. Historians seldom consider the militancy of Fundamentalism as a key to understanding how the movement formed, or with the passage of time, how militancy allowed it to grow and develop into a major social movement and religious powerhouse. With the benefit of historical hindsight, this key element adds much to the understanding of what happened at Dayton and beyond. The importance of studying this often-ignored aspect of Christian Fundamentalism should be apparent in an age when this type of religious response is increasingly common.

To understand the role of militancy in relation to doctrine, another event, with much the same relationship and during the same period, provides an example. In 1917 the Bolshevik Revolution overthrew the government of Russia. Communist doctrine, the foundation of the revolution, was the subject of much debate from 1844 when Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels first met and began their collaboration on the Communist Manifesto, published in 1848. Marxist doctrine, while a great subject for debate, came into its own, when, in 1917 a small number of ardent believers in Marx's writings violently overthrew the government and deposed Czar Nicholas II. Thus, while the movement was all about doctrine and belief (Marxism) it was not until its adherents felt strongly enough about making a stand for those beliefs that change in Russia was effected. In the same way, Christian Fundamentalists, in 1919 and after, brought a militant challenge to a public issue which affected their belief.

One area in which the 1920s media and historians tend to agree is that Fundamentalism was anti-modern. In reality, one major issue was at stake between religion and science, namely the belief that man was a special creation of God. This age-old argument began in earnest with the Copernican Revolution and saw the fight renewed with Darwinism, as huge paradigm shifts in thinking threatened commonly held beliefs and raised the specter of the battle between new scientific truths and religious dogma.

While doctrine will always be important to any study of Christian Fundamentalism, the militancy with which the early Fundamentalists attacked evolution in the 1920s and later issues such as abortion provide a better understanding of how the movement arose and came to prominence in America around the Scopes Trial. This willingness to draw a line in the sand over issues that challenged their beliefs about the Bible, and fight for them to influence the surrounding culture sheds needed light on the reasons why this event is so important to America's history.

By 1930 the media pronounced the death of the Fundamentalist movement. Yet, the report was highly exaggerated. Its sudden resurgence in the 1970s and 1980s upended the conventional wisdom of historians and with it, their assumptions concerning both the roots and the cause of Fundamentalism. The movement persists despite of, and thus, because of modernity. How was Fundamentalism able to recruit and charge an army of followers to lay a foundation for a stronger movement after the Scopes Trial which resurged and gained political clout in modern times? These questions provide a new and compelling perspective from which a new look at the Scopes Trial can prove valuable to theologians and historians.

DEDICATION

In honor,
of my former students, mentors, and friends,
who encouraged me to dream and dare,
and caused me to believe that at 52 years old,
it is never too late to fulfill life goals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Dr. Rod Andrew, Jr. for graciously chairing my committee and to Dr. H. Roger Grant and Dr. Abel A. Bartley for their critical analysis and encouragement. Thanks especially to Dr. James B. Jeffries, whose intimate knowledge of history and religion, along with his many hours in directed study and discussion served to focus this endeavor. Thanks also to Dr. Yanming An, a great friend, whose advice for my thesis was to do something from my past that I knew something about. His encouragement and advice was and is always of great value.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE PAGE.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL CHAOS: 1860-1920.....	16
III. RELIGION AND AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM.....	37
IV. THE WAR BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.....	63
V. THE STATE OF TENNESSEE VERSUS SCOPES.....	83
VI. AFTERMATH AND CONCLUSION.....	106
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	118

It is a mistake to suppose that those of us who represent Christianity have any quarrel with science. We have not....but Christianity, like all truth, is not tolerant of error, and it will not harmonize with this pseudo-science,--this utterly false philosophy.¹ ~William B. Riley~

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

As July 10, 1925, dawned on the town of Dayton, Tennessee, few, if any, residents realized the importance of the event that was about to unfold. The stage was set for the trial of John T. Scopes, a first-year teacher, charged with violating a recent Tennessee state law by teaching Charles Darwin's Theory of Evolution. Clarence Darrow, noted trial lawyer and avowed agnostic, agreed to lead the defense, and was determined to end once and for all the debate between science and religion over the question of origins. William Jennings Bryan, three-time presidential candidate and noted Presbyterian Fundamentalist, led the prosecution. The presence of Darrow and Bryan gave the trial an international appeal with journalists from around the world descending on Dayton for the trial's duration. Destined to become a defining moment in American religious and cultural history, the trial became a seminal event that historians return to repeatedly in order to understand the changes shaping the American popular and religious culture of the 1920s and beyond.²

¹ W. B. Riley, *Are the Scriptures Scientific?* (Minneapolis: n.d., after 1925), 5.

² Jeffrey P. Moran, *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents* .(Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2002), 2. Moran argues that 200 journalists produced more than 135,000 words of text per day from the trial. Radio carried the trial live to an expectant worldwide audience, making this a unique first of its kind event in American journalism.

As the historical evidence indicates, the Scopes Trial and its aftermath had one major plot and many subplots. It became the stuff of legend and, as Edward Larsen argues, creative works from 1931 onward shaped the event in ways that altered the truth. While the trial served as a nexus for the cultural, political, and scientific chaos of the 1920s, it also helped to define and launch Christian Fundamentalism. While Fundamentalism is usually understood only as a movement against modernity and towards doctrinal adherence this study will argue that the militancy which developed around the Scopes Trial and beyond presents a clearer definition of the movement and its characteristics.

This militancy embodies the willingness to step beyond the confines of personal conviction to openly oppose liberal (“unchristian”) laws, policies, and cultural-forms in the public arena. This tendency grew from a ground-swell of frustration and anxiety among conservative Christians as they experienced the drastic changes brought by advances in science and technology, the upheaval of World War I, and the financial uncertainties caused by a series of economic depressions. A growing desire to react to a world that was changing so rapidly and which was abandoning old ways of thinking and doing gradually came to a crossroads in deciding to do battle over their beliefs.

What cultural and political concerns formed the backdrop for the militant reaction of Christians at Dayton, Tennessee? What role did changing theology in America have in shaping the position of Fundamentalism? Was Fundamentalism a move against modernity, and if so, on what fronts? Was it basically a Southern movement propelled by an opposition to reason in the service of ignorance? While the cultural and political issues

have been the subject of many studies, the overall impact of religious ferment in light of the changes brought by science and modernity have only been considered in a narrow scope, and, again, without much critical examination. These are the issues which make the reconsideration of this seminal event so important.

Judeo-Christianity in America, at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth century, was also in the midst of chaotic change which mirrored the uncertainty in the general population as seminaries and denominations reacted to Higher Criticism of the Bible, doctrinal shifts, and the effects of modernity on religious thought. By 1919 Fundamentalist leaders, sensing that they were losing the debate in seminaries and denominations, determined that a more militant approach was necessary, and took the more public approach. The World Christian Fundamentals Association organized to take a visible stand against issues which threatened traditional religion. Thanks to the rhetoric of prominent politicians like William Jennings Bryan and well known preachers like Billy Sunday, this new approach led Fundamentalists to draw a line in the sand at Dayton, Tennessee with evolution as the main issue and the public schools as its battleground.³

Both the history and historiography support the assertion that while doctrinal adherence was a central part of the movement, the aggressive, public, political postures adopted by these people to combat issues and later a determined separatism became the

³ Edward J. Larson, *Summer For The Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion*. (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1997),225; Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online, March 15, 2010, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fundamentalism>, (accessed March 15, 2010); David O. Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850*. (Greenville, South Carolina: Unusual Publications, 1986),5, 30,87,92.

other foundations which formed the basis of the Fundamentalist movement. The Scopes Trial became the centerpiece of an age-old battle between religion and science which, for the first time, moved from the seminary and laboratory to the public courtroom as Fundamentalists battled the erosion of religious beliefs by Darwin's theories in a militant showdown over truth in the public arena. The willingness of Fundamentalists to take issues like creation vs. evolution into the marketplace in order to influence the surrounding culture serve to differentiate them from their Evangelical counterparts. The subplots which attended this event were the cultural and political backdrops that made the trial a major point of historical interest outside the purview of religion.⁴

The Scopes Trial, which only lasted for eight days in 1925, was one of the first major media events of American history. Widely covered by hundreds of journalists, and broadcast live over the radio, which was still in its infancy, the events at Dayton, Tennessee held the world spell bound and created many of the perceptions, both correct and incorrect, which have become part of the accepted history. In addition, historians have studied the trends which provide the backdrop of the trial, but in many cases simply accepted the media accounts of the event without serious evaluation of the facts or testing their veracity. This lack of serious evaluation resulted is that Christian Fundamentalism and its subsequent development over the decades after Scopes is often misunderstood, and especially when the movement re-emerged so strongly in the latter part of the

⁴ Evangelicals and Fundamentalists are doctrinally identical. Their differences lay in the model they followed in reaction to the increased changes which surrounded them.

twentieth century. In fact, an examination of Fundamentalism today is the strongest evidence that that militancy, and not doctrinal prescription, best defines the movement.

In the face of so many unacceptable changes, Fundamentalists of the late nineteenth century adopted a militant stance and viewed the battles with culture and modernity as warfare. Adopting the language of war, terms like “winners” and “losers,” the media’s use of such terms to promote the event, soon crept into the oratory that built the movement.

Historical events had a tremendous effect on religious realities as the Revolutionary War ended British rule, forcing British sympathizers to leave and Anglicans to either depart or modify their churches into institutions more adapted to the new sensibilities. For example, the Episcopal Church was born soon after the war when the practice of requiring Anglican clerics to swear allegiance to the English sovereign made it impossible to remain in the Church of England for American pastors. The departure of many Anglicans, especially in the South, left a void not easily filled. Some, like the Evangelicals, felt pressure to alter their beliefs regarding issues such as slavery and southern paternalism, which they did to gain acceptance. These changes raised added concerns to the growing sense of helplessness in the face of historical events that could radically alter the status quo.

The Enlightenment, in many respects, changed the mindset of humanity in positive ways, but also intensified the uncertainty and turmoil in others. Gertrude Himmelfarb, in *The Roads to Modernity*, highlights that the Enlightenment had different effects on France, Britain, and the United States, and the connotations varied widely

within each of these major players in the war. While France took on a distinctly anti-religious fervor in its battle against anti-clericalism, Britain adopted social movements relating to Methodism and American Enlightenment, according to Himmelfarb, found its expression in political democracy.⁵

Theological issues, precipitated by the Civil War, and coupled with the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* created new changes to the religious landscape. The decades following the Civil War brought new challenges to religion with arguments over the inerrancy of the Bible, originating from German textual criticism, and battles over modernity arising from the Enlightenment. These events fostered tremendous uncertainty within religious circles. Counter to the doctrinal adherence theory of Fundamentalism, as we shall consider, the fledgling movement accepted new doctrinal teachings, especially concerning end times and greatly altered their Christian world view.⁶

As the twentieth century dawned, serious questions existed over whether religion could survive under the weight of changes brought by modernity and science. The battle between religion and science only increased the weight with a growing sense that science was infallible and faith always on the losing end of the argument. The issues involved are much more complicated than the simplistic doctrinal adherence to a certain creedal belief,

⁵ Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The Roads to Modernity*. (New York: Vintage Books, 2004).

⁶ Christine Leigh Heyrman, *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt*. (Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press), 1997; Mark A. Noll, *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006). Noll argues that the theological crisis was not as simple as North vs. South but some Northern theologians were pro-slavery and some Southern theologians were anti-slavery, with both sides arguing from a Scriptural basis.

and goes directly to the need for a militant approach to be heard in a world in which many voices clamored for attention.⁷

Fundamentalism arose from a perceived threat and ongoing warfare with modernity, but only along the lines of a narrow front, namely, the position of man as the special creation of God and the center of God's activities in the world. The rise of evolution demanded a line in the sand because it questioned this belief in special creation, and thus required a defense within the same public arena in which the challenge was issued. Picking up the language of war, prevalent since the 1870s, as its vocabulary, Fundamentalism attempted to engage the surrounding culture and thus defined itself by its militancy.⁸

At the end of the Scopes Trial, the media, using the winners and losers analogy pronounced evolution and modernity the winner of the battle. Fundamentalists were seen as ignorant, unlearned, and simple folks who wanted to live in the past, and while they might not ascribe to Puritan doctrines, which had long changed, wanted the simpler life of the Puritans which in their historic memory seemed ideal in many ways.

But contrary to that view, the Fundamentalists appeared to have actually "won" the argument, not only in the conviction of Scopes, but by founding schools to teach their views of science and establishing a large subculture of printing and development from a creationist viewpoint. The public schools saw the removal of evolutionary teaching from

⁷ Dr. Jon Butler, "The Surprise of Religion in America." (Due West, South Carolina: The Joseph T. Stukes Lectures, Erskine College), March, 2010.

⁸ Dawn M. Digrius, "Draper, Dickson-White, and the Artificial Construction of the 'Warfare' between Science and Religion," *Evolution and Religion: Towards the History of an Evolving Relationship*. (Clemson: Clemson University, 2009).

textbooks from 1930 to 1960. Only with the Sputnik launch by the Soviets in the late 1950s, and when Americans realized that science education was a major need did the trend change. College professors began writing high school texts; with it Darwin's teachings re-emerged along with a growing Fundamentalist protest.⁹

As a nexus the Scopes Trial is often correctly evaluated in terms of cultural and political shifts brought about by tremendous changes due to the Industrial Revolution and increasing technology. The move from an agrarian to an increasingly urban society, with major population shifts and migrations into cities, posited great uncertainty as to where America was headed. Populism, a driving force in American politics after the Civil War, tapped into this uncertainty over economic change. William Jennings Bryan, who later played a key role in the Scopes Trial and evolution becoming the central issue of the movement, also enjoyed a close association with the political movement known as Populism.¹⁰

As Bryan's testimony at the trial ascribes, many Populists, while religious, did not adhere to a literal interpretation of the Bible as evidenced by his confusion over the time line of creation. Bryan's testimony reflects that Fundamentalism represented more than a literal adherence to the Bible. While Charles Postel argues that one cannot use the Scopes Trial to determine the religious views of Populism because at the time of the Trial the movement was dead or in serious decline, the argument can be made that the trial reflects

⁹ Randy Moore, "The Lingering Impact of the Scopes Trial on High School Biology Textbooks," *BioScience*, 2001: 790-796. Moore argues that the official reason for the removal was that evolution was too difficult for a high school student to grasp, but admits that even Darwin's photo was removed from the texts, suggesting an admission of the unpopular nature of the subject matter.

¹⁰ Charles Postel, *The Populist Vision*. (New York: Oxford Press, 2007), 21.

many of the nuances found in both Bryan's and Darrow's lives and their performances at Dayton, and can be explained by what he admits is "the dynamic intellectual and religious climate of the 1880s and 1890s that shaped the outlook of both Bryan and Darrow as well as of the Populist movement itself."¹¹

Of interest is the fact that both Bryan and Darrow were firmly within the Populist movement, and the trial offers an interesting window into the paradox of Populist adherents and their beliefs. In fact, contrary to what their legacies indicate, Bryan and Darrow were more alike than different. Each had been raised Presbyterians and came from strong Evangelical backgrounds. Both admired Leo Tolstoy and Robert Ingersoll, but unlike Bryan, Darrow followed Ingersoll's path into agnosticism.

Politically, both were strongly committed to reform, which was a key Populist belief, and both men were Midwesterners. Darrow even backed Bryan for president in 1896 and campaigned for him. Outside of opposing religious sensibilities, the men actually liked each other.

But when Populist reform was combined with religion, another picture emerged. Many Populists were firmly anchored in the Social Gospel movement prevalent at the end of the 1800s and beginning of the 1900s. They embraced science, modernity, and progress as Christian modes for the advancement of humanity. Even Bryan had not always espoused strong Fundamentalist ideas, but during his younger years experimented with various ideas and friendships well outside the conservative Presbyterianism of his

¹¹ Jeffrey P. Moran, *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents*. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2002), 46-50. Bryan admitted belief in the long day theory of creation or that the 7 days of creation were not 24 hours days but were representative geologic ages, a compromise proposed for the time frame proposed by Darwin's theories; Charles Postel, *The Populist Vision*. (New York: Oxford Press, 2007), 247.

childhood. When he returned to the church, he often took moderate positions on issues and worked to block conservative proposals in favor of moderate/liberal positions. For a time Bryan believed that evolution could be compatible with his religious convictions and only changed his position after the devastation of World War I and became convinced that the underlying cause of the war was related to Social Darwinism and that the idea advocated violence as a means of social change. World events only convinced him more strongly that the political and social upheavals in the world were caused by Darwin's views.¹²

A major tension of the 1920s was between city dwellers and rural farmers. Crop failures and economic distress forced large migrations to America's cities, and tension developed between urban and rural Americans. Media and some historians promoted the view that the more forward looking Populists were urban elites, and in contrast, the rural adherents to Populism were much more firmly Evangelical, religious and much less concerned about the poor or the human condition in general. As Postel argues, this synthesis might be in error and may explain one of the preconceived notions which came out of the Scopes Trial that religious people were ignorant and unlearned and that they rejected modernity.¹³

Historians presume that rural peoples were more likely to resist modernity and change and those in the city are more likely to embrace it. In reality, both urban and rural

¹² Jeffrey P. Moran, *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: (Bedford/St. Martins, 2002), 15-16. Bryan, as Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson opposed the United States entering the war and resigned when Wilson leaned in that direction. Bryan was convinced that Germany entered the conflict because its leaders accepted Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest as applying to nations as well as species; Postel, *The Populist Vision*. (New York: Oxford Press, 2007), 247-248.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 249.

dwellers in some sense embraced the Social Gospel, a significantly progressive movement, with slightly different applications and more reform mindedness coming from urban churches which had more resources.

The Butler Law, which made it illegal to teach evolution in Tennessee schools, raised other issues within the political divide of Populism. Well within the reform mantle of Populism, Bryan and Darrow approached the issue from the standpoint of local control versus academic freedom. This was the heart of the struggle. Bryan attempted to prevent the trial from becoming a trial about Christianity while Darrow intended to try both Christianity and the Bible. Bryan's famous statement at the onset of the Trial summarizes his belief regarding the defense: "These gentlemen did not come here to try this case. They came here to try revealed religion. I am here to defend it...I am simply trying to protect the Word of God against the greatest atheist or agnostic in the United States." Mr. Darrow replied, "We have the purpose of preventing bigots and ignoramuses from controlling the education of the United States as you know it, and that is all."¹⁴

Bryan and his followers maintained that local majorities had the right to determine what would be taught in their schools. His reputation as "the great commoner" instilled him as the hero of the rural Populists, or those Populists who envisioned themselves as the backbone of the Jeffersonian idea of an agrarian society. Bryan was their champion and beloved after his battle against Wall Street on behalf of farmers and debtors after the Depression of 1893. Darrow was the opposite, representing the newly formed American Civil Liberties Union, championing labor unions and the growing idea

¹⁴ Bryan, William Jennings, Interview by Clarence Darrow. Scopes Trial Transcripts (July 25, 1925).

of academic freedom to justify the teaching of evolution. Darrow came to Dayton from a Chicago trial in which he helped two well connected young men escape the death penalty.

Bryan's position was clearly stated in his prolific writings:

The first question to be decided is: Who shall control our public schools? We have something like twenty-six millions of children in the public schools and spend more than one billion and seven hundred thousand dollars a year upon these schools. And the training of children is the chief work of each generation; the parents are interested in the things to be taught our children.¹⁵

The American Civil Liberties Union position, on the other hand, expressed the idea of academic freedom as essential to a proper education:

The great essential to education is freedom—freedom in presenting and studying all the facts, and freedom of teachers to believe as they see fit and to express their beliefs like other citizens. It holds that, when for any reason this freedom is curtailed,—real education itself is crippled.¹⁶

Both positions could fit within the Populist movement. Scopes in his response to the guilty verdict incorporated these ideas within the Constitutional guarantees of religious and personal freedoms into his response:

Your honor, I feel that I have been convicted of violating an unjust statute. I will continue in the future, as I have done in the past, to oppose this law in any way that I can. Any other action would be in violation of my ideal of academic freedom—that is, to teach the truth as guaranteed in our Constitution, of personal and religious freedom. I think the fine is unjust.¹⁷

¹⁵ William Jennings Bryan and Mary Baird Bryan, *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan*. (Chicago: John C. Winston Co., 1925),526-528.

¹⁶ American Civil Liberties Union Committee on Academic Freedom, *The Gag on Teaching*.(New York: ACLU, 1931), 4-5.

¹⁷ Edward J. Larson, *Summer For The Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion*. (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1997),238; Jeffrey P. Moran, *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents*. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2002), 166.

As a center piece of the Scopes Trial, as displayed in the testimony by Bryan, Darrow sought to underline the closed mindedness of those who claimed adherence to literal interpretation of the Bible, and play up the views of rural Populists as ignorant and against progress and modernity.

World War I and the changes brought about by this “war to end all wars” also had a dramatic effect on the American psyche, both culturally and religiously, changing American thinking dramatically. The western world as a whole was embroiled in a ferment from both religious and secular wars surrounding events like the Reformation and the Enlightenment, as well as ideological wars within academia and religion. The cultural, political, and religious upheaval was a Western problem and not limited entirely in scope to just the United States, but these events do seem to have affected the Christian population of the United States more than other countries, pushing them to take a militant position on issues associated with belief..

While the United States did not enter the war until 1917, economics played a major role in why they entered because of its economic links to Allied Powers. Pressure from outstanding loans made by Wall Street tycoons put pressure on Washington to come into the war on the side of Great Britain. Also, prior to 1917 public opinion about the war was divided along racial lines with Anglo-Saxons siding with British, French and

German descendents pushing for neutrality. Those who claimed Eastern European heritage, Russian, and Polish Jews supported Germany.¹⁸

While America remained officially neutral President Woodrow Wilson began to gear up for war. America's entry into the war changed the outlook of the conflict in the Allies' favor. The men sent to war from America came from conservative religious stock and found their values and beliefs changed by the horror of trench warfare and tremendous carnage. Their return home came at a time of tremendous social upheaval and their new found sensibilities only served to make the upheaval worse.

World War I did succeed in welding religious devotion to war and its defense with a distinctly democratic fervor. While initially Americans resisted the thought of entering a European war, once Americans were fighting a connection between religion and patriotism developed which emphasized military service as both a religious and a civic duty in making the world safe for democracy. The outpouring of patriotism has been unmatched even to the present day.

While American involvement was short, it was no less brutal and shaped the mindset and thinking of American soldiers. The horrors of trench warfare and death raised many issues not confronted by Americans since the carnage of the Civil War. New influences, exposure to European ways of thinking and acting, and the fact that the war, on a major scale pitted Christians against Christians, raised new issues over what

¹⁸ George Brown Tindall, *America: A Narrative Story*. (New York: W.W.W. Norton & Company, 1984), 946. The House of Morgan loaned Great Britain more than \$2.3 billion; *Ibid.*, 948. Tindall says that of the 92 million population in 1910 more than 32 million were "hyphenated Americans" and maintained strong ties to European countries involved in the War. Many allegiances and enmities existed between these groups and the old world and figured in to American diplomacy and racial issues prior to, during, and following the war.

constituted a “just war.” Troops returning from battle came back with a new awareness about the world and many lost the values they had taken with them to war. In many ways, World War I raised the first questions over the validity of modernity and belief in reason as a replacement for faith.

The 1920s, while a time of great advancement was destined to increase the ferment of the times rather than decrease it. In so many ways Fundamentalism was a product of its times, and the militancy with which it approached the issues it chose to defend was well within the context of the social and cultural upheaval which surrounded its founding. The militancy of its actions would prove to be a distinctive characteristic into modern times.

God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-admiration. No! He has not made us the master organizers of the world to establish a system where chaos reigns...He had given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adept in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples.¹⁹ ~Senator Albert J. Beveridge~

CHAPTER TWO

ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL CHAOS: 1860-1920s

Religious movements arise many times during periods of unusual turmoil. For example, during the economic depressions of the 1800s, intentional communities (some religious) developed in response, and while many failed, they provided some means of action in response to what seemed overwhelming uncertainty around them. The early decades of the twentieth century found many conservative Christians in much the same circumstances. Economic and financial chaos, political uncertainty, and rising concerns over cultural issues defined the times in which these believers chose to act against a culture they perceived as lost. A clearer understanding of these issues illuminates much about the Fundamentalists and their perceived need to actively pursue change in the public arena to assure their voice was heard.

From the 1860s to the 1920s, tremendous winds of change were blowing worldwide, and particularly in the United States. Shifting cultural and economic structures became the norm, leaving Americans with a deep sense that old foundations were being destroyed and modernity was rapidly carrying them in directions for which they were not prepared. As the country recovered from the Civil War, a paradox

¹⁹ Senator Albert J. Beveridge, "In Support of an American Empire." *Congressional Record, Session I*. Washington, DC: Congressional Printing Office, 1901: 704-712.

developed between cycles of economic downturns and tremendous economic growth fueled by the Industrial Revolution.

Gradually, the American psyche changed as well, and this change fed ideas of American exceptionalism, and later American imperialism, as the nation worked to attain worldwide status and influence. But even in the midst of growth and development, other issues, many of which were also occurring around the world, feed into the angst of not only conservative Christians, but others. Labor unrest, racial strife, and economic uncertainty were realities which gave rise to social movements and the Social Gospel movement late in the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

Both the Industrial Revolution and the Gilded Age widened the gap between the “haves” and the “have-nots” as vast fortunes were made by some, and tremendous poverty was experienced by others. Both religious and secular responses to troubled times effected the concerns of Americans and molded both religious and political ideas leading to the 1920s.

The large number of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe who were willing to work for low wages, caused labor unrest and riots, and sometimes violent attempts at organizing the workforce resulted. The growing Industrial Revolution, with its advent of new technologies, which threatened jobs and the need for workers, fed the growing unrest. To better understand the effect of these historical events, on the period of the study, four examples will be considered as a snapshot of the changes and influences on American thinking and way of life.

During the period from 1860 to 1900, two major events, the Centennial Exhibition of 1876 and the Columbian Exposition of 1893, served as the symbols of modernity. Coupled with the sharp economic downturns in the American economy in the Panic of 1873 and 1893 made these decades a time of contradiction and change, these events provided an interesting backdrop for the turbulent decades leading up to the 1920s. In addition, the struggles of newly emancipated African Americans and the confrontation with issues of race and poverty, responses to Reconstruction in the South, and the emergence of women's rights promised to alter not only the culture, but religion as well.

The period immediately following the Civil War was a time of great economic expansion and growth, especially in the North and West. From 1860 to 1876 five new states joined the Union and the rush for new lands in the West expanded both immigration and western settlement. The first transcontinental railroad increased westward expansion and made farming more viable and getting crops to eastern markets a bit easier. Many southerners moved west after the Civil War as a way of escaping the Union occupation of the South, or to simply restart their lives after the devastation of the war years.

Following the war, cities grew as the Industrial Revolution provided more jobs and as an escape from the farm economy. After the turn of the century African Americans migrated in large numbers to northern cities seeking to escape the Jim Crow laws in the south and/or in search of economic opportunities. Immigrants arrived in greater numbers and usually lived in cities as well, increasing pressure on government's ability to provide services.

These new waves of European immigrants, especially after 1880, who were willing to work for low wages increased labor issues. Strikes, wage cuts, and general labor unrest marked the 1870s as labor struggled to organize workers and gain credibility. Accompanying this unrest, a marked change from rural occupations and crafts to industrial skills and trades allowed the strong emergence of a middle class. Increased urbanization and this new middle class clamoring for goods as they imitated the upper classes increased the economic base of the United States after the war. Great contradictions and change laid the foundation of American industrial growth between the Civil War and World War I. At the same time the inequities produced from these changes caused Americans to continually question their self identity and where this new world they were creating was headed.²⁰

The Centennial Exhibition of 1876 formally called the International Exhibition of Arts, Manufactures, and Products of the Soil and Mine, with the theme of celebrating the first American centennial, was held in Philadelphia to commemorate that august event. The Exhibition was the first of its kind in the United States, with previous exhibitions held earlier in Paris and London, and more than 10 million people attended. This represented about twenty percent of the American population. Highlighting their insecurities, Americans wondered if citizens of other nations would attend, and if they did, whether American exhibits could compete with foreign exhibits. To ensure success,

²⁰ Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Oxford History of the American People*. (New York: Oxford Press, 1965), 768. Morison states that annual immigration passed 300,000 in 1866 and was upwards of 789,000 by 1882. During the same period Irish and British immigration decreased in percentage, while immigrants from Russia, Italy, and other southern European countries increased. By 1900, 86 percent of foreign-born people were concentrated in the North East (east of the Mississippi and north of Ohio).

money was raised to send delegations to personally invite foreign governments to participate.²¹

With approval from the U. S. Congress in 1871 and promises of funding, the United States Centennial Commission organized in 1872 and began its work toward completion of the Exhibition by 1876. With funds from stock sales, the city of Philadelphia, state of Pennsylvania, and a loan from the federal government the Exposition became a reality. More than 200 buildings were constructed within the Exhibition grounds, with many foreign countries, corporations, and even the U. S. Government offering exhibits.²²

Of major importance to the theme of the fair was a working model of a colonial kitchen complete with a spinning wheel. Actors dressed in period costumes presented the colonial home as the premiere example of “old-fashioned domesticity in juxtaposition to the surrounding theme of progress.” Aside from sparking a renewed interest in colonial furniture and architecture, the exhibit showed Americans as coming from a good stock, rather than the hordes of multi-ethnic peoples brought by immigration, highlighting the racial and ethnic tensions underlying the societal views of the 1870s. Numerous technologies, designed to show American superiority and the advance of American culture, were the center points of the Exhibition, including the Corliss Steam Engine,

²¹ Linda P. Gross and Theresa R. Snyder, (2005). *Philadelphia's 1876 Centennial Exhibition*. Arcadia Publishing, 7; Nicholas Wainwright, Russell Weigley and Edwin Wolf. *Philadelphia: A 300-Year History*. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1982), 460.

²² Ibid, 461. An interesting note by Wainwright concerns women's rights. When women discovered little was planned by the Exhibition to showcase women's work, they raised an additional \$30,000 to build a Women's Pavilion, the first of its kind at an international exhibition, providing an interesting insight into the growing concerns of women in the society of the 1870s.

Alexander Graham Bell's telephone, Remington Typographic Machine (typewriter), Heinz Ketchup, and kudzu.²³

To the more than 10 million who visited the Exhibition, it provided a fresh look forward with renewed hope after the brutal years of the Civil War and Reconstruction. Progress and new technologies offered hope that the coming years would provide happiness and economic prosperity and allow them to forget a regrettable piece of history. The Exhibition was a showcase of what Americans could produce, and finally allowed Americans to escape the shadow of European dominance in both intellectual and technological pursuits. By producing their own Exhibition with attendance and exhibits from around the world, Americans were able to stake their own claims to innovation and invention, allowing them to showcase their abilities and escape their frontier past and show American progress.

Even while Americans prepared to tout their technological and cultural advancements, a severe economic depression was underway on both sides of the Atlantic. Referred to in the states as the Panic of 1873, the depression began in Vienna, capital of Austria-Hungary, spread throughout Europe, and hit the American banking sector in 1873. Failure of Jay Cooke & Co. added to the economic tensions. This was one of a series of economic downturns to affect the American economic system in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In Great Britain the down turn lasted for more than twenty years

²³ Edward Strahan ,Ed., *A Century After: Picturesque Glimpses of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania*. (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott and J. W. Lauderbach, 1875), 24.

and was referred to by at least one historian as the “long depression.” It cost Britain its world economic leadership.²⁴

Many economists believe the Panic was exacerbated in the United States by a boom in railroad construction following the Civil War. More than 56,000 miles of track was laid between 1866 and 1873. Government land grants and railroad subsidies drove railroad investment and the industry became the leading employer. Speculators infused cash into railroads, driving the overbuilding of docks, factories, and support facilities.²⁵

A change in U. S. policy, the Coinage Act of 1873, had a major impact on the economy and precipitated the rise of political groups such as the Greenback Labor Party and the People’s Party in the coming decades. The act moved the United States to the gold standard, effectively ending the government’s purchase of silver for silver coins, immediately depressing silver prices. This measure reduced the domestic money supply and raised interest rates, doing further damage to farmers and others who normally survived with loans until payments arrived from crops or invoices for manufacturing.²⁶

The issue over the gold or silver standard continued to be debated for years and by the 1892 and 1896 presidential elections the public outcry resulted in the issue becoming a plank in political platforms of both the Populists and Democrats. William

²⁴ A. E. Musson, “The Great Depression in Britain, 1873-1896: A Reappraisal,” *Journal of Economic History*, 1959.Vol. 19, No. 2,199-228.

²⁵ Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer, *A History of the United States Since the Civil War*. (New York: Macmillan.1917), 3:69-122.

²⁶ Irwin Unger, *The Greenback Era: A Social and Political History of American Finance, 1865-1879*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press.1964), 213-28.

Jennings Bryan, who later led the evolution movement and prosecuted the Scopes Trial, gained much of his popular support from these battles over the gold standard.²⁷

The perception of instability created by the railroad boom and the silver fight caused much uncertainty among Americans over the future, and this was compounded by other economic setbacks, including the Black Friday Panic of 1869, Chicago fire of 1871, and a major equine influenza outbreak in 1872. Major banking concerns went bankrupt, including those involved with the railroad industry, setting off a chain reaction, leading to the closing of the New York Stock Exchange and massive layoffs. By 1876, unemployment reached fourteen percent with construction stoppages common, wages cut, property values falling, and corporate profits dropping dramatically.²⁸

Wage reductions and working conditions resulted in the Great Railroad Strike of 1877, causing gridlock across the railway networks and resulting in President Rutherford B. Hayes sending in federal troops to restore service. Clashes between strikers and the army left more than 100 dead and many injured. In 1877 the lumber industry crashed due to slow demand and several leading lumber companies declared bankruptcy. The growing

²⁷ William Jennings Bryan, "William Jennings Bryan: An Electrifying Orator." *National Public Radio.org*. July 9, 1896. <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=95691800> (accessed March 10, 2010). Often referred to as the most famous speech in American politics, Bryan used the speech at the 1896 Democratic Convention in Chicago to gain the Democratic Presidential nomination. The most famous line of the speech underlines the importance of the silver-gold issue: "If they dare to come out in the open field and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we shall fight them to the uttermost, having behind us the producing masses of the nation and the world. Having behind us the commercial interests and the laboring interests and all the toiling masses, we shall answer their demands for a gold standard by saying to them, you shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

²⁸ Samuel Rezneck, "Distress, Relief, and Discontent in the United States during the Depression of 1873-78," *Journal of Political Economy*, 1950. Vol. 58, No. 6, 494-512. According to Rezneck, the stock exchange closed for ten days beginning on September 20, of the 364 railroads 84 went bankrupt, and more than 18,000 businesses declared bankruptcy between 1873 and 1875; M. John Lubetkin, *Jay Cooke's Gamble: The Northern Pacific Railroad, the Sioux, and the Panic of 1873*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 2006).

tension between workers and the banking and manufacturing concerns continued long after the depression eased at the close of the 1870s.

Of even greater significance, poor economic conditions resulted in Republicans losing congressional elections in 1874 and Democrats gaining control of the U. S. House of Representatives. These changes hampered the Grant Administration from developing a long-range policy for the Southern states, and as a result the federal government began to steer away from the policies of Reconstruction, leaving unfinished programs for railroad expansion and most Southern states deeply in debt. New political realities and the distaste of Southerners for reconstruction policies resulted in the federal government gradually withdrawing federal troops and leaving the South to pick up the pieces and developing some semblance of a new government of its own. Bitter feelings left from the war in the South continued to affect the thinking and feelings of uncertainty and distrust of the federal government, adding to the hopeless economic conditions by both African Americans and whites. Resentment in the South against the government imposing its views on Southerners played a major role in the Scopes Trial in 1925.

The Southern states fell one by one to Democratic control with carpetbaggers and African Americans losing any gains in power enjoyed since the end of the war. The rise of the Ku Klux Klan and the change in politics created a tremendous paradox in the coming decades for minorities. Americans on the one hand touted great strides in progress and modernity, and at the same time oppressed minorities and deprived them of their rights. Significantly, religion would play a major role, and not always a positive

role, in these events as well, shaping the morals or lack thereof, with the racial overtones of the Scopes Trial becoming a line in the sand.

In 1893, Americans again had the opportunity to display the advancement of American civilization with another major exposition in Chicago. The World's Columbian Exposition, more commonly called the Chicago's World's Fair, which began in 1893, proved to be a defining moment in American history. As part of the exposition, Fredrick Jackson Turner presented his Frontier Thesis which proposed the end of the American westward expansion and provided a framework to explain the exceptional nature of America and its democracy. Displays of native cultures from around the world, including Native Americans, showed the unparalleled advances of mankind, and the long road of civilization from the most primitive people.

During the exposition, an international meeting of world religions, The World Congress on Religion, showcased and initiated exposure to Americans of different religious concepts. The timing was no accident, coinciding with a period in American religious history when debates raged over belief and even the value of religion itself. This debate continued well into the 1920s and set the stage for Fundamentalists to militantly take positions in objection to many of the views articulated by the pan-religious gathering in Chicago.

The Exposition, like its predecessor in 1876, highlighted a major historical event and used the platform to promote concepts of modernity and change. The exposition was held in conjunction with the commemoration of the 400th anniversary of Columbus's arrival in the New World in 1492. Chicago bested other cities like New York,

Washington, D. C., and St Louis for the honor of being the host, making Chicago the consummate showcase of architecture, art, and industrialism. Neither the timing nor the purpose of the Exposition was an accident.

The Gilded Age, with its frantic growth, mass immigration, and growing class violence left many Americans believing the sectional conflict of the Civil War had ended only to give way to class warfare, as evidenced by Chicago's Haymarket Square Bombing in 1886. In fact, government leaders, in organizing the Exposition, were following British leaders, who felt such exhibitions of progress and modernity were effective deterrents to radical political ideas and to show progress toward greater civilization in the face of class conflict was vital to social stability.²⁹

The design of the Exposition was a major statement on civilization and progress, utilizing European Classical Architecture. Designed to rival the Great Exhibition in London in 1851, which was the symbol of the Victorian Era, the grounds covered more than 600 acres, contained more than 200 buildings, and was well appointed with canals, and mini lakes, providing the backdrop for the more than 27 million visitors (equal to about one third the American population) who came through the Exposition in the six months it was open.

The Exposition was foremost a showplace of American Exceptionalism, while celebrating Columbus's discovery and the coming of Europeans to the New World.

Dorothy Ross, in *Origins of American Social Science*, identifies three varieties of

²⁹ Robert W. Rydell, *World's Columbian Exposition* March 3, 2005. <http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/1386.html> (accessed April 2, 2010). Rydell argues that the London Crystal Palace Exhibition of 1851 was championed by the British for just those purposes.

American exceptionalism—religious, genetic, and geographic--- all of which were on display at the Exposition. First, she asserts America’s belief in supernatural explanations related to its religious heritage and the providence of God is key to understanding America. This belief defines how religion shaped America in unique ways from the Pilgrims beliefs in the providence of God in bringing them to the New World. Over time these beliefs shifted and changed but the exceptional nature of America continued to embrace the ideal. This idea informs our understanding of the rise of American Fundamentalism and the Scopes Trial, which will be addressed further in the next chapter.³⁰

The second form of Exceptionalism came through various genetic interpretations having to do with race, racial traits, ethnicity, and gender. As mentioned, the Exhibition of 1876 organizers took great care to frame the founders of colonial America, not as multi-ethnic, multi-racial individuals, but as descendents from good, European white stock. The Exposition determined to take this idea a step further. The symbolism of the fair and the language used suggested that white people were superior to all other races.

The job of giving form to the hundreds of exhibits fell to G. Brown Goode, of the Smithsonian Institution, and America’s best known taxonomist of the time. He visualized the Exposition as an “encyclopedia of civilization.” What it meant to be civilized ran from the exhibit halls, overflowing with the technologies of the world’s most affluent

³⁰ Note: American Exceptionalism, a concept first proposed by Alexis de Tocqueville in his *Democracy in America* in 1831, assert thsat America occupies a special place among nations because it was the first modern democracy, built by immigrants, the existence of unique political and religious institutions, and its national creed.; Dorothy Ross, *Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

countries, and with the modes of production and agricultural advances, architecture and art as the center piece of the fair in the central hub that was dubbed “The White City.” The midway, where the anthropological exhibits were arranged, showed man in his more primitive states. The design of the midway itself is perhaps the most suggestive of the cultural and historical context of this seminal event.³¹

Following the Paris Universal Exposition of 1889, where French anthropologists displayed “primitive” human beings in native settings, Fredric Ward Putnam, a noted Harvard anthropologist, envisioned the midway as a living outdoor museum of primitive peoples to allow visitors to measure the progress of civilization against the so called “white city” exhibit where the advancements and arts were shown. Whether planned or not, these anthropological displays of the primitive races turned out to be commercial enterprises run by vendors for profit. The educational benefits were over shadowed by the location of the exhibit among the amusement section of the midway. Along with the Ferris wheel and other attractions, one could pay to see Native Americans in authentic costumes doing “Indian” things. Belly dancers from Cairo, Native Americans, and a working African village served up the “primitive peoples” as educational amusement, for the price of admission.³²

³¹ Note: The designation “White City” grew to mean many things. The buildings were made of white stucco, which contrasted sharply with the tenements of Chicago, giving them a lighted effect. The extensive use of street lights allowed the buildings to be used at night. The term also carried a more ominous designation since the buildings housed the far reaching technologies and the art and architecture associated with “white” civilization in contrast to the Midway where the displays were a constant reminder that other races were uncivilized. The white stucco used for nonpermanent buildings in the “white city” was sprayed on to nonpermanent shells which served to indicate the shallow and fragile nature of this civilization being showcased; Robert W. Rydell. *World’s Columbian Exposition* March 3, 2005.
<http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/1386.html> (accessed April 2, 2010).

³² Ibid.

The Native American exhibit was of particular interest in light of the purpose of the celebration and the continuing American expansion at the price of native lands. The display highlighted Euro-American superiority over a people designated as “savages,” a commonly held view. With the final victory over Native American resistance in 1891, the timeliness of this display in showing the forward march of civilization over the savage Indian was well placed as part of the exposition.³³

Ross’s third variety of exceptionalism is found in geography, climate, and availability of natural resources, social structure, and type of political economy. It was also no accident that the exposition was the site for the delivery of Fredrick Jackson Turner’s greatest work, “The Frontier in American History”, in which he theorized that the presence of the frontier had an integral part in the shaping of America in thought and character, and was the secret of the national spirit. He proposed that democracy—and particularly American democracy ---- was a new idea which in turn influenced the Old World as well. These ideas, forged in the fires of testing and trials, facing unknown dangers and troubles, produced what became the economic, political, and social characteristics of the American people and their concepts of their destiny.

The Chicago Exposition exposed tensions and reflected broader struggles over the future course of American society and culture that would come to a head in the 1920s and specifically the Scopes Trial. The tensions between the White City and the midway were especially telling. Native Americans were not the only minorities to feel the pain of how

³³ Colin G. Calloway, *The First People: A Documentary Survey of American Indian History* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins.2008), 77-80. This designation of Native Americans, according to Calloway, began with Columbus himself, and soon became the common conceptualize by Europeans, first as “noble savages” and later as “dirty savages” or “treacherous savages.”

they were presented. The representation of African Americans and women at the Exposition developed issues. The whiteness of the White City was particularly offensive.

As the planning unfolded for the Exposition, African Americans were determined to show the world their own accomplishments since emancipation, but the directors required their ideas to be presented and approved by all white committees, with most requests rejected without consideration. Tokenism and exclusion resulted in calls for black boycotts of the Fair, ending in disagreements between Fredrick Douglas and black leaders of the boycott. With the setting aside of a “colored day” the Fair became a conspirator to the prevailing “separate but equal doctrine” that was to become law in 1896, with the Supreme Court decision in *Plessy vs. Ferguson*.³⁴

White middle class women enjoyed more success than African Americans in gaining representation at the Fair. How they were to be presented led to disagreements among themselves. Some women fought to have their exhibits displayed and judged in the same realm as those displayed by men and others wanted a building of their own. In the end the women’s displays were presented in their own building, designed by the well-known Boston architect, Sophia Hayden, and the building was located where the Midway joined the main exposition grounds. The location between the White City, displaying the advanced of white, European men and the anthropological exhibits of primitives speaks volumes concerning the place of women in the 1890s.

³⁴ Fredrick Douglas was the official representative the Haiti delegation and encouraged blacks to participate as widely as possible. Exposition managers arranged a “colored day” and a “white day” and on the “colored day” Douglas took the opportunity to call for Americans to live up to the Constitution and to give social justice to former slaves.

In the end those who visited the Exposition went away with new ideas of America and its people. A wide range of lectures by politicians, activists, and intellectuals presented new avenues of thought from religion and science to labor and women's rights. The World Congress of Religions opened new awareness of the plurality of belief around the world and laid a foundation for religious diversity, which aroused great conflict in coming decades as Fundamentalism stood against what it viewed as modernism. Men like Turner with his views on the frontier and the presence of the Buffalo Bill Wild West Show left a sense of nostalgia for what had been. Men like Henry Ford went away inspired with the idea of a horseless carriage. But many left unsure of just what they had seen or what is all meant in terms of civilization. All in all, while a financial success, the Exposition did not end on a positive note. A smallpox epidemic, which originated at the fair, spread through the city by the early autumn. Just before the closing ceremonies, the mayor was assassinated. Just as the exposition closed a fire swept through the site destroying many of the buildings. For those whose spirits were lifted by the Exposition, the shadow of yet another economic downturn was waiting nearby.³⁵

As the Exposition of 1893 came to a close signs of an economic downturn were already apparent. Following the depression in the 1870s, the decade of the 1880s was one of great expansion. During this period, the key industry was railroads and tremendous fortunes were made. Companies actively engaged in taking over other companies, increasing business instability. With the expanded rail system, mining (especially silver

³⁵ Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show was turned officially turned down as part of the Exposition, denying the Fair a huge profit from his very profitable show. He went to Chicago any way and set up adjacent to the Fair, making a small fortune from the huge crowds.

mining) flooded the market with product, driving down the price. Farmers in the Midwest & the Great Plains suffered crop losses due to drought, driving down property values and leaving them short of cash needed to repay loans. Support for the Free Silver Movement, mainly from farmers hoping to lower interest rates and miners hoping to return to silver money, grew into a major political agenda, and resulted in the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890, that required the government to purchase silver to raise prices.³⁶

The National Bureau of Economic Research reports that the contraction of the economy began during the first week of May, 1893 and continued until June of 1894, causing what was called the “workless winter of 1893-1894.” After a period of modest growth until December of 1895 a second recession occurred, lasting until June 1897.³⁷

Ten days before the second inauguration of President Grover Cleveland in 1893, the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad declared bankruptcy. With the economy rapidly worsening bank runs became a common occurrence, followed by a major economic blow when the National Cordage Company went into receivership. This set off a chain reaction resulting in more than 15,000 companies and 500 banks failing. High estimates placed unemployment at between seventeen and nineteen percent. At this point the middle class could no longer meet their mortgage obligations, many walked away from newly built

³⁶ David Whitten, "Depression of 1893." EH.Net Encyclopedia, edited by Robert Whaples. August 14, 2001. <http://eh.net/encyclopedia/article/whitten.panic.1893> (Accessed 5-02-2010). Railroads were the main engine of the economy after the Civil War and opened new markets for farmers both nationally and internationally; Gabriel Kolko, *Railroads and Regulation, 1877-1916*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), 1. Kolko asserts that from 1870 to 1900 that the “Robber Barons” of the Gilded Age were mostly railroad men; Naomi R Lamoreaux, *The Great Merger Movement in American Business, 1895-1904*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 1. Lamoreaux contends these mergers were more than one company taking over another, but were consolidations of industries such as the Standard Oil Trust formed in 1882, and increased dramatically in the 1890s.

³⁷ David Whitten, "Depression of 1893." EH.Net Encyclopedia, edited by Robert Whaples. August 14, 2001. <http://eh.net/encyclopedia/article/whitten.panic.1893> (Accessed 5-02-2010).

homes. The stress created by the economic hard times was felt from the farm to the mill villages and cities, resulting in displays of unrest across the nation. Coxey's Army, a widely publicized protest of unemployed workers marched on Washington, D. C. to protest falling crop prices and high unemployment. Several major strikes occurred in 1894, including the Pullman Strike that crippled much of the nation's transportation.³⁸

America's economy was in the midst of rapid change during this period. Agriculture was no longer the dominant force and accounting for a smaller and smaller part of the Gross National Product, falling behind manufacturing and mining. By 1890 agriculture's share of the workforce was roughly forty percent, having decreased from seventy-four percent in 1800. Increased productivity from new technologies and improved crops changed the face of farming in America as fewer people were needed to produce more food. The post-Civil War period saw industrial output grow by two hundred and ninety six per cent. By 1890 America boasted more than 350,000 industrial concerns that employed 4.75 million workers. In the midst of a rapidly changing workforce, a growing migration to urban centers to find industrial jobs, and the rapid influx of immigrant workers, the financial panic of 1893 raised new questions about where the country was headed economically.³⁹

With President Cleveland and the Democrats blamed for the panic, the pro-gold Republicans under William McKinley scored a decisive victory over the pro-silver Democrats led by William Jennings Bryan in 1896. During the period many of those who

³⁸ Charles Hoffmann, *The Depression of the Nineties: An Economic History*. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing, 1970), 106-107; Ibid. 68-69.

³⁹ Wheat, cotton, and corn production doubled between 1870 and 1890. Worldwide competition in grain and cotton production resulted in rapidly falling prices.

abandoned their homes moved west boosting the population of cities like Seattle, Portland, Salt Lake City, Denver, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. The U. S. economy finally began to recover after 1896 spurred on by the promotion of public road building and the overall improvement of the economy.

Of significance, the Panic brought an end to what historians deem as the Age of Populism. Populism, composed of farmers, silver miners, and blue collar wage earners, posed a challenge to the power, or at least perceived power of the corporate-industrial powers of the Gilded Age. The movement tapped into Enlightenment ideas of man and like earlier American agriculturalists embraced the belief that they “stood on the rungs of the historical ladder of progress.” Since the corporate powers claimed ownership of modernity, these conflicting beliefs became the battle ground for the nineteenth century. The ferment created by tremendous change and development and the expansion leading up to the Depression of 1893 set the stage for the economic collapse.⁴⁰

In *The Depression of the Nineties*, Charles Hoffman argues that while the economic downturn came as a surprise to most, it was really the changed relationships, particularly the agricultural society’s transformation into an industrial, urban-based society helped to produce the collapse of the economy. He argues that while agriculture remained a vital part of the economy, it failed to keep up with progress, creating a negative trend. He contends that more was required than just technology; it has to be

⁴⁰ Ibid. 232; Charles Postel, *The Populist Vision*. (New York: Oxford University Press. 2007).

embraced and used to be effective. It is this battle over whether to embrace technology or reject it that set the stage for battles over modernity in the new century.⁴¹

Among the various responses of Americans to the financial crises was the founding of intentional communities, which were in direct correlation to the hard times. The period of the 1880s and 1890s provided the ferment of ideas from which these utopian dreams developed. For some, they became a port in the storm and arguably were successful, depending on the measure of success used. A livelihood, peaceful life, and a place to live provided some level of security for those involved, not always readily available outside the utopias. This idea of withdrawal from a failing society and the chaos attached came to resonate among Fundamentalists in the 1920s as they sought to withdraw from the culture they perceived to have failed.

The early decades of the twentieth century continued much in the same pattern as the closing decades of the previous century. Economic unrest resulted from other panics and downturns. Political upheaval in Europe and around the world only increased the uncertainty in America. World War I initially an economic boost as factories produced armaments and supplies for Britain and her allies. Manufacturing expanded further as America entered the war and concerns over American involvement were expressed in opposition from various groups. The horror of the war brought home to America even more uncertainty. Soldiers returned with European views of politics, culture, and religion,

⁴¹ Charles Hoffmann, *The Depression of the Nineties: An Economic History*. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing, 1970).

helping to shape the society of the 1920s. The fall of Russia in 1917 to Communism left Americans wondering what the future held for America.

The economic and cultural upheavals following the Civil War, while raising the concerns over change and where humanity was headed, created a desire to return the country and the culture back to a simpler time. This desire for a more certain past drove the new Christian Fundamentalists to take a militant stance on an issue which they felt violated their beliefs but which set up the clash at Dayton, Tennessee over what was being taught in public schools.

Controversy of the right sort is good; for out of such controversy, as Church history and Scripture alike teach, there comes the salvation of souls.⁴² ~H. Gresham Machen~

CHAPTER THREE

RELIGION AND AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM

The rise in Christian Fundamentalism in the early decades of the twentieth century reflects the seriousness with which Americans hold their religious beliefs and practices, even to the point of militancy when necessary. From the founding of the earliest English colonies on the American continent religion played a large role. Although religion was important, the majority did not come to America because of religious dissent. Many who did migrate for religious reasons brought with them a spirit of separatism, if not a history of separatist actions. Among the more well-known were the Pilgrims who settled at Plymouth.

The Pilgrims had already taken separatist actions and physically left the Church of England, prior to their migration from Scrooby to Leiden. The Pilgrims were a subset of a larger movement, who while believing Puritan doctrines, choose to take a different approach to how they practiced their faith and along the way chose to become separatists. Like their latter day counterparts, the Fundamentalists, the Pilgrims' militant actions often left them misunderstood and at odds with the surrounding religious and secular culture. An examination of the relationship between the Pilgrims and the larger Puritan movement will provide a window into how their presence in America influenced and

⁴² J. Gresham Machen, *What Is Faith?* (1925; reprint: Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1991), 42-43.

shaped not only America's religious history, but more directly, the Fundamentalist movement which drew from the Pilgrims' separatist history.

Long before the Pilgrims left England their defining characteristic, of separatism, was already a vital part of their religious experience, distinguishing them from the wider Puritan movement. Their separatism was based, not on doctrine, but on a growing realization that Anglican reform was not likely to occur, and they chafed under what they perceived as Catholic practices in Anglican worship. They objected to Catholic-like elements in the services such as the elaborate vestments worn by the priests and believed in a simple service without elaborate rituals. This major distinction defined the Pilgrims from the broader Puritan movement. Non-separatist Puritans chose to remain within the institution, and to seek reform from within the Anglican Church. The differences between Non-separatists and Separatists were not doctrinal, but practical. This same distinction would be reflected later in the rise of Christian Fundamentalism from the broader Evangelical movement.

Fundamentalists adopted an almost fatalistic world view of their own, despairing over the impossibility of cultural and moral change in an increasingly chaotic world. In response to their growing concerns about the world, Fundamentalists adapted their doctrinal beliefs, especially eschatological teachings about the return of Christ, to reflect those changes. These adaptations directly affected their world view, moving from the postmillennial belief of Calvinism, to a pre-millennial escapist mentality, justifying their

militant spirit in dealing with an encroaching secular culture upon their values. This new world view also justified their rejection of the growing Social Gospel Movement.⁴³

Central to any discussion of either the Puritan-Pilgrims or the Evangelical-Fundamentalists is an understanding of doctrines and how they changed between the early days of the first settlers and the 1920s.

Within religious movements, change are not always negative, but may increase the sense that something is being lost, forcing some to take stronger stands against new ideas or actions. The tensions produced by change can increase to the point that divisions result and two groups, both holding identical doctrines can develop. This is what happened in both the Pilgrims and Fundamentalist movements. Therefore, a better understanding of the Pilgrims' origins and practices is vital to understanding how the Fundamentalist movement arose.

The religious group commonly known as the Pilgrims originated in the Midlands of England, near Scrooby, between 1586 and 1605. While there they were influenced by the teachings of the first Baptist of record, John Smyth, whom they eventually followed to Leiden in Holland to escape English persecution under James I and Non-separatist Puritans.⁴⁴

⁴³ Albert Matthews, "The Term *Pilgrim Fathers* and Early Celebrations of Forefathers' Day." *Publication of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, 1915:17:293-331. The distinguishing of the Pilgrims as distinct from the larger Puritan movement is not a new concept. President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907 in a well criticized speech missed this important distinction in his speech commemorating Forefathers' Day.

⁴⁴ Nathaniel Philbrick, *Mayflower*. (New York: Penguin Books, 2006), 190-191. Philbrick alludes to evangelizing the Indians as a selling point to recruit Pilgrims for the intended settlement of the New World, which was much more a Baptist doctrine than a Calvinistic idea, which may be attributed to Smyth's influence. Philbrick says that while this idea was used to recruit, the Mayflower was barely out of the harbor before this was forgotten. Neither the Pilgrims nor their Puritan counterparts in Boston expended much effort to Christianize the Indians.

The Pilgrims were separatists and as such chose to withdraw from the wider Puritan movement, because they did not believe that Anglican worship could ever be reformed and various “catholic” elements removed. Unlike their non-separatist brethren, they chose to withdraw rather than remain in the Anglican Church. Since church attendance was mandated by law, their militant position opened them to arrest by the legal authorities and to ridicule by other Puritans. When James I came to the throne, both Non-Separatist and Separatists were persecuted, but the latter group, because of its strident refusal to worship in Anglican churches was always in greater danger.⁴⁵

The Pilgrims’ growing legal plight in England led to their evacuation to Holland in 1607 or 1608, which proved problematic as well. Leiden soon proved to be a mistake, since it threatened both the loss of their cultural identity and ability to earn a livelihood. They found life to be quite different in Holland and while extremely accepting and providing a haven for many persecuted Christians, the liberal attitudes of the Dutch had an unsettling influence on the Pilgrims’ children. They soon began the process of organizing a group to form a colony in the New World.

The idea of going to the New World was problematic on two fronts. First, they had to gain approval of the Virginia Company, one of two entities set up to manage English settlements in the new world. Secondly, James I was laboring to remove

⁴⁵ The Pilgrims, although identical in doctrine to the larger Puritan group, were designated as separatists because of their withdrawal from the Anglican Church, isolating them from the wider movement. This isolation was even more apparent when Puritans, who were not separatists, founded colonies around Boston. Their goal to remain within the Anglican Church and to provide an example of what reform could mean and what an ideal Puritan society would look like was expressed by their Governor John Winthrop in his metaphor of a “city on a hill.” This view was at variance with the views of the Pilgrims, just as later Fundamentalist views would collide with the views of the wider Evangelical Movement.

dissenters from the Church of England and needed to be convinced that allowing such a vocal group to plant a colony in America would not be a mistake. The King found the idea of religious liberty no less to his liking on the other side of the Atlantic than he did close to home. After complex negotiations, in which the Pilgrims compromised as far as they could with regards to the state church and its beliefs, and James I allowed some ground with regard to their liberty the needed permission was given.

Once in the New World, the Pilgrims, relying on their strong Calvinist beliefs, which drew particular conclusions about the sovereignty of God and his providence, began the arduous task of shaping a separatist community in the wilderness. The first winter was harsh and the Pilgrims lost many of their group to cold, disease, and hunger. While the Plymouth colony was never a great success, and never growing beyond 2,000 settlers, by 1660 it was absorbed into the larger Massachusetts Bay Colony. But separatist ideas continued to grow within the American Puritan community, shaping and influencing American history for the coming decades.⁴⁶

A careful reading of Governor William Bradford's writings regarding the Pilgrims' purpose indicates that because of their willful separation from the Church of England while at Scrooby, they were left "hunted and persecuted on every side," not only by the government of James I, but branded as "schismatic" by non-Separatist Puritans,

⁴⁶Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*. (New York: Pearson-Longman, 2007), 27. In speaking of the Pilgrims as separatists, Morgan aligns them with those of like faith who would come after them. "Every age has its own separatists. They are the intransigents, the undeviating purists, who have to be right whatever the cost, who would sacrifice the world rather than compromise their own righteousness."

many of whom later immigrated to and founded the Puritan settlement at the Massachusetts Bay Colony.⁴⁷

The non-separatists came to the New World with different political and religious goals than the Pilgrims. Seeking to establish the Massachusetts Bay Colony and other towns as “cities on a hill,” to coin the words of their founder, John Winthrop, they hoped their ideal society of what could be accomplished by obedience and faith would challenge England to return to Puritan roots, and bring reform within the Anglican Church. The Pilgrims at Plymouth did not entertain any such ideas of reforming an apostate church and simply desired to be left alone. Tensions between Plymouth and the Massachusetts Bay Colony were common as each settlement lived out its faith, each pursuing its opposing aims vis-à-vis England and its official church. Yet, neither the Puritan colony nor the Massachusetts Bay Colony succeeded in their goals and by mid-century, the general religious and political outlooks for the two colonies had become indistinguishable.⁴⁸

Neither the Pilgrim Colony nor the Massachusetts Bay Colony succeeded in their goals. By the time Winthrop died, only twenty years after the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, “the city” reflected little of Puritan life. More than half of its inhabitants refused to join a Puritan church. So many of the second generation settlers abandoned Plymouth for economic opportunities, that William Bradford described the

⁴⁷ William Bradford, Ted Hildebrandt, Ed., *Bradford's History "Of Plimoth Plantation."* (Boston: Wright & Potter Printing Co. 1622 Published 189): 94-95, 106.

⁴⁸ Governor John Winthrop, “A Model of Christian Charity,” *Religious Freedom Page*. 1630. <http://religiousfreedom.lib.virginia.edu/sacred/charity.html>; Philbrick, Nathaniel, *Mayflower*. (New York: Penguin Book), 2006.

settlement as “an ancient mother grown old and forsaken by her children.” Economic enterprise had replaced much of the religious idealism.⁴⁹

By the turn of the eighteenth century the Puritan idea of America as a “Holy Commonwealth standing in a national covenant with its Lord was fading.”⁵⁰ The Enlightenment, with its emphasis on reason, created problems for Puritan theology and especially the covenantal foundation of their beliefs. The fires of devotion held by the first generation Americans dissolved into a battle for relevance, producing a religious environment that was spiritually dead and uninviting to many.

Into this setting, men like George Whitefield, Jonathan Edwards, and on a much smaller scale John Wesley began preaching a message of revival. Not only would their preaching produce a rebirth of the old Pilgrim separatism of an earlier generation, but the Awakening would begin the process of eroding Puritan doctrine and promoting the rise of Evangelicalism, which played a prevalent role in shaping the coming religious environment of the 1800s and 1900s, and especially the founding of Christian Fundamentalism.

New doctrinal truths, including access to salvation by all, as opposed to the Calvinist teaching of election and predestination, and new teachings regarding Dispensationalism and Pre-millennialism, coming out of the First and Second Great Awakenings, challenged the Calvinism of the Puritans and their practices. Religious revivals, while considered public events, were intensely controversial among both

⁴⁹ William Bradford. Ted Hildebrandt, Ed., *Bradford's "History of Plimoth Plantation."* (Boston: Wright & Potter Printing Co. 1622 Published 1898): 124.

⁵⁰ Sidney E. Ahlstrom. *A Religious History of the American People.* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972), 280.

religious and nonreligious peoples. “Old light” believers were aghast at the emotional displays and the holding of preaching events outside conventional meeting houses. “New lighters” found the religious upheaval inspiring and worked to reach every community with the new spiritual movement grounded in a salvation message available to all and not just the elect.⁵¹

The First Great Awakening set the pattern which would be repeated again in the Second Great Awakening and in the rise of Fundamentalism. All three were answers to concerns over the declining state of religion and in each a public display served to heighten those concerns as religious leaders argued over declining church attendance, cultural decay, and increasing diversity. In each case the renewed religious fervor called people back to former days when religion played a more central role in the society and each, at least for a short time, influenced prevailing culture. These former days were the idealized times of the Puritans and Pilgrims. These events served as major transitions, not only in religious belief but in culture and society as well. And, in each the characteristic militancy drove religion in new directions based not on doctrine, but experience and public expression.

In both the First and Second Great Awakenings the experiences of individuals played a key part. The personal experiences varied with the individual and extreme emotions, not present in Puritan worship, became common in both movements. This shift in emphasis from a sovereign God to the individual is significant in the evolution of

⁵¹ Edwin Gaustad & Leigh Schmidt. *The Religious History of America*. (San Francisco: Harper Publishing, 2002), 61. The designations of “old light” versus “new light” was used by Jonathan Edwards to denote the two armies resulting from the First Great Awakening, one for and one against the revivals.

American religion. Many of the preachers of the Awakenings did not agree doctrinally, but concurred in allowing these public expressions and the sharing of public “testimonials” to go unchecked.⁵²

Before both Awakenings, even with churches a major part of the landscape, most Americans were apathetic to church attendance and prescribed living. In each case the revivals returned spiritual life to a new fervor with new converts and excited previous believers. Stories abound of life changing events which shaped and changed whole societies.

By the 1690s, the period preceding the First Great Awakening, religion still played a key role in Puritan New England, but the society had changed. As previously noted, the second and third generations of the original settlers had developed material interests that took them away from the church centered environment of their forefathers and away from the coercive dictates of the Puritan covenant and belief. In the 1630 to 1640s seventy to eighty percent of the population belonged to a Puritan congregation. By 1670 membership had dropped to thirty five to forty percent. Since the church was the center of Puritan life, this decline was of serious concern to those who advocated for a revival within religious circles.⁵³

⁵² Mark A. Noll, *America's God*. (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 43-44. Noll highlights the fact that the First Great Awakening represents a transition from “clerical to lay religion and of the minister from an inherited authority figure to a self-empowered mobilize, from the definition of Christianity by doctrine to its definition by piety, and from a state church encompassing all of society to a gathered church made up only of the converted.”

⁵³ Jon Butler, Grant Wacker, Randall Balmer, *Religion in American Life: A Short History*. (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 64. Butler, Wacker, and Balmer note that in at least four Connecticut towns church membership was as low as 15%.

Adding to the malaise in church attendance, growth among other religious groups added diversity to what was once a religious monopoly held by the Puritans. The early Puritan settlements were much easier to govern and church attendance at Puritan worship was mandatory, but as time passed and other groups immigrated to the New World, the diversity eroded both the following and the doctrines of the Puritans. In 1654, the president of Harvard College, Henry Dunster, became a Baptist and the leaders forced his resignation. Harvard College was the bastion of Puritan education and the removal of Dunster speaks to the changing religious environment of the times.⁵⁴

Two types of events in the First Great Awakening elucidate its importance. First, well-known preachers such as George Whitefield, John Davenport, and Gilbert Tennent provided itinerant preaching, many times going out into the countryside for large outdoor meetings. Also, regular pastors, like Jonathan Edwards, were awakened by the new interest in personal evangelism. Edwards became the theologian and the most widely known leader of the Awakening. Both aspects are important for understanding the great revival, but also because they served as a model for other such religious movements important to this study. The first created sensational and immense controversy and the second would have longer lasting significance, building the infrastructure for the growing Evangelical movement. For the first time, emphasis on personal conversion, holy living, and a regenerated church membership who studied the Bible for themselves, became the core teachings, calling into question Puritan Calvinism with its predestination and

⁵⁴ Ibid.

election by a sovereign God. Even with the more demanding requirements church membership grew an estimated twenty to fifty thousand.⁵⁵

Even in the midst of religious decline, the preaching associated with the First Great Awakening stirred the populace because it reached deeply into the roots of Puritan theological tradition. The preaching resonated with the great Calvinist themes of the Bible, even while the movement included new experiences and practices not associated with that theology, including religion as a very personal experience. In fact, Jonathan Edwards developed and elucidated a “New England Theology” and birthed a style of preaching that became a distinct American trademark and these new approaches raised a sense of expectancy in churches. Of major importance to future generations, his preaching not only intensified religious dedication and resolution, but rekindled millennial hopes, which became an integral part of other religious movements of the 1800s and 1900s. Increased membership in churches and increased seriousness among members and clergy, along with Edwards’s development of a new school of theology, nurtured the growing spiritual awakening.⁵⁶

Antagonism to these new ideas divided proponents and opponents with each claiming to be the orthodox protectors of historic truth. In reality, the Great Awakening provided the catalyst for the rise of Unitarianism among the opponents of the revivals. Also, the growing sense of personal faith and human responsibility sparked a rise in

⁵⁵ Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 287.

⁵⁶ Millennial teachings were central to revival movements, even as they changed from the Puritan Post-millennial doctrines to a pre-millennial doctrines rising out of the Second Great Awakening, with important ramifications for religion and the churches.

Universalism after the 1770s which proposed that all men would eventually come into a right relationship with God since God's major attribute is love. These new ideas were a major deviation from Calvinistic Puritan doctrines.⁵⁷

One interesting development coming from both the "Old Light" and "New Light" groups was a renewed missionary zeal to reach not only a new American nation but the world, with the Gospel. Missionary outreach showed the changing nature of the new emphasis on personal accountability of the individual to seek his own salvation instead of dependence upon election and predestination. This increased effort towards evangelism magnified the effect of the Second Great Awakening in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Also, this renewed emphasis increased the need for education, resulting in the establishment of schools to train ministers in the new theological realities proposed by Edwards and dedicated to evangelism. The founding of Dartmouth is an example and represented a new zeal to convert and train Native Americans.⁵⁸

Of singular importance, the Awakening fueled separatist tendencies that were reminiscent of the Pilgrims themselves. From the 1630s, diversity of belief created many problems in New England for Puritans, who insisted on holding to their Anglican beliefs and practices, and sought to punish or exclude any separatists. The expelling of Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson are good examples of their determination to hold on to their old ways of knowing and doing at whatever costs. The addition of the Half-Way

⁵⁷ Sydney E. Ahlstrom. *A Religious History of the American People*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972) ,288. Ahlstrom states that prior to the Awakening, both Harvard and Yale were considered strong Puritan seminaries. Afterwards, Harvard adopted more liberal thought and its graduates more suspect among those who endorsed the Awakening.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 289.

Covenant allowed membership by non-regenerated believers, creating a theological difference between them and the “new lights” which more and more advocated a regenerated membership. Dissenters from Puritan beliefs grew and Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches became the beneficiaries.

The revivalist doctrines of personal conversion and regenerated church membership formed a basis for fellowship which joined these three major groups together in a bond which would last through the 1920s and make Fundamentalism a distinctly interdenominational group up until the 1960s. In fact, Whitefield, Tennent, and Edwards were Anglican, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist, respectively, but viewed their work as being of one mind. The revivals allowed other evangelicals to reach similar accords. Fellowship among these groups spread throughout the colonies, thanks in part to the widespread travels of Whitefield. Edwards’s appointment to the presidency of Princeton College was also an indicator of the far reaching effect this new movement would have on a new nation. His appointment and the appointment of his son-in-law after him influenced conservative theology for several generations.

By the turn of the nineteenth century, the spiritual fires of the Awakening had gone out and churches were once again in decline. As in the past the spiritual condition of the United States was in question among many clergy. The Revolutionary War, while cooling the fires of religious revival, and occupying the attention of Americans, brought new religious realities as well. The new nation faced many questions, not the least of which was the role of religion and its influence. These new religious sensibilities involved both adaptation and change in religious doctrine and practice.

The withdrawal of the British meant that Anglican churches either closed or changed into a distinctly American entity. Methodism, founded by John Wesley, who remained within the Anglican Church until his death, found new life in one of the great lights of the coming Second Great Awakening, Francis Asbury. The departure of the Anglicans after the war created a vacuum not so easily filled by other religious groups. Doctrinal changes to embrace social issues became the usual means of accommodation and acceptance.⁵⁹

While the period after the Revolutionary War and leading up to the Second Great Awakening was relatively calm, theologically, tremendous innovations in religious practice and belief were occurring. The frequency increased after 1790 as religion adjusted itself to the realities of a new nation and religion fed the growing ideas of American Exceptionalism and Expansionism.⁶⁰

Liberal Congregationalists in New England, African Americans, Baptists and radical dissenters all showed signs of theological change as they sought to flow into the religious openings produced by new realities posed by the departing British. Theological lines drawn during this period promised to establish the nineteenth century as one of the key periods in American religious history.

In the North, the Congregationalists broke decisively with Puritan theology by proclaiming liberation from Calvinist doctrines, promoting natural revelation over special

⁵⁹ Note: In the case of the First Great Awakening the Revolutionary War interrupted the revival and refocused America's people. In the same vein, the Civil War and World War I interrupted the Second Great Awakening and the rise of Christian Fundamentalism; Christine Leigh Heyrman, *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt*. (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

⁶⁰ Mark A. Noll. *America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. (New York: Oxford Press, 2002), 138.

revelation, and acquiescing to the ideas of man's self determination. Charles Aker's biography of Jonathan Mayhew encapsulates these ideas when he says of Mayhew that "he saw no problem in mixing the Reformation with the Enlightenment, revelation with rationalism, and individualism with submission to one's betters." New England was destined to be the center of theological debate well into the 1920s, culminating in the rise of Fundamentalist Christianity.⁶¹

Another theological trend, although small in the number of adherents, was destined to have an effect on the young nation far beyond what is suggested by its numbers. Deism reflected a strong belief in the rationalism of the Enlightenment and admired Christianity for its moral and philosophical strengths, while rejecting most of the supernatural elements of the Bible and claims of divinity associated with Christ. Its strongest supporters were found among the nation's Founding Fathers in men like Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Ethan Allen, Thomas Paine, and to some degree John Adams. Their influence is readily apparent in the founding documents of the nation as they sought to institutionalize a civic religion embracing Enlightenment ideas, which advocated liberty and freedom to worship and by implication, not to worship according to the dictates of one's heart.⁶²

The early African American story is of particular interest and is probably the best example of theological stability in the period. The reoccurring theme is liberty. While blacks embraced traditional theology, they never accepted it quite in the way their white

⁶¹ Charles W. Akers, *Called Unto Liberty: A Life of Jonathan Mayhew. 1720-1766*. Cambridge, Mass., 1964, 226.

⁶² Adams descended from the "Old Lights" Puritans which were the heirs of Unitarian belief. While he at times expressing Deist views, at other times, was more Congregationalist-Unitarian.

teachers expected. Writers like Phillis Wheatley, an educated slave in Boston, wrote poems of Whitfield's preaching of an "impartial Savior" who "longs for" Africans and is willing to make them "sons and kings, and priests unto God." Well known African American Christian leaders, such as Lemuel Haynes and David George, were strong Calvinists and while arguing for much broader liberty than that envisioned by the Founding Fathers, stayed within the theological framework of their Calvinist beliefs. African Americans, no matter how distinctive they became, were able to accommodate a great deal of traditional Protestant belief and practice, even while adding unique qualities from their own culture.⁶³

The Second Great Awakening was similar to the first in several respects. Both emphasized the authority of the Bible, a personal, definite conversion experience, and evangelism of those considered lost. As beliefs moved further away from the Calvinism of the Puritans, the preaching of the Gospel was more personal and hinged upon personal responsibility. This Awakening was more widespread and diverse in its effects than its predecessor. The characteristics of the meetings ranged from very quiet in the New England area, to very emotional at the campmeetings in Kentucky, but with the same effects of new church members, conversions, and changed lives so central to the first awakening. The idea of personal responsibility and freedom to accept or reject the Gospel fit well into the framework of a new country, full of fresh opportunities for anyone willing to take his destiny in his own hands, salvation included.

⁶³ Phillis Wheatley. "On the Death of Mr. George Whitefield, 1770." In *Life and Works of Phillis Wheatley*, by Editor G. Herbert Renfro, 51. Washington, D. C. 1916.

The sense of a personal God who spoke to individuals, coupled with the idea that anyone could accept the Gospel and go to heaven was exciting. The concept of Jesus Christ, the second person of the Godhead, as the “friend of sinners” also came out of the Second Great Awakening. The shift of focus from the sovereign God of the Puritans to the Son, Jesus Christ, was a major change for the Evangelicals. While belief in God as a trinity was debated from the early days of the Christian church and still remained a matter of some uncertainty with Puritans and Evangelicals, the issue became more of a settled doctrine as Evangelicals confirmed and developed the role of Jesus as the Son of God, and more pointedly as the second person of the Godhead. Growing interest in evangelism and missions resulted in major missionary efforts by Christians of all persuasions. Convinced of the availability of salvation in Jesus Christ for all men, efforts to send preachers to American frontiers to win those who had outrun the church in their move west increased. Churches also increased their participation in foreign outreach as they began to take seriously their duties to take their message to the world at large.⁶⁴

As in the First Awakening diversity played a major role. In the first two decades of the nineteenth century the demographics changed drastically, from a populace which had been mostly English Protestants and largely direct descendents from the Calvinist wing of the Reformation. With the opening of the frontier the population climbed from 3 million in 1790 to 13 million in 1850. Many of these immigrants came from the Continent and brought other understandings of Reformation belief. In addition, large

⁶⁴ Stephen Prothero, *American Jesus: How the Son of God Became a National Icon*. (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2006), 45. “The Puritans were a God-fearing people rather than a Jesus-loving people, obsessed not with God’s mercy but with His glory, not with the Son but with the Father.”

numbers of Roman Catholics, which appeared like a tidal wave to Protestants, raised concerns which would continue among American religious groups into the early 1900s.⁶⁵

For the first time sizable numbers of non-Christians also immigrated. Various hybrid religious groups, like the Transcendentalists, who emerged from the Unitarians, sprang up within American society. Diversity and the new found independence from England worked together to create a religious environment which allowed people to disagree; schism soon became a common trait among America's religious community. In *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, Francis Trollope, who traveled to the United States during the period, was not impressed. "The most endless variety of religious factions," she said, had "the melancholy effect of exposing all religious ceremonies to contempt."⁶⁶

The Second Great Awakening occurred in three different areas of the country and was not limited to New England. In New England the fires of revival were stoked by the descendents of Jonathan Edwards, including his grandson, Timothy Dwight, then the president of Yale College. Other notable preachers, like Lyman Beecher, the father of Harriet Beecher Stowe, were key leaders in the Northeast. The Awakening appeared in the western states and territories in the form of campmeetings. The famous, or infamous, Cane Ridge Campmeeting in Kentucky brought thousands of people together for a week or more for preaching services, with many of the emotional and physical displays so

⁶⁵ Ibid. 46-47.

⁶⁶ Francis Trollope, *Domestic Manners of Americans* (1832). (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), 108.

apparent in the First Awakening of which Jonathan Edwards was a part, but which the North failed to experience in the Second Awakening.⁶⁷

While the movement was most effective among local pastors, two ministers of note during this period were Francis Asbury and Charles Grandison Finney. Asbury, the bishop of the American Methodist churches, saw the number of Methodist converts explode as settlers moved west and in response to his establishment of “circuit riders” to minister on the frontier. Because of Asbury’s work, Methodists became the largest and fastest growing Evangelical group prior to the Civil War.

Finney, called “the father of revivalism,” soon brought the revival to the third area of prominence, upstate New York. Known for his plain speech and the “new measures” that he employed in ministry, Finney departed from tradition and held longer meetings with the addition of a mourner’s bench where those interested in additional counseling and spiritual help could wait after the service to talk with a pastor. He departed from tradition and encouraged women to give testimonies in the services and allowed them to lead in public prayer. His approach to meetings was unique in that it was entirely practical and involved utilizing the means at hand such as publicity and the laws of scientific results. Finney’s successes alarmed the “New Light” leaders in New England, leading to friction between Finney and Beecher, but they failed to intimidate him into restraining what they considered excesses. Finney’s importance to American history lies in the influence his revivals had on the antislavery movement and urban evangelism. He

⁶⁷ Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972),433. Note:Estimates of attendance at Cane Ridge ranges from ten to twenty-five thousand.

developed the modern high-pressure revival as the accepted mode of outreach which lasted well into the twentieth century.⁶⁸

Like the First Awakening, missions and outreach expanded. A renewed emphasis on reading the Bible resulted in increased education. Christian publishing, and the Sunday School Movement, provided Christians with the means with which to study the Bible. As in the First Awakening, an increased sense of millennial awareness provoked serious study and preparation for the end times. A new prophetic doctrine, or at least a major modification of the prevalent postmillennial doctrine, which originated with John Nelson Darby (1880-1882) grew in appeal with Evangelicals. By the 1920s the doctrine was widely accepted thanks in part to the Scofield Study Bible. Dispensational Pre-millennialism challenged the end-times view of Calvinists and only added to the urgency of the evangelistic message in light of an imminent return of Christ.⁶⁹

The changing face of American Christianity during the Second Great Awakening challenges the idea that Christianity has a body of long-held beliefs passed down unchanged from the early church or even from the time of the Reformation. Societal and cultural changes certainly served to alter and adapt doctrine and practice within an American society filled with uncertainty. The new Evangelicalism was forced to adapt to realities on the ground and especially in the South.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 460-461.

⁶⁹ George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 46; Note: The Scofield Study Bible gained wide acceptance among Fundamentalists because it contained study notes in and below the texts. The Bible conference movement in the late 19th century made personal study common among Christians and Scofield's Study Bible is still widely used.

In the South, southern paternalism and slavery provided the backdrop against which Evangelical groups, notably the Baptists, divided along regional lines. In the Northeast, “old light” and “new light” Puritans suffered the erosion of their doctrines, bringing new ideas and new realities of faith. But in the midst of all the changes, the Second Great Awakening resulted in a large growth in both numbers of believers and diversity. While many date the end of the Second Great Awakening with the Civil War, revivals continued among the troops on both sides. The changes in the religious and cultural landscape were readily apparent.

The Civil War set up a theological crisis adding to the religious uncertainty of the decades prior to the new century. Both sides in the conflict claimed God as their champion and both governments invoked the civic religion of the nation as supportive of their cause. Winners and losers afterwards had to come to terms not only with the catastrophic results of the war, but were forced to determine the role of religion and belief in the aftermath.⁷⁰

Sweeping changes and challenges to Christianity and its beliefs were about to create a firestorm which would shift the paradigm of belief both within religion and outside in the realms of science. The final decades of the 1800s brought tremendous changes to both society and religion. The religious changes were not limited to Protestant

⁷⁰ Mark A. Noll. *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006). Noll argues that the lines were not so neatly drawn theologically in the Civil War, but that some Southern ministers were against slavery, while some Northern clerics were for slavery, thereby creating a crisis of theology; Robert N. Bellah, “Civic Religion in America.” *Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Winter, 1967: 1-21. Bellah argues that the Civil War was the first real test of the nation. The Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 were not full scale due to a distracted British Empire whose resources and attention were on too many places to be a serious threat.

Evangelicals alone, but raised questions related to modernity, science, and even whether religion itself was viable. The question of authority and the infallibility of that authority led to the Roman Catholic Church's declaration of Papal Infallibility (1870). German Higher Criticism raised major questions about the reliability of Scripture, and revealed hidden fractures within Protestant religion, causing a growing debate among denominations and seminaries, and increasing the modernist-Fundamentalist debate.

Of major importance was the question of modernity. The Roman Catholic Church dealt with the issue of modernity by adopting the Syllabus of Errors in 1870. With Protestants, and especially American Protestants, it was not that simple. The debate over science, Biblical authority, and modernity continued from 1870 through the 1920s.

With the renewed interest in the Bible and its study following the Second Great Awakening, coupled with new millennial interests as an outgrowth of the end of the Civil War, conservative Christianity was challenged by German Higher Criticism after the 1870s. The "old lights" of the Northeast, influenced by Deism, Congregationalism, and the Enlightenment had already moved in the direction of natural inspiration with regards to the Bible and had, for the most part, rejected special inspiration. Unitarianism and Transcendentalism both rejected the Bible as an authority. Textual Criticism applied Enlightenment ideas to the Biblical texts and raised issues of reliability. Conservatives responded with an entrenched position on the inerrancy of the Bible, defending its authority strenuously against the charges leveled against it. The Scopes Trial was the battleground over this issue. Either man's origins were as the Bible declared or as Darwin surmised, but both could not be correct.

These questions raised by Higher Criticism about the Bible, coupled with Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859, threatened a major shift in thinking which either had to be accepted or opposed by religion. Liberal and conservative theology both emerged from the ongoing debates with very clear positions. But the issues were not nearly as simplistic as they appear. Battlegrounds emerged in unlikely places during the concluding decades of the 1800s and the early 1900s. Schools like Harvard, Yale, and Princeton found themselves the center of debate, and new schools emerged to defend both conservative and liberal theology. Both sides responded to the issues, but the liberals tended to respond to the social, moral, and cultural needs as well as the theological issues, leaving the impression that their theology was the more intellectual response to the issues of modernity. The Social Gospel movement at the end of the nineteenth century was one of the responses of liberal theology, and continued to be argued against for decades by Fundamentalists, whose new eschatology amounted to an abandonment of the world rather than an attempt to save it.⁷¹

Conservatives organized prophetic Bible conferences around the new Darby interpretation of the end times with one of the most famous at Niagara, New York. Darby's roots were strongly Calvinistic and both Presbyterian and Baptist attendees came every year for this well known meeting designed to study Bible prophecy. Many pastors, including evangelist and pastor, Dwight L. Moody of Chicago participated in these meetings which were destined to influence the thinking of the growing Fundamentalist

⁷¹ After the Scopes Trial the issue of modernity and intellectualism became a major issue, with Fundamentalism repeatedly branded as "anti-intellectual" and "antimodern."

movement. In fact, many historians define the beginning of the movement with this creation of an interdenominational group of preachers for these annual meetings. The end time studies grew into a widespread understanding of God's plan for the ages and they gradually became alarmed at the apostasy and heresy present in religious denominations and how far their culture had wandered from Christian principles. They believed the cure was preaching directly from the Bible. To train preachers to preach from the Bible, schools sprang up all over the country, including the famed Moody Bible College in Chicago.

These new ideas found resonance in an associate of Moody's, Cyrus I. Scofield. Scofield became Darby's strongest supporter and fueled the fledgling Fundamentalist movement with the development of the Scofield Study Bible, which he created using the leading conservative theologians from a variety of denominations, to produce study notes as part of the Biblical text. Among the teachings included in Scofield's Bible were the Gap Theory, a compromise with evolution, and Dispensationalism including the premillennial rapture theory proposed by Darby. For more than a century the Scofield Bible became the established source of teaching materials for conservative Christians, and while not the first Bible with notes, launched a series of study Bibles up to the present day. Scofield's notes gave authority and credibility to Darby's teachings, making it the established prophetic outlook for most conservative Christians.⁷²

⁷² Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 808-811; Note: Dispensationalism proposes that God's plan for the ages consist of eight distinct periods in which God works with man in a particular way with respect to his sins and man's responsibility for them. The most controversial part of the model concerns the church age which is considered to be a

Dispensationalism had a dramatic effect on church teachings. It provided the impetus for conservative Christians to escape the charges of the liberal churches with regard to the Social Gospel. Christians were not here to save the world, but to save souls out of the world. Also, having a time line of the ages increased the urgency to evangelize the lost and get missionaries to the ends of the earth.

Dispensationalism gave the new movement its sense of interdenominational cohesion, but at the same time caused rifts within older denominations. In older denominations where the liberal-conservative factions were found in larger numbers, conservatives tended to side with Dispensationalism and liberals to disagree. Princeton became the bastion of conservative thought from the 1880s and Biblical inerrancy became the rallying cry of the Fundamentalist controversy largely due to who occupied the school presidency. Princeton, influenced by Edwards and his descendents remained conservative up into the twentieth century. Educational institutions became battle grounds as they divided along lines of liberal and conservative theology since most of the oldest schools such as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton were started as seminaries to train clergy. Schools promoting liberal theology also opened the door to teaching of evolution.

The final straw in the liberal-conservative controversy might have been a survey published in part in 1916 and then fully in 1921 which found that many American young people who went away to college and studied in liberal schools and were exposed to the

parenthesis in God's greater program with Israel, in which God allows the Gentiles a season of repentance prior to the end time events of Revelation.

new science, new theology, and new ways of thinking came away losing their faith in the Bible and God. Conservatives were prompted by this study to make their stand over the inerrancy of the Bible and in particular its teachings concerning creation. William Jennings Bryan quickly became the orator and hero of those upset by the teaching of Darwinism and spoke extensively, working to get states to adopt laws to prevent evolution education. Dayton, Tennessee was destined to be that place where the line was drawn in the sand.⁷³

From the earliest settlements on American soil through the First and Second Great Awakenings to the founding of Christian Fundamentalism, religion has held a central place in American history. Religious liberty within the context of a new country and a diversity of people and ideas, gave religion a definite militancy which has shaped and changed its beliefs over time with respect to events, teachings, movements, and creeds. Central to these great movements, militancy became the definer of Fundamentalism in a way that explains much of what happened with the movement at Dayton and beyond.

⁷³ James H. Leuba, *The Belief in God and Immortality*. (Chicago and London: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1921).

“Well, I do not think that it is necessarily the case that science and religion are natural opposites. In fact, I think that there is a very close connection between the two. Further, I think that science without religion is lame and, conversely, that religion without science is blind. Both are important and should work hand-in-hand. It seems to me that whoever doesn't wonder about the truth in religion and in science might as well be dead.”⁷⁴ ~ Albert Einstein~

CHAPTER FOUR

THE WAR BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE

The relationship between religion and science is both old and controversial. How man should define and relate the two has been debated for centuries. Through history these two fields have been cast in various ways through a number of discourses, of which the conflict theory is but one. Unfortunately, the conflict theory became the option of the Fundamentalist in the Scopes Trial in 1925 and since. In the face of other Evangelicals who sought to approach the scientific questions of origins from another viewpoint, this became a defining moment for Fundamentalists. Their viewpoint then raised many questions that needed answers, but served to re-enforce the militant positions on social, political, and educational issues throughout their history.

The promotion for the Scopes Trial by both Clarence Darrow and William Jennings Bryan portrayed the coming trial as some epic battle between religion and science. Science and particularly evolution was the battlefield where the conflict would take place, and so some understanding of the history and nature of that conflict, or at least the discourse which made it so, and how it relates to the Scopes Trial is essential. The teaching of evolution, a scientific subject, became the object over which the

⁷⁴ Peter A. Bucky & Allen G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*. (Kansas City: Andrews and McMeel. 1992), 85-87.

Fundamentalists chose to engage in a battle at Dayton, Tennessee, placing a question mark on both Fundamentalism and science which has never been erased. As previously noted, the changing nature of religion in America ran on a parallel course with economic, cultural, and social developments, through periods of great uncertainty, growth, retractions, wars, and a multitude of other influences which defy simplistic explanations. The troubles raised many questions in the minds of Americans, both religious and nonreligious concerning the validity of their beliefs that America was exceptional and that divine providence was responsible for the blessings they had long enjoyed.

The first mention of the exceptional nature of the American “experiment” came from the travels and writings of Alexis de Tocqueville, in the early days of the republic. He argued that American democracy was unique in the world, and may have been the first to tie the political with the religion. He maintained that American goodness was directly related to American religion. From those statements, the idea of American Exceptionalism and divine providence progressively became a concept which scholars and politicians debated for decades. Like the model of American Exceptionalism, models help us to envision possible explanations for a relationship, and various models of the relationship between religion and science do the same. While most models have strong and weak aspects, they provide understanding of those who propose and hold them, and at least some understanding to the times in which they are formed.⁷⁵

⁷⁵ Alexis de Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Edited by Gerald Bevan. London: Penguin Books. 2003.

Historians of science, when seeking to explain the complicated relationship between science and religion, consider one or more of three different models, and each is defended with examples from history. First, some scientists consider science and religion as complementary. These are simply two ways of knowing and each complements the other. The example most often cited is that of Johannes Kepler, who in his discovery of the three laws of planetary motion, recognized God as a geometric designer of the universe, and saw no conflict between the laws of science and the laws of God. A more common view is that science and religion exist in two completely separate spheres and deal with distinctly different kinds of knowledge and should never intersect. Scientists often consider Gregor Mendel's work with heredity and the pea as an example of this benign coexistence.

In the third instance, science and religion are in conflict or at war and this third model is the one most often employed by Christian Fundamentalism; it was in full form at the Scopes Trial at Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925. Adopting the language of war during the trial, Fundamentalists adapted this model to demonize science and wage war with modernity in general and evolution in particular. The crisis model would continue to be the method of choice to engage in cultural warfare well into the twenty-first century.⁷⁶

Fundamentalism adopted not only the model but a language of war beginning in the early decades of the twentieth century. While other Evangelicals sought middle ground, they responded to the oratory of men like Darrow and Bryan at Dayton, to enlist

⁷⁶ Edward J. Larsen, *The Creation-Evolution Debate: Historical Perspectives*. (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2007), 37-38.

legions in their army to tremendous effect. A closer historical look at the roots of this conflict thesis and the historic instances that serve as its foundation will prove helpful in understanding the events of the Scopes Trial and its aftermath. This conflict did not start with the Scopes Trial, and its history provides the reader with both a rationale and a motivation for understanding those who would use the crisis model so effectively in shaping a fledgling religious movement.

While minor issues had erupted between religion and science prior to the 1500s, none had more effect than the publication of Copernicus' *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* (*On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres*) in 1543. Not only did the proposal of a heliocentric universe create a revolution in the scientific world, but it precipitated the first major crisis between science and religion. The discovery is termed a revolution because only a few times in the history of man have discoveries been of such import as to shift the entire paradigm of how one thought about an entire body of knowledge in a particular subject.⁷⁷

For centuries, men of science and men of faith agreed with the Ptolemaic model that claimed the earth as stationary and the center of the universe. Like any model, it had problems and did not fully explain every detail. By the time of Copernicus, changes were needed and especially in relation to the calendar, which due to the faulty model became increasingly problematic. Copernicus was a cleric in the Roman Catholic Church, and

⁷⁷Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Copernican Revolution: Planetary Astronomy in the Development of Western Thought*. (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.) Kuhn first coined the phrase "paradigm shift" to indicate the importance of a scientific revolution. Copernicus dared to challenge settled scientific belief which had been held for centuries and disputed established theological truth that the earth was stationary and the center of the universe. The result was a major change in worldview.

while working in rural Poland, not only engaged in his church duties but as a hobby studied astronomy. While working on the corrections for the calendar he developed his heliocentric theory which, after his death, would stun the world and institute a new age of scientific inquiry.

Copernicus's work was valuable on two fronts. First, he bravely presented a theory which discounted the greatest Greek philosopher, Aristotle, and the greatest astronomer, Ptolemy, and challenged centuries of popular thought held sacred by the Church. Indications are that he was more afraid of the ridicule of his peers than the threat of imprisonment by the Church. Second, he sought to work from first principles in performing his research, and along with the invention of the printing press, these ideas and practices might be the two greatest steps in the process of scientific inquiry.⁷⁸

Copernicus was well aware that his findings challenged scientific truth, but he also was not ambivalent to the reaction of the Church. As a cleric to challenge long-held beliefs regarding man's place in the universe and the earth as the center of God's creation were grounds for charges of heresy and went to the very heart of religious belief. These concerns were no doubt in the mind of Copernicus when he delayed printing his book for more than 31 years and in fact held the newly published manuscript on his deathbed, just minutes before expiring. As he anticipated, the astronomer was subject to ridicule and embarrassment for years after his death by the Church, and his book remained on the Index of Banned Books until 1758, long after Galileo, Kepler, and Newton had proven beyond any question that Copernicus was correct. His peers, most of whom read the book

⁷⁸ Jack Repcheck, *Copernicus' Secret*. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2007), 194-195

and pondered his ideas, were slow to accept the changes Copernicus proposed for fear of religious consequences.⁷⁹

In his last days Copernicus had many issues with the Church including charges that he had been tainted by the Protestant teachings of the Lutherans. The fact that he published the book at all was due to the intervention of scholars in Germany who were no doubt Lutheran and came to encourage his publication with, at least in the beginning, the blessing of Lutheran leadership. However, his religious opponents were not limited to the Roman Catholic Church, but included Reformers as well. Far from being a supporter of Copernicus, Martin Luther warned:

People gave ear to an upstart astrologer who strove to show that the earth revolves, not the heavens or the firmament, the sun and the moon.... This fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy; but sacred Scripture tells us [Joshua 10:13] that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth.⁸⁰

John Calvin also joined the condemnation in his *Commentary on Genesis* by condemning all who claimed the earth not to be the center of the universe. In a reference from the ninety-first Psalm he called Copernicus by name: “Who will venture to place the authority of Copernicus above that of the Holy Spirit?”⁸¹ Despite early opposition from Protestants, by the time of Isaac Newton’s discoveries Protestants came to accept Copernican theories.

⁷⁹ Owen Gingerich, *The Book Nobody Read: Chasing the Revolutions of Nicolaus Copernicus*. (New York: Penguin Books, 2004). Gingerich, using inscriptions and notes from various astronomers who were contemporary with Copernicus and Kepler argues that the work was widely read if not openly acknowledged as fact by other astronomers of the day.

⁸⁰ Andrew D. White, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*. (Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1896), 126; *Ibid.* 127.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 128

The real angst of the Church played out in this matter in its treatment of Galileo. Galileo chose to champion the Copernican view of the universe while most astronomers, philosophers, and clerics still held strongly, at least in public, to the old geocentric view. His support became publicly known after 1610 and he was soon denounced to the Inquisition. In 1616, although he was cleared of wrong doing, the Roman Catholic Church condemned heliocentrism as “false and contrary to the Scriptures”⁸² and gave a stern warning to Galileo to cease his vocal support for its teachings. Galileo promised to comply, but later he defended Copernicus’s views in his famous work, *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, in 1632. For this he was retried by the Inquisition, and found guilty of the suspicion of heresy. He was forced to recant and spent the remainder of his life under house arrest.⁸³

In his defense Galileo attempted to explain that science and religion were separate spheres, but the war unleashed on the Copernican Theory and Galileo were proofs that the Church had chosen the conflict route, attempting to force science to conform to the Bible. The Galileo affair is significant because Protestants used it also to good effect in their battles against Catholics in the eighteenth century. Enlightenment leaders turned the weapon on Christianity in general as proof for their anti-clericalism.

A major challenge to religion and science came with the Enlightenment and rekindled conflict that lasted into the twentieth century. A definition of the Enlightenment is difficult because it was more of a change in values than an embodiment of ideas. Its

⁸² Michael Sharratt, *Galileo: Decisive Innovator*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1994), 127-131.

⁸³ Maurice A. Finocchiaro, *The Galileo Affair: A Documentary History*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 1989),47.

core values involved a questioning of traditional institutions, morals, and customs and embraced reason and rationality. Most scholars agree that from this breakthrough in critical thinking a number of benefits to mankind ensued including freedom, democracy, and reason as primary values within society and that great changes resulted when reason came to be applied to every problem.⁸⁴

As Gertrude Himmelfarb argues in *Roads to Modernity* the Enlightenment bore different fruits in France, England, and America. While France moved towards anti-clericalism and anti-religion, England's sensibilities turned to social change and dealing with the poor. Methodism grew in numbers and in scope during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with social reform gaining credibility. America's Enlightenment bore fruit, as Himmelfarb argues, in its democratic and religious ideas. Many of the Founding Fathers are considered Enlightenment figures, and in particular the deism of men like Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Paine reflect an enlightened view of religion. Grounded in "Old Light" Puritanism, both Unitarianism and Liberalism represented Enlightenment views applied to religion.⁸⁵

The Enlightenment may have been the vehicle which transferred the conflict between science and religion to the new world. Jefferson and Franklin were both scientists and often entered into religious debates. After the First Great Awakening the change in Puritan theology, as noted previously, gave rise to new thinking involving Unitarian and Deistic beliefs, and "old light" Puritans eventually accepted natural

⁸⁴ Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation*. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company. 1996).

⁸⁵ Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The Roads to Modernity*. (New York: Vintage Books, 2004).

interpretation over literal interpretation of the Bible, allowing for more liberal views of science, including theistic evolution.

Since science was based on rational empiricism and religion on faith and metaphysics, Enlightenment ideas were more at home with science than with religion. Religion at its core placed faith and belief above rationalism and reason and so immediately became suspect, deepening the divide and making much of the conflict. Even religion as an academic subject suffered great debates during the period.

Out of the Enlightenment, the concept of modernity raised issues about man's progress and the practicality of religion as a pursuit for a vocation or as a personal choice. The French Revolution in particular took on a distinctly anti-clerical, anti-religious overtone which influenced other countries including a small cadre of thinkers in the young United States.⁸⁶

From these early battles various views developed which resonated into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in America. Scientific inquiry continued to expand and as men like Sir Isaac Newton confirmed the early works of Copernicus and Galileo, science took on a new respectability. The image of conflict between the two also grew, with many on both the religious and the scientific sides accepting the conflict argument as the natural form of discourse between science and religion. By the mid-1800s science had developed into a seemingly unassailable position, giving the perception that it embodied truth and that religion was nothing more than a collection of fables.

⁸⁶ Unitarians and Transcendentalists never comprised a significant percentage of religious followings in the United States and neither did the Religious Liberals.

The growth of the natural sciences brought new, although smaller, battles between science and religion in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, with the growing realization that the earth was much older than the 10,000 years proposed by many theologians. Religious scholars added the timeline of Bishop James Ussher to the texts of many Bibles during the period, which gave the creation timeline as occurring in 4004 B.C. and man's time since the creation as about 6,000 years.⁸⁷

The next major revolution occurred with the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859. His book is considered the foundational work on evolutionary biology. The ideas were not new and had been considered for several years before Darwin, but using research he gathered while working on the *H.M.S. Beagle* in the 1830s and further research Darwin produced another revolution in the world of science. In short, the book introduced the idea that populations evolved over time through a process he called natural selection. Darwin believed that the diversity of life was due to common descent through an evolutionary tree whereby all living organisms shared common ancestry.

Darwin's ideas were in direct conflict with the literal interpretation of the Bible inspired by the Protestant Reformation, and like the Copernican Revolution was the source of much debate well into the twentieth century. These two major paradigm shifts shared a common thread which serves to explain what theologians and some Christians found so objectionable about both theories, in that they both called into question the

⁸⁷ James Ussher, *Annals of the World: James Ussher's Classic Survey of World History. 1650*. Modern English republication, ed. Larry and Marion Pierce, (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2003).

nature of man as a special and unique creation of God. Theologians seeking to defend the existence of religious belief in a secular world realized that if they lost this particular battle to science the foundation of Christian belief was in serious jeopardy as well.

Among other major changes after the 1870s, the rise of Higher Criticism from Germany raised the stakes in the defense of the Bible against the encroachment of science, rationalism and reason. The practice of applying textual criticism to the Bible raised serious questions about many of the beliefs regarding the Bible's accuracy and authority. From the first major revolution in science with the Copernican publication to the new theories concerning man and his evolution, the attack on the Bible brought by Higher Criticism only heightened the crisis theory in the war between science and religion.

Due to the lack of original texts, lower textual criticism dealt with the comparison of the oldest extant writings of the New Testament books in order to find the truest and most original writings. This method was a common practice from ancient times and did not seriously challenge religious beliefs. It was the addition of Higher Criticism that raised the concerns of most conservative theologians and Christians.

Higher Criticism challenged the long held religious belief of the inspiration of Scriptures and applied reason to the Scriptural accounts by seeking to find outside collaboration to stories and events in the Bible. Those which could not be confirmed by other extant sources were deemed doubtful. A classic example would be a study of the first four books of the New Testament, the Synoptic Gospels, to determine if they agreed, and if not, whether there were reasons for the disagreement. Many times the Higher

Criticism contradicted church tradition or even the words of the Bible itself. For example, Higher Criticism would question the validity of the Gospel account of Jesus walking on the water in John 6:19.⁸⁸

Those committed to liberal theology did not find the application of Higher Criticism objectionable, but the more conservative Christians and especially Fundamentalists found the practice unacceptable and a major example of how Christian values were disappearing from American culture. It was also further reflection of the continued erosion of doctrinal belief from the Puritans, which they considered as the glory days of Christian America. From 1870 through the 1920s, Christians watched the religious landscape undergo attack after attack from liberalism and science, and they realized that a definitive stand needed to be made, which must be unequivocal in its militancy to awaken a constituency that was spiritually lethargic. Evolution and the public schools became the issue to enlist soldiers for the battle.

From the 1870s onward two distinct models were used to rectify science and religion on the one hand or to rally support against science on the other. The conflict theory itself came to life in two books published twenty-four years apart. The first book, *History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science*, written by John William Draper, appeared in 1870 and outlined the history of religion (mainly Catholic) and its warfare against science. Draper proposed the existence of an intrinsic intellectual conflict from the historical record of religion against the advancement of science. The book was mainly

⁸⁸ Ramsden Balmforth, *The New Testament in the Light of Higher Criticism*. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1905).

undertaken as a response to the Roman Catholic Church's adoption of the Syllabus of Errors, the church's response to modernity. In 1896 Andrew D. White produced his *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, in which he sought to address the restrictive forms of Christianity and its influence on scientific inquiry.

While modern historians have dismissed the conflict theory as a gross over simplification of a more complex relationship, the fact remains that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, these theories enjoyed great popularity and acceptance and provide insight into the mindset of the coming battle at Dayton, Tennessee, where the showdown over evolution would finally occur. The growing realization that science was gaining acceptance among the masses and that religion was losing ground caused great concern.

Of course, the conflict thesis was not the only model in use during these centuries, and neither was it solely the purview of religionists who used it to fight against the growing perceptions of science. Some scientists engaged in promoting other ways of rectifying the two fields by means of finding other approaches than declaring war on religion.⁸⁹

At least four compromises were offered to reconcile the creation account of Genesis with Darwin's theories. Theistic Evolution asserted that classical religious teachings about God are compatible with the modern beliefs of biological evolution. Promoted in the United States by Asa Gray, a Harvard scientist and one of America's best known botanists, the theory accepts the existence of God as creator of the material

⁸⁹ Edward J. Larson, *The Creation-Evolution Debate: Historical Perspectives*. (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2007), 40-41.

universe, but also as one who uses natural processes within that creation. Evolution is one of the Creator's tools in which the development of human life occurred. While not a scientific theory, theistic evolution rejected the conflict theory and allowed a compromise for Christians who believed in both science and theology. The concept is widely accepted among major denominations within Christianity and other religions as well.⁹⁰

Another compromise with evolutionary thinking was the Day-Age Theory of creation. Proponents argue that the days of creation contained in the Genesis account were not literal 24-hour days but geologic ages of undetermined length and that the sequence in Genesis is symbolic and a summary of creation events. The theory attempts to account for the vast differences between the 6,000 years creationists propose for the age of the earth and the 13.7 billion years proposed by scientists for the age of the universe and the 4.6 billion years for the age of the earth itself. This process of cosmic evolution rests upon a symbolic interpretation of Genesis and finds acceptance among both theistic evolutionists and progressive creationists.⁹¹

In his testimony at the Scopes Trial, Fundamentalist William Jennings Bryan mentioned the Day-Age Theory as a possible solution to the claims of science that the earth was billions of years old. Clarence Darrow seized on Bryan's mention of this theory to prove that while claiming to believe in literal interpretation that Christians in reality

⁹⁰ Kenneth B. Miller, *Perspectives on Evolving Creation*. (Grand Rapids: William B. Erdmans Publishing Company, 2003); Francis S. Collins. *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*. (New York: Simon & Shuster, 2006).

⁹¹ Ronald L. Numbers, *The Creationists: The Evolution of Scientific Creationism*. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1993).

interpreted the Bible in different ways and not always literally. As a result, Bryan's position was discredited, leaving a negative impression on Christian Fundamentalism.

The Gap Theory was an old earth creation theory that while accepting a literal 24-hour day of creation, posited that between the first and second verse of Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 were indications of a gap in time in which an original creation had existed and was destroyed, so that the creation of Genesis 1 was actually a re-creation which explained the advanced age of the earth. Like the Day-Age Theory, the Gap Theory was a direct response to the new field of geology, which proved the earth far older than the literal interpretation of the Bible allowed. Natural theology at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century considered science to be a second revelation alongside the Bible and many geologists, who were Christians, accepted the Gap Theory as a means of reconciling the two sides.⁹²

As a compromise, the Gap Theory gained a large following and wide acceptance from an unlikely source. Cyrus I. Scofield, an early leader of the Fundamentalist movement, included the Gap Theory as part of the extensive notes in his Scofield Study Bible. While a strong advocate for literal interpretation, his inclusion of the theory shows the unsettled nature of orthodox belief. Along with Bryan's testimony at Dayton, Tennessee, it illustrates something of the struggle among Christian theologians to come to terms with the new science arising from new discoveries which were coming to light on an almost daily basis. Along with Scofield's endorsement of Premillennial Dispensationalism, the Gap Theory became almost standard belief within

⁹² Ibid., 45-46.

Fundamentalism with few realizing the extent to which it compromised their claimed beliefs.⁹³

The fourth form of compromise between science and religion with respect to evolution was a series of writings called *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*, published from 1910 to 1915 and assembled by such famous Evangelical preachers as A. C. Dixon, pastor of the Moody Church in Chicago and editor of the publication, and Reuben Archer Torrey, international evangelist and pastor of The Church of the Open Door in Los Angeles. Financed by Lyman Stewart, co-founder of Union Oil Company, the essays were intended to define the orthodox beliefs of the Protestant Evangelical movement against the growth and encroachment of liberal theology and the growth of the Social Gospel Movement.⁹⁴

While the publications are widely believed to be the foundation for the Fundamentalist Movement, a survey of some writers raises doubts as to the veracity of this idea. The articles give a clear picture of the concerns faced by religion as it encountered the chaotic issues of a new century with articles dealing with higher criticism, liberal theology, socialism, philosophy, evolution, and various threats from other religions such as Catholicism, Adventism, Mormonism, and Christian Science, which they considered to be non-Orthodox.⁹⁵

⁹³ The Scofield Study Bible. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1917).

⁹⁴ *The Fundamentals*. 12 vols. (Chicago: Testimony Publishing Co., 1910-1915).

⁹⁵ George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991); George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Among the more interesting writings in the series were those by George Fredrick Wright, mentioned by Bryan in the Scopes Trial as one of two men who ascribed to the Day-Age Theory of evolution. Wright was a Congregationalist minister, theologian, and a geologist whose history as an evolutionist and friend of both Charles Darwin and Asa Gray placed him at an important nexus in the history of both science and religion. Wright had no problem reconciling his religious beliefs with theistic evolution, but his thoughts changed over time as he became more concerned with the place of orthodox Protestant theology in American history and as theological and evolutionary thought developed. With the death of Darwin and Gray, Wright lost much of the territory which he had staked out for himself as a theistic evolutionist which allowed him to hold to a belief in both God and science. He expressed a growing concern for the direction of neo-Darwinism with its application of Darwin's theories into areas where Darwin never ventured, and as a result Wright moved towards the conservative camp while holding tenaciously to what middle ground he could between belief and science.⁹⁶

Wright grew up surrounded by the evangelicalism which followed the Second Great Awakening and attended liberal Oberlin College during Charles Finney's tenure as its president. He was particularly interested in Finney's beliefs and natural theology. Finney's unconventional ideas, as previously noted, held that observable phenomenon from Christianity could foster belief and that God's intention with creation was "the good of all beings." Wright became a student of Finney's theology and defended him against

⁹⁶Peter Sachs Collopy, "George Frederick Wright and the Harmony of Science and Revelation". Honors Thesis, Berea, OH: Oberlin College, 2007.

other anti-evolutionists such as Charles Hodge, the noted president of Princeton Theological Seminary. In a letter to Asa Gray Wright expressed concern that the loudest voices in the creation-evolution debate came from the “the infidel class of Darwinian expositors (who) have had the ear of the public entirely too much, and have needlessly added to the alarm of orthodox people.” His answer to that was a series of articles defending the Gray position for theistic evolution as a viable alternative between faith and science.⁹⁷

Wright was driven out of the scientific establishment because of his views and because of the crisis stance of his contemporaries in geology. In addition, as Peter Collopy successfully argues, the death of Darwin and Gray made his presence in both the world of science and religion less tenable. His role changed and with the advent of the Neo-Darwinians the crisis theory returned to the forefront of the discussion, forcing Wright into a position of opposing evolution. Hence, he was enlisted to write against evolution in *The Fundamentals* but his position had not changed significantly. The field has merely left him standing alone without the cover of his previously staked out middle ground.⁹⁸

The proposal that *The Fundamentals* represent a compromise and are foundational to the establishment of Fundamentalism rests upon the inclusion of Wright and others who were not positioned in both science and religion as he was, but who would pose distinct problems for a new Fundamentalist movement. *The Fundamentals* then are more

⁹⁷ Asa Gray, *Letters of Asa Gray*. Edited by Jane Loring Gray. 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside, 1893–1894).

⁹⁸ Peter Sachs Collopy, "George Frederick Wright and the Harmony of Science and Revelation". Honors Thesis, Berea, OH: Oberlin College, 2007.

likely a definitive statement for the belief system of the wider Evangelical movement.

Many Evangelical leaders were interested in staking out these compromise positions with science and religion. A perusal of the 12 volumes of *The Fundamentals* finds that the vast majority of articles were not doctrinal in nature as many claim, but interpretational and several are related to Higher Criticism. Many authors wrote on subjects pertaining to the tremendous changes that were sweeping the religious and scientific world in the early decades of the twentieth century. The goal of defining religious orthodoxy would have been a worthy enterprise under such difficult conditions.

By the twentieth century the relationship between religion and science had further eroded as Evangelical and Fundamentalist churches moved to the center of controversy and adopted an antievolution position. With a growing sense that their beliefs were under attack, coupled with the economic and cultural chaos of the times and with the growing dominance of science in areas not only of biology, geology, cosmology, and psychology, it is not difficult to see that a move to lash out at these encroachments was on the horizon.

William Jennings Bryan began the process that would lead to the Scopes Trial by putting legal limits on the teaching of evolution in public schools by advocating for state laws which forbade the practice. A growing number of scientists, college professors, and even high school teachers were teaching the new science. An increasing number of young people from Christian homes came home from college with their faith shattered by

Darwinism and religious people of conscience were challenged to make a stand against science which also might involve a stand against modernity and change.⁹⁹

⁹⁹ Edward J. Larson, *The Creation-Evolution Debate: Historical Perspectives*.(Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2007), 43.

Revolution destroys the good with the bad. Evolution destroys the bad and favors the good. Revolution occurs again and again in the mind and heart of man. Evolution begins and ends the purposes of God.¹⁰⁰ ~Henry Fairfield Osborn~

CHAPTER FIVE

THE STATE OF TENNESSEE VERSUS SCOPES

In the early years of the 1920s the stage was set for a showdown over issues of modernity and whether humanity would embrace the new world of science, thought, and enlightenment, or pursue an antimodern, anti-intellectual course. It was not an accident that religion and science would be the battleground. Islam, like its Christian counterpart in the West, wrestled with many of the same issues. With the end of World War I and the fall of the Ottoman Empire, Muslims became less engaged with science and philosophy and gradually withdrew from many areas of learning where they had for many centuries had great influence. These two great monotheistic religions faced the same test, and the Muslims, which were for centuries the primary source people for scientific knowledge and philosophy, faced many of the same choices that faced Christianity and particularly American Christianity. That both dealt with such issues at the same time says much about the confusion and uncertainty of the early decades of the 1900s. Militancy and separatism, with both were viable options.

The Scopes Trial which became the center point for these issues promised to settle once and for all, at least in the minds to the two great protagonists William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow, the great questions of man's origins. The trial has

¹⁰⁰ Henry Fairfield Osborn, *Evolution and Religion in Education: Polemics of the Fundamentalist Controversy of 1922 to 1926*. (New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926).

been one of the great paradoxes of American history in which the event's location and actors were overshadowed by what happened there. It was the nexus of cultural, economic, scientific, and religious issues, some dating back to the founding of America and even beyond. A close examination of the trial and the surrounding activities will not only shed light on the historical and cultural conditions of the time, but more importantly, will indicate how religious militancy came to be the defining characteristic of the fledgling Christian Fundamentalism. The trial became the showcase for those who held to a literal interpretation of the Bible whose intent was to expose the fallacies of evolution and present the validity of their own beliefs. While their failure to accomplish their goals temporarily hurt the movement, the militancy learned from the experience became the signature characteristic of the future actions.¹⁰¹

For Fundamentalists, the 1920s posed a growing problem. On the one hand World War I exposed American soldiers to a world beyond the conservative, religious environment of their upbringing. Soldiers returned home with changed attitudes and more liberal ways of thinking and doing things. The awfulness of the "war to end all wars," which pitted Christians against Christian, raised serious questions about religion's ability to save the world. Soldiers' beliefs were challenged by the conflict and many returned home significantly changed by the experiences. On the other hand, great secular movements were sweeping the world. The Bolshevik Revolution was still fresh in the

¹⁰¹ Dr. Jon Butler, "The Surprise of Religion in America". Due West, South Carolina: The Joseph T. Stukes Lectures, Erskine College, March, 2010. Historians tend to view the Scopes Trial and its aftermath as the end of Christian Fundamentalism when in reality it was the beginning. Butler argues that Fundamentalists' reappearance as a political and religious power in the 1980s proves that the movement did not die after 1930 as many believed.

minds of many and “wars and rumors of wars” raised the specter of the end of the age for believers.¹⁰²

Militancy among Fundamentalists took two forms. First, they sought to prevent public schools and universities from teaching scientific theories that were incompatible with the traditional, literal interpretation of the Bible, and secondly, they worked to block the advancement of liberal theology and modern scholarship in churches. Of these two, the first is directly related to the Scopes Trial.¹⁰³

The education issue, which raised the prospect of young people losing their faith due to Darwinism in public schools, became a greater concern after a preliminary survey published by James H. Leuba in 1916, and then in a wider form in 1921. In the survey large numbers of young people were interviewed who returned home from college with their beliefs in God and the Bible shattered by the teachings of evolution. William Jennings Bryan began writing articles for The New York Times in 1921 and 1922 entitled “God and Evolution.” They were answered by Henry Fairfield Osborn, a noted evolutionary scientist and a member of the faculty at Columbia University, and started what was termed a “newspaper war.” The ensuing struggle quickly was framed as a war

¹⁰² While Christians have fought each other for centuries, World War I posed a particularly sensitive problem for the Roman Catholic Church which had members on both sides of the conflict. The Pope had to exercise great care in both words and actions; *Sergeant York*. Directed by Harold Hawkins. Performed by Alvin York. 1941. The movie depicts the struggles of a young Fundamentalist soldier as he struggles with the religious issues of the war of particularly with the fact that Christians killed Christians.

¹⁰³ Sydney E. Ahlstrom. *A Religious History of the American People*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 909.

between religion and science, and raised the concerns of Christians all across the country that they were losing their children to godless science.¹⁰⁴

Bryan, a three time presidential candidate, was not a latecomer to the evolution debate. His call for public education to align science teaching with the Bible resembles the Bryan who in 1896 battled Wall Street during the Great Depression of 1893-1897 on behalf of farmers and debtors. He was the consummate crusader. His demand for the direct election of senators and his assistance in women's suffrage are great examples of Bryan's style. While he did not start movements, Bryan came to support and defend them, putting all the force of his powerful oratory behind his actions. Similarly, while he did not invent the antievolution movement, his support helped move it into the center of the fight for Fundamentalism and set the standard for how it would come to adopt militancy as its strongest method of operation.¹⁰⁵

Bryan's oratory successfully adopted the language of war to the prevailing conflict and so demonized science as the enemy of religion that since the trial at Dayton, Tennessee, no one has been able to change the image. His declarations concerning the inspiration of the Bible in *The Fundamentals* are classic examples of using issues to bolster support for a cause. "The Bible is either the Word of God or merely a manmade

¹⁰⁴ James H. Leuba. *The Belief in God and Immortality: A Psychological, Anthropological, and Statistical Study*. (Boston: Sherman, French, and Co., 1916, 1921); Henry Fairfield Osborn. *Evolution and Religion in Education: Polemics of the Fundamentalist Controversy of 1922 to 1926*. (New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), 1-10.

¹⁰⁵ Jeffrey P. Moran. *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents*. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2002), 13.

book.....When all the miracles and all the supernatural are eliminated from the Bible it becomes a scrap of paper.”¹⁰⁶

Bryan, a Presbyterian, believed that politics and religion were inseparable and worked for political reform that would move man closer to God’s vision of earthly perfection. Initially, he accepted the Darwinian thesis as true, holding a Theistic Evolutionary position, that God used processes to create life. But the chaotic times, and especially the inhumanity of World War I, drove him to the antievolutionary position, and its crusade fit well within his vision.¹⁰⁷

Bryan effectively used his oratory and beliefs about Darwinism to connect Darwin’s ideas about survival of the fittest to German’s military mobilization and militarization in Europe and a decline in morals and loss of culture at home in the United States. He blamed evolution for the horrific war. Through his readings he believed the Germans had adapted the Darwinian Theory of the survival of the fittest to their military strategy, and after the war he gradually turned away from his acceptance of evolution as anything but an excuse to wage war. With the catastrophe of the war fresh on the minds of most Americans, his oratory served the purpose of uniting patriotism with the Fundamentalist cause. As he traveled across the country parents shared with him the result of their children’s shattered faith and beliefs, already documented by Leuba’s

¹⁰⁶ *The Fundamentals*. 12 vols. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Co., Forum 70 (July, 1923): 1666, 1675.

¹⁰⁷ William Jennings Bryan and Mary Baird Bryan, *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan*. (Chicago: John C. Winston Co.,1925), 44-48.

survey, these insights fired him with the realization that Darwinism was winning the day against faith.¹⁰⁸

Many Fundamentalists shared Bryan's connection of evolution with Germany. Billy Sunday, the famous Fundamentalist evangelist, preaching during the war said, "If you turn hell upside down you will find 'Made in Germany' stamped on the bottom!"¹⁰⁹ Added to the sense of patriotism was the realization among theologians that Higher Criticism was of German origin, and this served to join Fundamentalists of all persuasions into a joint crusade against evolution.

As evolution replaced modernism the battle for Fundamentalists shifted from denominational fights to the public schools. "The teaching of Evolution," complained Evangelist T. T. Martin in *Hell and the High Schools*, "is being drilled into our boys and girls in our high schools during the most susceptible, dangerous age of their lives."¹¹⁰ Fundamentalists drew the first line in the sand and decided to take a militant stand for their beliefs at the schoolhouse door.

The first legislation to ban the teaching of evolution was considered in Kentucky in 1921 and 1922, and came on the heels of the prohibition success that attempted forced compliance after realizing that men do not have to ability to control their own urges.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 479.

¹⁰⁹ Quoted in George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 142.

¹¹⁰ T. T. Martin, *Hell and the High Schools: Christ or Evolution: Which?* (Kansas City, Mo.: Western Baptist Publishing Co., 1923); Edward J. Larson. "Before the Crusade: Evolution in American Secondary Education Before 1920," *Journal of the History of Biology*. 20 (Spring, 1987): 89-114. Evolution and education's impact on faith was not considered a threat prior to the 1920s because so few American teenagers were able to attend high school. Less than 5% of high school aged students attended. By 1920 the numbers had grown from 200,000 in the late 19th century to more than 2 million in 1920. High schools and education became a focus of educational and social concern.

Legislation of morality became a natural fit for Fundamentalists as other states followed suit. Although Kentucky's law failed to pass on a slim margin, the idea spread to Oklahoma, North Carolina, and Bryan's adopted state of Florida.¹¹¹

In January, 1925 a Primitive Baptist representative named John Butler proposed a ban on the teaching of evolution in the state of Tennessee with criminal penalties for any teacher who violated the law. The bill passed the Tennessee House by a wide margin only to bog down in the Senate. Antievolutionist preachers like Billy Sunday came to Tennessee to support the bill. Senators distributed the latest antievolution speeches of Bryan. The law passed and was signed by Governor Austin Peay on March 23, 1925. While many of the legislators and the governor did not expect the law to be enforced, reasons for its passage rested in the immense popular support raised by the Fundamentalists and the relative quiet of the bill's opponents. Public opinion and William Jennings Bryan's fiery speeches made voting against the bill unpopular. The governor and legislators hoped passage would quiet the growing agitation and militancy of the antievolutionists.¹¹²

Instead of quieting the agitation the passage only fanned the flames. Letters to the editor in support of the law from mothers protesting that their children were taught to distrust the Bible were met with a barrage of letters, depictions, and editorials denouncing the Butler Act even from Tennessee. North-South sentiments were aroused as many from the North wrote letters, editorials, and printed cartoons depicting Tennessee's legislators

¹¹¹ Frank R. Kent, "Evolution War Similar to Wet and Dry Fight," *Baltimore Sun*, 14 July 1925; Larson, Edward A. *Trial and Error: The American Controversy Over Creation and Evolution*. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 35-36.

¹¹² Joseph Wood Krutch, "Tennessee: Where Cowards Rule," *Nation*, 15 July 1925, 88-89.

as representative of their backwards “ape relatives.” The Chicago Tribune posited that teaching about the “flat earth theory” was only a matter of time.¹¹³

In New York, the newly formed American Civil Liberties Union carefully watched the events surrounding the Butler Act. Formed during World War I as a reaction to President Woodrow Wilson’s use of the Espionage and Sedition Acts to arrest and detain disloyal Americans, actions in Tennessee resembled the loyalty oaths required of teachers during the Wilson era that threatened their civil rights. Based on American Civil Liberties Union founder, Roger Baldwin’s appraisal of the Act, both freedom of speech and personal civil rights were at issue. Baldwin decided to launch a test case against the “monkey law” and posted advertisements in Tennessee papers for a willing respondent.

The only respondent to the American Civil Liberties Union’s ad was from the town of Dayton, Tennessee. City fathers saw the challenge as an opportunity to bolster their sagging economy and answered the advertisement, not realizing the negative connotation that would be forever attached to their small town. They convinced a young, first year, general science teacher named John Scopes to stand trial, and unwittingly he signed on to the idea. As a general science teacher, Scopes did not teach biology, but had on at least one occasion substituted for the current teacher, giving a review using the current state issued biology text. After examining the text book from which Scopes had conducted the review, the head of the school board, who was also a licensed constable,

¹¹³ Mrs. E. P. Blair, letter to the editor, *Nashville Tennessean*, 16 Mar. 1925, 4; Editorial, *Chicago Tribune* (n.d.), reprinted in *Nashville Tennessean*, 20 Mar. 1925, 4.

arrested him and called the authorities. At the same time he contacted the American Civil Liberties Union to volunteer as the test case against the Butler Law.

Scopes' own testimony as to why he agreed to be the defendant is more revealing. He saw himself as acting in the cause of freedom against a bad law and he "did little more than sit proxy in freedom's chair."¹¹⁴ Scopes testifies that the two men who had the greatest influence on his life were his father and Clarence Darrow. His father taught him to stand up for what he believed in and Darrow assured Scopes that standing up for one's beliefs as a man of conscience was a worthwhile endeavor and that he could do no less in the face an unjust law.

The American Civil Liberties Union wanted to defend the case along the narrow front of academic freedom. The fact that the leaders in Dayton wanted all the publicity they could get meant the case would have much greater repercussions. As Scopes attests in his autobiography, the issue at Dayton was not whether evolution was true or not, but whether the state of Tennessee had the power to control what children were taught. The limiting of the human mind was at issue.¹¹⁵

William Jennings Bryan signed on to lead the prosecution and changed the stakes of the entire proceeding. Encouraged by William Bell Riley, head of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association (WCFA), and others, Bryan immediately introduced

¹¹⁴ John T. Scopes & James Pressley, *Center of the Storm: Memoirs of John T. Scopes*. (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winton. 1967), 9-10.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 65.

religion into the proceedings. On the eve of the trial he asserted that the whole issue came down to the question: “Is there a God?”¹¹⁶

When Clarence Darrow heard that Bryan had signed for the prosecution, he decided to volunteer to join the defense team for Scopes. Later Darrow would declare that after hearing Bryan had volunteered that “at once I wanted to go. To me it was perfectly clear that the proceedings bore little resemblance to a court case, but I realized there was no limit to the mischief that might be accomplished unless the country was aroused to the evil at hand.”¹¹⁷ Immediately upon wiring Scopes of his willingness to serve, he also released the telegram to the press creating a firestorm.

The American Civil Liberties Union planned to retain Bainbridge Colby, a New York attorney, who had followed Bryan as Secretary of State, and when the case reached the Supreme Court, as they anticipated it would, Charles Evan Hughes would represent Scopes. Due to reservations by Scopes based on how Colby would be perceived in rural Tennessee, he insisted on Darrow. “It was going to be a down-in-the-mud fight and I felt the situation demanded an Indian fighter rather than someone who had graduated from the proper military academy.”¹¹⁸ In at least two instances the American Civil Liberties Union tried to change Scopes’ mind and retain more prominent counsel, including two former presidential candidates, but Scopes held out for Darrow. The American Civil Liberties Union realized they had lost control of the case even before the trial began.

¹¹⁶ *Baltimore Evening Sun*. “Issue Remains Clouded on Eve of Scopes Trial.” July 9, 1925: 1.

¹¹⁷ Clarence Darrow, *The Story of My Life*. (New York: Scribner's, 1932).249.

¹¹⁸ John T. Scopes & James Pressley. *Center of the Storm: Memoirs of John T. Scopes*. (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston. 1967), 70.

Clarence Darrow came to Dayton with the baggage of recently defending and preventing a death sentence for two notorious killers in Chicago. Nathan Leopold, a 19 year old University of Chicago graduate, and Richard Loeb, 18, and the youngest graduate on record from the University of Michigan, were from wealthy families and charged with the thrill killing of 14 year-old Bobby Franks purely for the excitement. Darrow had them plead guilty and spent twelve hours in his summation designed to soften the heart of the judge and build public sympathy for the young men. His defense of their actions based on their environment and lack of parental supervision and training won the judge's heart. They received a life sentence in place of the death penalty. His reputation as America's foremost defense attorney and the notoriety in the Leopold-Loeb case were the main reason Scopes insisted on accepting Darrow's offer.¹¹⁹

Darrow had grown up in Ohio and his mother's and father's families had deep roots in Puritan New England. His father was commonly called the "village infidel" because of his antireligious tirades and his mother was a staunch feminist. While Darrow attended the Methodist Allegheny College and Michigan Law School, he graduated from neither. He was admitted to the bar in 1878. He was influenced early in life not only by his father's agnosticism, but read after and often listened to such noted atheists as Robert Ingersoll. Darrow's prejudice against religion knew no bounds and he sought out opportunities to debunk holders of religious belief.

¹¹⁹ Arthur Weinberg, Editor. *Attorney For The Damned: Clarence Darrow in the Courtroom*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 16-88.

Anticipating that Bryan planned to make the Scopes Trial about religion, Darrow saw this as his chance to challenge Bryan to a face-to-face fight. From the moment of Darrow's inclusion on the panel, he controlled the event, even with the presence of other more widely known attorneys serving with him.

Those serving on the defense team were some of the most able barristers in the U. S. including Dudley Field Malone, Arthur Garfield Hays, and John Randolph Neal. Darrow's prejudices against religion and his past reputation put off many of his fellow defense attorneys and neither he nor Bryan considered the trial a test case. Rather they saw it as a platform from which to present their views on religion and manipulate an audience.¹²⁰

The initial strategy of the American Civil Liberties Union was to get the Scopes Trial moved to the federal courts. With the high emotions driving the religious side of the trial, Dayton promised to be a fiasco, American Civil Liberties Union wanted to avoid at all costs. In addition, a federal court would be cheaper and would test the constitutionality of the Act and not Scopes' guilt. Darrow reluctantly agreed to accept this strategy and did everything in his power to accomplish it. The only problem was Bryan's presence. The public outcry for Bryan to defend Fundamentalism made it impossible for any judge to move the case to federal jurisdiction, and out of state hands, and so the motion was denied.¹²¹

¹²⁰Edward J. Larson, *Summer For The Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion*. (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1997), 98-103.

¹²¹John T. Scopes & James Pressley. *Center of the Storm: Memoirs of John T. Scopes*. (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston. 1967), 77-78.

By July 10, 1925, the date set for the trial, the atmosphere in Dayton was charged. In the days leading up to the start of the trial, a circus atmosphere took over the town. In Scopes' words: "from the beginning to the end of the test case, Ringling Brothers or Barnum and Bailey would have been pressed hard to produce more acts, more sideshows, and freaks than Dayton had."¹²² Since H. L. Mencklen of the Baltimore Evening Sun had christened the proceedings the "Monkey Trial", this motif followed the set up of the event with every type of merchandising of the monkey theme one could imagine.

When Bryan arrived in Dayton on Tuesday, July 8, the demeanor of the place took on a more serious note, with many of the monkey motifs taken down and religious posters going up. The people replaced monkey business with God's business as the trial was set to begin in three days. Large crowds met him at the depot and social events featuring the "Great Commoner" were unlike any seen in Dayton before or after the trial.

The eve of the trial on Thursday found Dayton filled with people from all walks of life and of every religious and non-religious persuasion. Cars bearing signs which read "Evolution Special" and "Monkeyland Bound" filled every available space. But the number of regular tourists was relatively small, with the majority of the crowd coming to the trial composed of an assortment of evangelists, street vendors, and media. Many set up venues on the street to preach and sing or sell their wares. Only about 500 people actually stayed in Dayton for the trial and more than half of those were the media. Live

¹²² Ibid., 77.

monkeys were brought to the event and all across the Southeast zoos noted that their primate exhibits were popular as attendance increased.¹²³

The first day of the trial, Friday, July 10, opened with a long prayer by a Fundamentalist minister and directed at the defense. Most of the day's activities were taken up with mundane matters in which the indictment was certified and a jury was selected and seated. Neither Darrow nor Bryan tipped their hand to suggest their strategy. In the final days Bryan had altered his grandiose plan of having a war between religion and evolution because he could not find reputable expert witnesses to testify to the fallacies of Darwin's theories. He decided instead to argue based on the Tennessee law that had been broken.¹²⁴

The defense had the harder task. The last thing the American Civil Liberties Union wanted was an acquittal. After all, its original goal was to take the case to the U. S. Supreme Court in hopes of a ruling which would apply nationally and stop the states from individually adopting such laws against evolution. They hoped to be able, even with the majority of Tennesseans against the law, to argue that it was unwise and went against most trained scientists' beliefs. They would also submit testimony to its acceptance by many more liberal Christians who found evolution acceptable and not contradictory to their beliefs. They intended to show that only Fundamentalists with their narrow, literal

¹²³ Edward J. Larson, *Summer For The Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion*. (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1997), 147.

¹²⁴ Edward J Larson. *Trial and Error: The American Controversy Over Creation and Evolution*. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 63-64.

interpretations found it incompatible with the Bible. Their purpose was both educational and legal.¹²⁵

On Day Two the Scopes defense team presented a motion to kill the indictment on the grounds that the law under which he was charged was unconstitutional. Over the next several days they presented minor arguments about the clarity or form of the law but their major argument lay in the Butler Act being against the separation of church and state.¹²⁶

Darrow, in his opening arguments, began by raising the constitutionality of the Butler Act because it enshrined into the law the Fundamentalist view of the Scriptures, which violated the First Amendment's prohibition of the establishment of any religion. Darrow related the Butler Act to religious fanaticism in the past in which people attempted to enshrine their particular views with militant acts like the antievolution bill, drawing the applause of the crowd with his oratory:

Ignorance and fanaticism is ever busy and needs feeding. Always it is feeding and gloating for more. Today it is the public school teachers, tomorrow the private... After a while, your Honor, it is the setting of man against man and creed against creed until with flying banners and beating drums we are marching backward to the glorious ages of the sixteenth century, when bigots lighted fagots to burn the men who dared to bring any intelligence and enlightenment and culture to the human mind.¹²⁷

In fact, Tennessee, as did most states, recognized Protestant Christianity as reflected in the daily reading of Scriptures in school, and in the opening prayer before any

¹²⁵ Arthur Garfield Hays, "The Strategy of the Scopes Defense," *Nation*, August 5, 1925, 157-58.

¹²⁶ Leonard Levy, *The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment*, 2nd ed., rev. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 63-69. In 1925 the establish clause was only applied to Federal laws and not to state laws. Twenty years after Scopes the Clause would be applied to state laws as well in the 1947 case of *Everson v. Board of Education*.

¹²⁷ Clarence Darrow, "Text of Darrow's Speech on Day Two of the Scopes Trial," in *The World's Most Famous Court Trial: Tennessee Evolution Case* (1925; reprint, Dayton, TN.: Rhea County Historical Society, 1979), 87.

court session. The Tennessee State Constitution did not allow the establishment of one denomination as the official religion and public religious duties were rotated between different Protestant groups.

More than 200,000 words of text went out of Dayton that day, setting a record for any event. Darrow's speech was reprinted in newspapers and editors across the country hailed its plea for tolerance. But the accolades in Dayton were not unanimous and some hissed at Darrow as he left at the end of the day.

On the following day a strong storm interrupted power and water and forced adjournment until the afternoon. After the opening prayer, Judge John T. Raulston needed time to complete his ruling on a motion to dismiss from the defense based on the Establishment Clause issue because of their objection to the prayer at the beginning of each day's procedures. Darrow affirmed: "I do not object to the jury or anyone else praying in secret or in private, but I do object to the turning of this courtroom into a meeting house."¹²⁸ The motion was overruled, the prayers continued, and the judge refused again to dismiss the indictment against Scopes.

In opening remarks, Bryan argued that evolution was an attack on the religion of children, citing the frequent encounters he had with parents who despaired over their children's loss of faith because of the teaching of evolution in public schools and colleges. He argued that if the state could not advance religion, then by the same token it

¹²⁸ Scopes Trial Transcripts. Dayton, Tennessee: Bryan College Archives, 1925. 89-90. Note: Darrow requested the case be dismissed because the prayer at the beginning at the start of the session in effect was the establishment of religion and violated his client's rights.

should not be able to attack religion. “These people in the state---Christian people—have tied their hands by their constitution.”¹²⁹

The prosecution began its case by calling first the local school board superintendent to the stand. Superintendent White testified that Scopes admitted to teaching evolution while substituting for the regular biology teacher from Hunter’s *Civic Biology* text. He identified several sections from the book which Darrow, during cross examination, read into the court record. Darrow forced White to admit that the text was adopted by the state textbook commission for use in Tennessee public schools. A clash occurred when White was asked to identify the King James Version of the Bible and offered it as evidence to what the Butler Act meant when it referred to “Bible.” Hays objected on behalf of the defense on the grounds that there were numbers of versions of the Bible, and that it should not be understood that teachers had to subscribe to one version. Raulston overruled on the contention that to the inhabitants of Dayton, the King James Version was the Bible.¹³⁰

Two of Scopes’ high school students testified that Scopes did discuss evolution and under Darrow’s cross examination admitted they were still in church and that the teaching had not affected them significantly. Fred Robinson, testified to Scopes admission that he taught evolution, and under cross examination from Darrow admitted that his store sold the textbooks to students. The prosecution decided against calling any

¹²⁹ William Jennings Bryan, “Text of Bryan’s Speech on Day Two of the Scopes Trial,” in *The World’s Most Famous Court Trial: Tennessee Evolution Case* (1925; reprint, Dayton, TN.: Rhea County Historical Society, 1979), 172.

¹³⁰ Scopes Trial Transcripts. Dayton, Tennessee: Bryan College Archives, 1925, 121-122.

further witnesses, and rested its case after stating for the record that they were prepared to offer similar testimonies to the guilt of Scopes.

Since they lost the constitutional argument, the defense turned to the second half of their case that involved the exposure of the Butler Act to the intellectual shortcomings of the law and its supporters. Darrow intended to offer scientific and theological experts who would testify that religion and science were perfectly compatible with each other and one posed no threat to the other. The prosecution opposed the allowance of expert witnesses because it could not find any scientists that supported its antievolutionary stance. This disagreement over expert witnesses served more than just the battle between religion and science but exposed the deep disagreements between Fundamentalism and liberal Christianity itself. It also introduced the issue concerning experts in American society and their new role.

On day five, Darrow began by laying the foundation for the expert testimony:

We expect to show by men of science and learning—both scientists and real scholars of the Bible...first what evolution is, and , secondly, that any interpretation of the Bible that intelligent men could possibly make is not in conflict with any story of creation, while the Bible in many ways is in conflict with every known science.¹³¹

More than a dozen expert witnesses for the defense were in Dayton waiting to testify concerning evolution, and Darrow intended to use them all. Darrow made the case that experts were needed to explain religion and evolution, both in the courtroom and the classroom. His defense of experts resonated well with the cultural uncertainty of the 1920s as technology widened the knowledge gap between the educated and the

¹³¹Ibid, 147.

uneducated. Darrow's intent was the call into question the intelligence of Fundamentalists in Dayton and beyond, who would dare refute science and its experts. As the Chicago Tribune reported scientific truth should not be "compelled to conform to what a majority of the people think is true."¹³²

The prosecution, because of its own lack of experts, refused to allow Darrow the field without a fight. Bryan, who had said little during the first four days of the trial, objected on the grounds of Tennessee's right of the majority to protect its religious faith against an invasion of experts from the North. He further argued that no experts were needed and that Scopes stood accused of violating the spirit and the letter of the Butler Act and that discussing the finer points of evolution would not change the facts. He railed on evolutionists for their lack of consensus in what they believed.

There is not a scientist in all the world who can trace one single species to another, and yet they call us ignoramuses and bigots because we do not throw away our Bible...More than half (scientists) do not believe there is a God or personal immortality and they want to teach that to our children...Do such experts have a right to come down and instruct a jury or Tennessee's children contrary to the wishes of the vast majority of Tennesseans?¹³³

Bryan did not limit his attacks only to the scientists, but waxed eloquent on the need of expert religious testimony. He skillfully used the Fundamentalist belief in a personal relationship with God as the only skill needed to understand the Bible and appealed to Tennesseans' right to interpret the Bible for themselves. He played on the feelings of residents that they were under siege from outsiders and stood as a great contrast to the attorneys for Scopes who all hailed from Northern cities that were the

¹³² Chicago Tribune, "Thought Free, or in Chains?" Editorial in *School and Society*, July 11, 1925, 45.

¹³³ Scopes Trial Transcripts. Dayton, Tennessee: Bryan College Archives, 1925, 177, 178, 181.

source of most of the concerns of the 1920s—the centers for social change so resented in the South. As a result on day six, Judge Raulston ruled against the defense in disallowing the use of expert testimony in defense of Scopes and the Butler Act. The trial seemed to be over and in the words of H. L. Mencken of the Baltimore Evening Sun, “all that remains of the great cause of the State of Tennessee against the infidel Scopes is the formal business of bumping off the defendant.”¹³⁴

Assuming the trial was over as the judge closed all avenues of redress for the Defense, many left Dayton on the final weekend. On day seven, Darrow pulled off his greatest surprise and announced that he intended to call William Jennings Bryan to the stand as an “expert witness” on the Bible. His co-counsels were shocked and dismayed over Bryan’s acceptance. Why he chose to testify is one of the great questions of history. With the legal maneuvering Bryan’s “duel to the death” between science and religion had been anything but that and probably Bryan felt the need to recover his reputation. Bryan, as the defender of the faith, also felt he would be able to call the defense attorneys to the stand and in the words of the Baltimore Sun expose “a gigantic conspiracy among the atheists and agnostics against the Christian religion.”¹³⁵

The judge moved the trial outside out of concern for the court house floor, afraid it could not hold the weight of the throngs of people inside and outside the courtroom. As it happened, the most famous and significant part of the trial was held in the open courtyard to the listening ears of those who supported Bryan most.

¹³⁴ H. L. Mencken, “Battle Now Over, Mencken Sees; Genesis Triumphant and Ready for New Jousts,” *Baltimore Evening Sun*, July 18, 1925, 1; Jeffrey P. Moran, *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents*. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2002).

¹³⁵ *Baltimore Sun*, July 20, 1925, 1.

Darrow planned to use the Bible to expose the fallacies of literal interpretation and to expose Bryan and in turn all Fundamentalists for their inconsistencies in applying this method of interpretation. The most significant admission from Bryan came when asked about the days of creation. When asked by Darrow whether the days of creation were literally 24 hour days, Bryan replied that they could well have been geologic ages instead of literal days. This was one of the compromises accepted by liberal Christians who sought to accommodate evolution. Arthur Garfield Hays, defense attorney, observed that Bryan lost his case on this admission. “If Mr. Bryan, who is a student of the Bible, will state that everything in the Bible need not be interpreted literally, that each man must judge for himself... [then] we are not bound by a literal interpretation of the Bible.”¹³⁶

Darrow’s continued questioning also revealed wide areas of Biblical truth of which Bryan pleaded ignorance. His portrayal as a Fundamentalist, a self-proclaimed student of the Bible who wrote weekly columns on Bible subjects, but who expressed a lack of curiosity beyond the narrow scope of Fundamentalist issues was probably the most damning revelation coming from his testimony. His only scientific statement was bolstered by a claim of collaboration with a geologist who had no credentials as an expert in his field.

The day ended with Darrow and Bryan in a shouting match. Bryan struggled under the questioning and when the judge finally called an end to the day, Bryan, exhausted and defeated, slumped in his chair as Darrow received the congratulations of

¹³⁶ *The World’s Most Famous Court Trial: Tennessee Evolution Case* (1925; reprint, Dayton, TN.: Rhea County Historical Society, 1979), 300.

young people in the crowd. At one point in the examination, Bryan had risen to his feet to declare...”the world shall know that these gentlemen have no other purpose than ridiculing every Christian who believes the Bible.” Darrow angrily responded,”We have the purpose of preventing bigots and ignoramuses from controlling the education of the United States and you know it.”¹³⁷ The defense finally reached the end point desired by Darrow.

World reaction was swift and not positive to Bryan. The New York Times reported that the crowds who observed the examination gave “no pity for [Bryan’s] admissions of ignorance of things boys and girls learn in Sunday School.” The media printed the whole account of the exchange and editorials across the country commented that “it has brought about a striking revelation of the Fundamentalist mind in all its shallow depth and narrow arrogance.”¹³⁸ Some even lamented the cruelty of Darrow’s approach as designed to destroy Bryan himself.¹³⁹

The testimony virtually ended the trial. The next day as Bryan prepared to put the defense on the stand, Darrow requested the jury find Scopes guilty so they could get on with the appeal. Scopes was fined \$100 and the trial of the century ended.

Bryan never left Dayton, Tennessee. Years of ignoring health problems and travel finally took their toll. On the Sunday after the trial ended, Bryan spoke on Sunday morning in a nearby church. He died that afternoon while taking a nap. The trial of the

¹³⁷ Ibid, 299

¹³⁸ *Baltimore Sun*, July 22, 1925, 10.

¹³⁹ *The New York Times*, July 21, 1925, 2.

century was over and the “great commoner” died ending an era both in American religious and secular history.

The trial publicly exposed the weakness of the Fundamentalist movement in its tendency to take an argument, demonize it, and rally support for the cause. While declaring that the movement was about defending the faith, education, and preventing children from being corrupted by evolution, the trial displayed another side. Followers did not have a consensus on the beliefs they supported, and even, as in Bryan’s case, did not even have a clear understanding of the basics of the Bible they claimed to support. But in the future the Fundamentalist movement would continue to use the same model again and again. Taking a militant stand on an issue related to the Bible to energize believers into a public stand against an issue that was demonized for effect, and then used to elicit support.

It was that old mass yearning for a likeness in all things that troubled them, and him. Neither this father nor his mother was like other people, because they were always making so much of religion, and now at last they were making a business of it.¹⁴⁰ ~Theodore Dreiser~

CHAPTER SIX

AFTERMATH AND CONCLUSION

The small group of men who met in Robinsons' Drug Store on May 5, 1925, in Dayton, Tennessee, had no idea the firestorm their innocent desire to bring economic help to their town was about to unleash. By accepting the challenge from the American Civil Liberties Union to test Tennessee's Butler Act, which declared the teaching of Darwin's theory of evolution against the law, this group of community boosters put themselves and their town in the eye of a cultural and religious storm that had been brewing for decades. The recently passed Butler Act was the work of Christian Fundamentalists, encouraged by one of the nation's most eloquent politicians, William Jennings Bryan. Even though most of the inhabitants of the small community did not understand the term "evolution," many did believe the Bible was the Word of God, and they were convinced that evolution challenged their beliefs.

John T. Scopes was young and idealistic enough to go along with the town fathers, and from his own testimony he was convinced the Butler Act was not a good law. From the time the constable arrested Scopes for teaching evolution and called the American Civil Liberties Union, he and the other boosters moved to the side lines of the story and were nothing more than actors with secondary parts. Dayton, Tennessee, like

¹⁴⁰ Theodore Dreiser, *An American Tragedy*. New York: New American Library, 1925.

Waterloo, or any of a number of other sites would find its historical significance far outweighed the people or the place. What would happen there would become fodder for decades of historical research and endless quests for understanding the times, the people, and the chaotic events in which the Scopes Trial was framed.

More than three quarters of a century later questions continue to arise about the Scopes Trial and its meaning. The surprising resurgence of Christian Fundamentalism after 1960, assumed to be dead after 1930, caught many historians by surprise and has reopened issues related to the rise of Christian Fundamentalism and its foundational beliefs. A careful re-examination of the trial and the surrounding cultural and religious environment makes the issue of militancy as a founding motivation—of particular interest is the willingness to take a public issue like alcohol, evolution, and much later, abortion, into the marketplace of ideas, and demonize and wage war against it based on a narrow interpretation of the Bible. In essence, recent developments and actions within Christian Fundamentalism make this long overlooked point a more valid explanation of what happened in America in the 1920s. In 1919 the establishment of the World Association of Christian Fundamentals shows the growing need to become more publicly organized in defense of those ideas which related to belief. While belief and doctrine are important to Fundamentalism, the militancy to defend those beliefs in public arenas explains much about the movement and its history. From this point the escalation of

rhetoric, including the language of war, moved events towards the eventual showdown over evolution.¹⁴¹

Christian Fundamentalism was already several decades in the making before the Scopes Trial. The movement adopted a more militant stance after 1919 with the organization of the World Christian Fundamentals Association over fears that modernism would do to America what it had allegedly already done to Germany. In 1920 Curtis Lee Laws, editor of the Baptist Watchman Examiner coined the word “fundamentalists” to apply to the militant stance of the new group.¹⁴²

Prior to 1925 Fundamentalists fought their battles within denominations and churches mainly over doctrinal changes and issues of modernity that gradually evolved since the early days of the Puritans. During this period Christianity in America moved from a strongly Calvinist world view into an Arminian view in which man’s salvation changed from belief in predestination and election to one in which salvation was available to all men and the responsibility for salvation rested on them alone. Practices, such as evangelism, Sunday School, and missions changed greatly and the effects of the Enlightenment and other historical events forced ministers, churches, and especially colleges and seminaries to choose sides. These changes made Fundamentalists more determined and planted the seeds of educating students in their own world view.

¹⁴¹ Dr. Jon Butler, "The Surprise of Religion in America". Due West, South Carolina: The Joseph T. Stukes Lectures, Erskine College, March, 2010. After the Scopes Trial the media pronounced that Christian Fundamentalism as a movement was dead. They assumed the defeat of the trial was mortal.

¹⁴² Douglas Carl Abrams, *Selling the Old-Time Religion: American Fundamentalists and Mass Culture, 1920-1940*. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2001), 6.

Initially, after 1870, doctrinal battles in seminaries and churches defined Fundamentalism as a belief in a literal interpretation of the Bible as opposed to those who accepted natural inspiration in which nature was as strong a voice for God as the Scriptures. While truth became more and more nebulous for some and more and more certain for Fundamentalists, the battle lines and the language of war increased. The Fundamentalists adopted wording from the conflict model and writings of the 1870s such as “winners and losers” and developed the context of their issues within a distinctly military framework.

Beginning in the early decades of the twentieth century, and thanks to the oratorical skills of great preachers like Billy Sunday, and Christian politicians like William Jennings Bryan the battleground extended among Fundamentalists from the church to public education. Society in general sensed that the nation was adrift and concerns about culture and America’s youth and the abandonment of tradition and religious values occupied the minds of many.¹⁴³

Technology and science added to this sense of concern as the pace of life increased and materialism replaced religious and spiritual devotion. Technology and science increased the pace of life and the sense that society was out of control and old values were rapidly being replaced by modern trends and ways was alarming to many. Wars and political distress, together with economic and cultural upheavals left many with

¹⁴³ James H. Leuba, *The Belief in God and Immortality: A Psychological, Anthropological, and Statistical Study*. Boston: Sherman, French, and Co., 1916, 1921. Leuba’s surveys coupled with the complaints from parents across the country showed the growing angst of Americans over the direction of their young people.

a sense of concern about their lives and questions surfaced as to the cause of these problems.

Fundamentalists expressed growing concern that the major cause of the problem rested with the theory of evolution that left unchecked, the promotion of Darwin's theory would result in religious and the cultural ruin for the nation. William Jennings Bryan and many pastors were convinced that not only Germany's militarization and the war, resulted from Darwin's theories, but also that that Social Darwinism had changed man's belief about man himself. If he was no more than an animal, the possibilities of what he could become were greatly affected. This crisis needed to be addressed in a definite way from those who believed the literal interpretation of the Bible, and many believed that it must be done in a concerted way to call attention to the problem on a larger scale than just church on Sunday or in a seminary classroom.

Learning from their previous success with prohibition, Fundamentalists chose another public issue with which to make their stand and this time it was done at the school house door. While doctrinal adherence would always be of importance to the Fundamentalist movement, militancy to defend those beliefs publicly became the defining characteristic, with an increased willingness to take a cultural issue like education and fight publicly for the removal of evolutionary teaching.

Like the Copernican Revolution, the Darwinian Revolution raised questions concerning the Bible. Both particularly challenged the Bible's teachings concerning man—where he came from, his special place in God's creation, the earth as the center of God's creation, and mankind made in the image and likeness of God.

Not all Christians chose to oppose evolution. Many chose to accommodate evolutionary teaching and after the 1870s various theories arose that attempted to reconcile the two beliefs. Fundamentalists chose to fight rather than surrender and their militant stances came to characterize the movement in ways often overlooked by historians who see only the doctrinal adherence as the defining characteristic.

Fundamentalists learned from Prohibition that if voluntary compliance would not work, forced compliance was the most viable option. Laws against the teaching of evolution began to be debated and considered as coercive measures to stop the practice in public schools. Of particular concern were the biology classes in public high schools. Fundamentalists gave few considerations to teaching evolution in other publicly funded schools, namely colleges and universities. The high school biology class became the main focus of attention. The arrest of John T. Scopes in Dayton, Tennessee, became the occasion to make a public stand against the encroachment of science and modernity on a way of life. To this battleground two of the great protagonists came to defend their positions. Unwittingly the personal prejudices and beliefs of William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow shaped and defined not only the Scopes Trial but also Fundamentalism in important ways.

The events of Dayton have been widely analyzed from a variety of different perspectives. Dayton resonated with Americans because it uncovered the underlying divisions and crevices long hidden in American society. North-South tensions erupted in the legal defense team chosen by Scopes and the American Civil Liberties Union as the lawyers were painted as Northerners who insisted on interfering with the way of life of

Southerners. Intrusions were resented, and since the Civil War, latent feelings of the superior attitudes of Northerners against Southerners were still a reality.

Modernity brought its own issues with the opposition of religious people who adhered to in a literal interpretation of the Bible, against those with more modern views. Towns like Dayton were found throughout the nation, and especially in the South, holding to old ways of knowing and doing and resisting both outsiders and change. Southerners especially resented those who sought to impose new ways on them. These were areas, however, where men like Bryan could gain his greatest following. His reputation as a man of the people made Americans instantly like him and listen to the rhetoric he used to plant the ideology of Fundamentalism. The demonization of modernity, liberal theologians, or even science resonated well with those who followed Bryan.

The trial, although a sham put together by Dayton's boosters for financial gain, became a mirror to American society, and therein is the value of the historical event that invites continual study. The trial and its attending peoples and events provide the historian with a snapshot of the times and how those times shaped events for the decades to come.

While cause and effect of most events in history are not black and white, the written history of the Scopes Trial seems myopic in its dealing with this seminal period in American history. If as historians typically assert, the rise of Fundamentalism arose to defend long-held doctrinal beliefs only and the movement was over by the 1930s, then the sudden resurgence in the 1960s over evolution and then abortion in the 1970s is not a

sufficient explanation. In fact, the militancy of the movement, illustrated at the Scopes Trial, provides an interesting reason for the great amount of interest around the world, as hundreds of reporters telegraphed reports and made live radio broadcasts from Dayton. Born in an age when epic contests were framed by the language of war, people viewed Dayton as the spectacular battleground that would determine who won and who lost.

After years of uncertainty with seemingly endless economic and cultural upheavals, Fundamentalists' actions, militant though they were, captured the attention of Americans. The battle, which loomed for decades, invited the attention of Christians and non-Christians alike. Many who lacked the power to do much about the currents sweeping the nation were eager to support a cause and enlist in the battle. William Jennings Bryan, famous from his speech at the 1896 Democratic Convention against the gold standard, and often billed as the Great Commoner, was the perfect general for just such a battle. Clarence Darrow came with all the right attributes that made him easy to demonize as an adversary to everything Bryan was not. As generals marshaled their troops, these men enlisted recruits in a battle that would eclipse Dayton and enlist the attention of the world for decades.

Winners and losers were a daily prognostication in the newspapers and across the wire services. After the examination of William Jennings Bryan and his failure to successfully defend the Fundamentalist position on the Bible, even those of his own camp were convinced that he had somehow let them down. Newspapers pronounced evolution the winner and Bible believers the losers. But a closer examination questions that assessment. Scopes was convicted and then the sentence was over turned on appeal,

preventing the American Civil Liberties Union from moving the case to the Supreme Court for a wider ruling affecting the entire country. Other lesser known facts also question the media's awarding of the winner's prize to the evolutionists.¹⁴⁴

After Dayton, Darwin virtually disappeared from high school textbooks for more than 30 years. During the period from 1930 to 1960 surveys of high school texts, including the *Hunter's Civic Biology* used by Scopes, found that along with the details of evolution, even the picture of Darwin disappeared. It was not until the 1960s with the Soviet launch of Sputnik on October 4, 1957, and a realization that American young people were behind in science that evolution again reappeared and with it the resurgence of Christian Fundamentalism.¹⁴⁵

The interests of Fundamentalists in education did not end with the Scopes Trial. Just before and during the Great Depression more than twenty-six Christian colleges were organized, including Dallas Theological Seminary (1924) and Bob Jones College (1927). Significantly, Wheaton College, in Illinois, was for several years the fastest growing liberal arts college in the country, as the Fundamentalists sought to train their own recruits in an environment free of evolutionary teaching. In the 1970s another public issue---humanism---would inspire Fundamentalists to start thousands of Christian day schools across the country to escape what they billed a godless religion. Raising and training an army of Christian young people with a Christian world view to counter the

¹⁴⁴ Dawn M. Digrius, "Draper, Dickson-White, and the Artificial Construction of the 'Warfare' between Science and Religion," *Evolution and Religion: Towards the History of an Evolving Relationship*. Clemson: Clemson University, 2009.

¹⁴⁵ Randy Moore, "The Lingering Impact of the Scopes Trial on High School Biology Textbooks," *BioScience*, 2001: 790-796.

world view of the evolutionist and humanist became the goal of Fundamentalism during the quiet years between 1930 and 1980.¹⁴⁶

The media left some lasting perceptions of the participants at Dayton as being against modernity and progress. In reality Fundamentalists were not resistant to all changes. From the 1930s to the 1960s their preachers dominated the airwaves and made first radio and then television broadcasting their own. For example, J. Frank Norris pastored two churches, one in Detroit, Michigan and one in Dallas, Texas at the same time. Boasting that this ministry included the largest number of people combined under one pastor in history he used radio and other media along with organizational skills to grow his congregations. In five years his congregation in Detroit added more than 5,300 members.¹⁴⁷

Fundamentalists were adept at using the rhetoric and language of war to shape the argument that religion was under attack by secular culture. The ability to rally support and later to incorporate technologies like radio and television to educate and challenge their followers were important in advancing Fundamentalist causes. In the 1980s Dr. Jerry Falwell, much like Bryan, used his speaking skills to raise the angst of Christians with the issues of abortion. Mobilizing Fundamentalists and others, including Roman Catholics, in opposition to abortion brought millions to the cause, and enlisted foot soldiers into a religious-political activism which affected elections and brought political clout to the movement. With education still at the center of the fight, Falwell raised the

¹⁴⁶ George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. (Grand Rapids, Michigan.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991). 195, 246.

¹⁴⁷ Douglas Carl Abrams, *Selling the Old-Time Religion: American Fundamentalists and Mass Culture, 1920-1940*. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2001), 124-125.

funds to build Liberty Baptist College, now Liberty University, which trains thousands of Fundamentalist young people from all over the world.¹⁴⁸

The Fundamentalists went a step further after Scopes and established their own publications that supported the Biblical views of science. By the 1970s, development of curricula to supply the growing Christian school movement had grown, and demand for books and writings in support of Fundamentalist viewpoints became a marketplace phenomenon. During the years immediately after the trial, Fundamentalists learned to embrace the consumer culture, first with radio, then television, and then with print media which has grown into a multi-million dollar business.¹⁴⁹

To paraphrase the words of Mark Twain, the announcement of the death of Fundamentalism was highly exaggerated and premature. Its continued presence and growth speaks to the complicated nature of its founding and raises the possibilities of continued reflection and investigation into its origins, beliefs, and influence. The growth and influence in the present and where the movement is now certainly raises questions regarding long-held beliefs and warrants a new look at the militancy of the movement in light of its unusual survival in modern days.

This present-day growth and influence also raises questions regarding which characteristics best define a movement which remains a viable force in today's religious and political life of the United States. Its present activities, whether leading the fight to overturn abortion, or its political involvement in electing conservative politicians, begs

¹⁴⁸ Ibid; Susan Friend Harding. *The Book of Jerry Falwell*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

¹⁴⁹ Douglas Carl Abrams. *Selling the Old-Time Religion: American Fundamentalists and Mass Culture, 1920-1940*. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2001), 11-39.

the question of whether the militancy of the early movement provides a better rationale for its existence and staying power than those proposed by historians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

BOOKS:

Balmforth, Ramsden. *The New Testament in the Light of Higher Criticism*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1905.

Beecher, Henry W. *Evolution and Religion*. New York: Fords, Howard, and Hulbert, 1886.

Bradford, William (1898) [1651]. Hildebrandt, Ted. ed. *Bradford's History "Of Plimoth Plantation."* Boston: Wright & Potter Printing Co.1622.

Bryan, William Jennings and Mary Baird Bryan. *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan*. Chicago: John C. Winston Co., 1925.

Bryan, William Jennings. *The Menace of Darwinism*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1921.

Calef, Robert. *More Wonders of the Invisible World*. London: Prenciss-Arms, 1700.

Cole, Stewart. *The History of Fundamentalism*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1931.

Draper, John W. *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*. New York: Appleton, 1928.

Theodore Dreiser. *An American Tragedy*. New York: New American Library, 1925.

Gray, Asa. *Letters of Asa Gray*. Edited by Jane Loring Gray. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside, 1893–1894.

Hays, Arthur Garfield. "The Strategy of the Scopes Defense," *Nation*, August 5, 1925, 157-58.

Jones, Bob, Sr. *Bob Jones' Revival Sermons*. Wheaton, Il: Sword of the Lord Press, 1948.

Keebler, Robert S. "The Tennessee Evolution Case." *Tennessee Bar Association*. Memphis: Tennessee Bar Association, 1925. 3-34.

Leuba, James H. *The Belief in God and Immortality: A Psychological, Anthropological, and Statistical Study*. Boston: Sherman, French, and Co., 1916, 1921.

- . *The Belief in God and Immortality: A Psychological, Anthropological and Statistical Study*. Boston: Sherman, French and Co., 1916.
- Machen, J. Gresham. *Christianity and Liberalism*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1923.
- Machen, J. Gresham. *What Is Faith?* (1925). reprint: Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1991).
- Martin, T. T. *Hell and the High Schools: Christ or Evolution: Which?* Kansas City, Mo.: Western Baptist Publishing Co., 1923.
- Matthews, Albert. "The Term *Pilgrim Fathers* and Early Celebrations of Forefathers' Day." *Publication of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, 1915:17:293-331.
- McCosh, James. *The Religious Aspect of Evolution*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1890.
- Millikan, Robert Andres. *Evolution in Science and Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929.
- Osborn, Henry Fairfield. *Evolution and Religion in Education: Polemics of the Fundamentalist Controversy of 1922 to 1926*. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.
- . *The Earth Speaks to Bryan*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.
- Scopes Trial Transcripts. Dayton, Tennessee: Bryan College Archives, 1925.
- Shibley, Maynard. *The War on Modern Science: A Short History of the Fundamentalist Attacks on Evolution and Modernism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.
- Strahan, Edward (ed.). *A Century After, picturesque glimpses of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott and J. W. Lauderbach, 1875, 24.
- The Fundamentals*. 12 vols. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Co., 1910-1915.
- The Scofield Study Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 1917.
- Trollope, Francis. *Domestic Manners of Americans* (1832). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949, 108.
- Ussher, J. 1650. *Annals of the World: James Ussher's Classic Survey of World History. 1650*. (Modern English republication, ed. Larry and Marion Pierce, Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2003).

Wheatley, Phillis. "On the Death of Mr. George Whitefield, 1770." In *Life and Works of Phillis Wheatley*, by Editor G. Herbert Renfro, 51. Washington, D. C. 1916.

White, Andrew D. *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*. 2 vols. New York: Appleton, 1905.

Winthrop, Governor John. "A Model of Christian Charity," *Religious Freedom Page*. 1630. <http://religiousfreedom.lib.virginia.edu/sacred/charity.html>.

ARTICLES

Wright, George F. "The Ground of Confidence in Inductive Reasoning." *The New Englander* 30 (October 1871).

———. "Recent Books Bearing on the Relation of Science to Religion." *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

No. I—The Nature and Degree of Scientific Proof." 32 (July 1875): 537–555.

No. II—The Divine Method of Producing Living Species." 33 (July 1876).

No. III—Objections to Darwinism, and the Rejoinders of Its Advocates." 33 (October 1876).

No. IV—Concerning the True Doctrine of Final Cause or Design in Nature." 34 (April 1877).

No. V—Some Analogies between Calvinism and Darwinism." 37 (January 1880): 48–76.

———. Review of *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*, by John William Draper. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 33 (July 1876),

———. "Dr. Hodge's Misrepresentations of President Finney's System of Theology." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 33 (April 1876).

———. "The Proper Attitude of Religious Teachers towards Scientific Experts." *The New Englander* 37 (November 1878).

———. *Studies in Science and Religion*. Andover, Mass.: Draper, 1882.

———. "The Debt of the Church to Asa Gray." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 45 (July 1888)/

- . “Darwin on Herbert Spencer.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 46 (January 1889).
- . *Charles Grandison Finney*. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside, 1891.
- . *Man and the Glacial Period*. New York: Appleton, 1892.
- . *Scientific Aspects of Christian Evidences*. New York: Appleton, 1898.
- . “The Evolutionary Fad.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 57 (April 1900): 303–316.
- . “The Mistakes of Darwin and His Would-Be Followers.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 66 (April 1909).
- . “Calvinism and Darwinism.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 66 (October 1909).
- . “The Testimony of the Monuments to the Truth of Scriptures.” In *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*, 2:7–28. Chicago: Testimony, 1910.
- . *Origin and Antiquity of Man*. Oberlin, Ohio: Bibliotheca Sacra, 1912.
- . “The Passing of Evolution.” In *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*, 7:5–20. Chicago: Testimony, 1912.
- . “Present Aspects of the Relations between Science and Revelation.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 71 (October 1914).
- . *Story of My Life and Work*. Oberlin, Ohio: Bibliotheca Sacra, 1916.
- . Papers. Oberlin College Archives.

NEWSPAPER, RADIO, MEDIA

Beveridge, Senator Albert J. “In Support of an American Empire.” *Congressional Record, Session I*. Washington, DC: Congressional Printing Office, 1901: 704-712.

Blair, Mrs. E. P. letter to the editor, *Nashville Tennessean*, 16 Mar. 1925.

Bryan, William Jennings. “William Jennings Bryan: An Electrifying Orator.” *National Public Radio.org*. July 9, 1896.

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=95691800> (accessed March 10, 2010).

Chicago Tribune, “Thought Free, or in Chains?” Editorial in *School and Society*, July 11, 1925.

Chicago Tribune (n.d.) Editorial, reprinted in *Nashville Tennessean*, Mar. 20, 1925.

Kent, Frank R. "Evolution War Similar to Wet and Dry Fight," *Baltimore Sun*, 14 July 1925.

Krutch, Joseph Wood. "Tennessee: Where Cowards Rule," *Nation*, 15 July 1925, 88-89.

H. L. Menchen, "Battle Now Over, Mencken Sees; Genesis Triumphant and Ready for New Jousts," *Baltimore Evening Sun*, July 18, 1925, 1.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abrams, Douglas Carl. *Selling the Old-Time Religion: American Fundamentalists and Mass Culture, 1920-1940*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2001.

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. *A Religious History of the American People*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Akers, Charles W. *Called Unto Liberty: A Life of Jonathan Mayhew. 1720-1766*. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.

American Civil Liberties Union Committee on Academic Freedom, *The Gag on Teaching*. New York: ACLU, 1931.

Beale, David O. *In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850*. Greenville, South Carolina: Unusual Publications, 1986.

Bendroth, Margaret Lamberts. *Fundamentalism and Gender, 1875 to the Present*. Yale, 1993.

Blee, Kathleen M. *Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1991.

Bucky, Peter A. & Allen G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*. Kansas City: Andrews and McMeel. 1992.

Butler, Dr. Jon. "The Surprise of Religion in America". Due West, South Carolina: The Joseph T. Stukes Lectures, Erskine College, March, 2010.

Butler, Jon, Wacker, Grant, Balmer, Randall. *Religion in American Life: A Short History*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Calloway, Colin G.. *The First People: A Documentary Survey of American Indian History*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins. 2008.

Carpenter, Joel A. *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism: 1925-1950*. Oxford, 1997.

Carwardine, Richard J. *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1993.

Clabaugh, Gary K. *Thunder on the Right: The Protestant Fundamentalist*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Co., 1974.

Coben, Stanley. *Rebellion Against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in the 1920s America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Collins, Francis S. *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*. New York: Simon & Shuster, 2006.

Conkin, Paul. *When All the Gods Trembled: Darwinism, Scopes, and American Intellectuals*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

Dalhouse, Mark Taylor. *An Island in the Lake of Fire: Bob Jones University, Fundamentalism & the Separatist Movement*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1996.

Dalhouse, Mark Taylor. *Bob Jones University and the Shaping of Twentieth Century Separatism, 1926-1991*. Ph.D. dissertation, Miami: Miami (Ohio) University, 1991.

Darrow, Clarence. *The Story of My Life*. New York: Scribner's, 1932.

Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species By Means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. Reprint of 1st ed. New York: Bantam, 1999.

Digrius, Dawn M. "Draper, Dickson-White, and the Artificial Construction of the 'Warfare' between Science and Religion," *Evolution and Religion: Towards the History of an Evolving Relationship*. Clemson: Clemson University, 2009.

Dionne, Jr., E. J. *Why Americans Hate Politics*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991.

Dollar, George W. *A History of Fundamentalism in America*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1973.

—. *The Fight for Fundamentalism: American Fundamentalism, 1973-1983*. Sarasota, Fla.: G. W. Dollar, 1983.

- Dupree, A. Hunter. *Asa Gray: 1810–1888*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1959.
- Fass, Paula. *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Finocchiaro, Maurice A. *The Galileo Affair: A Documentary History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989.
- Friedman, Milton, and Anna Jacobson Schwartz. *A Monetary History of the United States, 1867-1960*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Furniss, Norman F. *The Fundamentalist Controversy*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1954.
- Gasper, Louis. *The Fundamentalist Movement*. Paris: Mouton & Co., 1963.
- Gay, Peter. *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996.
- Gatewood, Williard B. *Controversy in the Twenties: Fundamentalism, Modernism, and Evolution*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969.
- Gaustad, Edwin & Leigh Schmidt. *The Religious History of America: The Heart of the American Story from Colonial Times to Today*. San Francisco: Harper Books, 2002.
- Ginger, Ray. *Six Days or Forever?: Tennessee v. John Thomas Scopes*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.
- Gingerich, Owen. *The Book Nobody Read: Chasing the Revolutions of Nicolaus Copernicus*. New York: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Gross, Linda P.; Theresa R. Snyder. *Philadelphia's 1876 Centennial Exhibition*. Arcadia Publishing, 2005, 7.
- Hankins, Barry. *God's Rascal: J. Frank Norris & the Beginnings of Southern Fundamentalism*. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996.
- Harding, Susan Friend. *The Book of Jerry Falwell*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Harris, Harriet. *Fundamentalism and Evangelicals*. Oxford, 1998.
- Hart, D.G. *Defending the Faith: J. Gresham Machen and the Crisis of Conservative Protestantism in America*. Johns Hopkins, 1994.

- Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Henry, Carl F. H. *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*. Grand Rapids: William B. Erdmans Publishing Co., 1947.
- Henry, James O. *For Such a Time as This: A History of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America*. Westchester, Ill.: I.F.C.A., 1983.
- Heyrman, Christine Leigh. *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt*. Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Higgs, Robert. *The Transformation of the American Economy, 1865-1914*. New York: Wiley, 1971.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *The Roads to Modernity*. New York: Vintage Books, 2004.
- Hoffmann, Charles. *The Depression of the Nineties: An Economic History*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing, 1970.
- Hutchison, William R. *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Jorstad, Erling. *The Politics of Doomsday: Fundamentalists on the Far Right*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Kindleberger, Charles Poor. *Manias, Panics, and Crashes: A History of Financial Crises*. Revised Edition. New York: Basic Books, 1989.
- Kluger, Pearl. *New Light on the Scopes Trial*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Kolko, Gabriel. *Railroads and Regulation, 1877-1916*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Copernican Revolution: Planetary Astronomy in the Development of Western Thought*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Lamoreaux, Naomi R. *The Great Merger Movement in American Business, 1895-1904*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Larson, Edward J. *Summer For The Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1997.

—. *The Creation-Evolution Debate: Historical Perspectives*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2007.

—. *Trial and Error: The American Controversy Over Creation and Evolution*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Levy, Leonard. *The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment*. 2nd ed., rev. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

Lippman, Walter. *American Inquisitors: A Commentary on Dayton, and Chicago*. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Lubetkin, M. John. *Jay Cooke's Gamble: The Northern Pacific Railroad, the Sioux, and the Panic of 1873*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006.

Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Marsden, George. *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1987.

—. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991.

McCune, Rolland. *Promise Unfulfilled: The Failed Strategy of Modern Evangelicalism*. Greenville, SC and Belfast: Ambassador International, 2004.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online. March 15, 2010, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fundamentalism>, (accessed March 15, 2010).

Miller, Kenneth B. *Perspectives on Evolving Creation*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.

Moore, Howard Edgar. *The Emergence of Moderate Fundamentalism: John R. Rice and the Sword of the Lord*. Ph.D Dissertation, Washington: George Washington University, 1990.

Moore, James R. *The Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms with Darwin in Great Britain and America, 1870-1900*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Moore, Randy. "The Lingering Impact of the Scopes Trial on High School Biology Textbooks," *BioScience*, 2001: 790-796.

Moran, Jeffrey P. *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2002.

Morgan, Edmund S., *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*. New York: Pearson-Longman, 2007.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *The Oxford History of the American People*. New York: Oxford Press, 1965.

Morison, William J. "George Frederick Wright: In Defense of Darwinism and Fundamentalism 1838–1921." Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1971.

Noll, Mark A. *America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Oxford Press, 2002.

Noll, Mark A. *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Noll, Mark A. *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1973.

Numbers, Ronald L. *The Creationists: The Evolution of Scientific Creationism*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1993.

Oberholtzer, Ellis Paxson. *A History of the United States Since the Civil War*. New York: Macmillan. 1917, 3:69-122.

Pettegrew, Larry Dean. *The History of Pillsbury Baptist Bible College*. Owatonna, Minn., 1981.

Philbrick, Nathaniel. *Mayflower*. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.

Pickering, Ernest. *Biblical Separation: The Struggle for a Pure Church*. Schaumburg, Ill.: Regular Baptist Press, 1979.

Postel, Charles. *The Populist Vision*. New York: Oxford Press, 2007.

- Presley, John T. Scopes and James. *Center of the Storm: Memoirs of John T. Scopes*. New York, Chicago, San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Prothero, Stephen. *American Jesus: How the Son of God Became a National Icon*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2003.
- Rees, Albert. *Real Wages in Manufacturing, 1890-1914*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Repcheck, Jack. *Copernicus' Secret*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2007.
- Rosen, Edward. *Three Copernican Treatises*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 1939.
- Ross, Dorothy. *Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Russell, C. Allyn. *Voices of American Fundamentalism*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- Sandeen, Ernest R. *The Origins of Fundamentalism: Toward a Historic Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- . *The Roots of Fundamentalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Scopes, John T. & James Pressley. *Center of the Storm: Memoirs of John T. Scopes*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston. 1967.
- Sharratt, Michael. *Galileo: Decisive Innovator*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1994.
- Sweet, Douglas A., *The American Evangelical Story: A History of the Movement*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Sweet, Leonard I. *The Evangelical Tradition in America*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1984.
- Thompson, Jr., James J. *Tried As By Fire: Southern Baptists and the Religious Controversies of the 1920s*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1982.
- Tindall, George Brown. *America: A Narrative History*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1984.
- Tompkins, Jerry R. *D-Days at Dayton*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Edited by Gerald Bevan. London: Penguin Books. 2003.

Trollinger, William Vance, Jr. *God's Empire: William Bell Riley and Midwestern Fundamentalism*. Wisconsin, 1990.

Turner, Daniel L. *Standing Without Apology: The History of Bob Jones University*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1997.

Unger, Irwin. *The Greenback Era: A Social and Political History of American Finance, 1865-1879*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964, 213-28.

Wainwright, Nicholas; Russell Weigley and Edwin Wolf. *Philadelphia: A 300-Year History*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1982.

Wells, David F. *No Place For Truth: Or What Ever Happened to Evangelical Theology*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.

White, Andrew D. *A History of the Warfare of Science With Theology In Christendom*. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1896.

Wright, Melton. *Fortress of Faith: The Story of Bob Jones University*. Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1984.

ARTICLES

Barnes, James A. (1947). "Myths of the Bryan Campaign". *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 34: 383-394.

Bellah, Robert N.. "Civic Religion in America." *Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, (Winter, 1967):1-21.

Closson, Carlos C. Jr. "The Unemployed in American Cities." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 8, no. 2 (January 1894).

Closson, Carlos C. Jr. "The Unemployed in American Cities," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 8, no. 4 (July 1894).

Collopy, Peter Sachs. "George Frederick Wright and the Harmony of Science and Revelation". Honors Thesis, Berea, OH: Oberlin College, 2007.

Larson, Edward J. "Before the Crusade: Evolution in American Secondary Education Before 1920," *Journal of the History of Biology*. 20 (Spring, 1987): 89-114.

Musson, A. E. "The Great Depression in Britain, 1873-1896: A Reappraisal," *Journal of Economic History*, 1959. Vol. 19, No. 2, 199-228.

Reznek, Samuel. "Distress, Relief, and Discontent in the United States during the Depression of 1873-78," *Journal of Political Economy*, 1950. Vol. 58, No. 6, 494-512.

Stevens, Albert Clark. "An Analysis of the Phenomena of the Panic in the United States in 1893." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 8 (January 1894): 117-48.

NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, MEDIA

Rydell, Robert W. *World's Columbian Exposition* March 3, 2005.
<http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/1386.html> (accessed April 2, 2010).

Sergeant York. Directed by Harold Hawkings. Performed by Alvin York. 1941.

Whitten, David. "Depression of 1893". EH.Net Encyclopedia, edited by Robert Whaples. August 14, 2001. <http://eh.net/encyclopedia/article/whitten.panic.1893.html> (accessed April 3, 2010).