379
N81d
NO. 992

CRUSADE FOR THE FAITH: THE PROTESTANT FUNDAMENTALIST MOVEMENT IN TEXAS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Patsy S. Ledbetter, M. A.
Denton, Texas
December, 1975

© 1975

PATSY SPENCER LEDBETTER

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Ledbetter, Patsy S., Crusade for the Faith: The Fundamentalist Movement in Texas. Doctor of Philosophy (History), December 1975. 284 pp., bibliography 256 titles.

This work provides a history of the Protestant fundamentalist movement in Texas, beginning with the 1890's and progressing to the 1970's, but it emphasizes the controversial decade of the 1920's. Although it is a narrative account it also attempts to analyze the reasons for the movement's development, while evaluating its impact on the state.

For the most part, research for the study was done in primary sources. Of major importance were personal papers of Protestant leaders, such as J. Frank Norris, Lon Scarborough, and S. P. Brooks, which are available at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary Fort Worth, Texas, and in the Texas Historical Collection of Baylor University, Waco, Texas. Church documents, records, and newspapers, located in the libraries of theological seminaries or denominational colleges across the state, were also significant. For studying the secular impact of the religious controversy, public documents, especially the Texas Senate and House Journals were useful. Secular newspapers helped particularly in evaluating public opinion across the state. Although secondary works on this specific topic were unavailabe, books and articles on related topics, especially biographies, contributed to a broader understanding.

Organized chronologically, this study begins with a review of the nature of Texas Protestantism at the turn of the century. Ideas and attitudes later identified with the fundamentalist movement were discernible at that time. Accepting the supernatural in religion, Texas Protestants stressed orthodox doctrines concerning Christ, especially His virgin birth, literal crucifixion bodily resurrection, and visible second coming. Since Texas Protestants considered Christianity a spontaneous individualistic experience, they resisted institutionalization of religion.

In the 1920's the fundamentalist controversy developed primarily as a reaction to the rapid changes taking place in society. In Texas, since few Protestants were actually theological modernists, the controversy concerned primarily degrees of orthodoxy; nevertheless a number of professors resigned under fundamentalist pressure as the movement limited the free exchange of ideas even within orthodox limits. The Baptist fundamentalist, J. Frank Norris of Fort Worth, divided the Texas Baptist denomination, while other denominations also experienced conflict. The state legislature considered fundamentalists inspired legislation. The fundamentalists' most significant victory came in 1925 with the editing of public school textbooks to remove discussion of evolution.

Since the 1920's Texas fundamentalists have retreated into their own groups and institutions, making the controversy seem less heated; however, the movement remains a significant

influence in Texas, manifesting itself in resistance to changes of various kinds. The most significant impact of the 1920's conflict was that its bitterness contributed to the failure of both sides to develop grounds for communication and meaningful dialogue.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

FOUNDATIONS OF TEXAS FUNDAMENTALISM

On a still, spring evening in 1895 horses and wagons surrounded a small but crowded village church in rural East Texas as joyful voices singing "Bringing in the Sheaves" filled the countryside. An old-time revival was underway, and the little church was fairly bursting with religious enthusiasm. A circuit-riding minister had just delivered an intensely emotional, hell-fire and brimstone sermon, while all the converted joined in feverish prayer for their unregenerated friends, neighbors, and relatives. After much crying and soul searching several lost sinners responded to the preacher's call to surrender their souls to the Lord. Then the congregation sang its praises to God before congratulating and sharing tears of joy with the newly converted souls. The revival season was just beginning in Texas, and little dramas similar to this one would be repeated over and over before the summer's end.

Such revivals were familiar sights in rural Texas at the turn of the century. Whatever the denomination or locality, the scene and the doctrines were much the same. It was a simple, direct gospel message of regeneration of the individual soul, and redemption by grace alone, that Texans received; unchanging, it offered them security and certainty.

Religion was an integral part of their lives, with much of a community's social life revolving around the church. In a society that was still over 80 per cent rural,[1] church socials were frequent, all day singings a good excuse to escape a day of plowing or canning. A church picnic brought many a young couple together; then the church married them, blessed their children, and ultimately buried them. Family devotionals, daily Bible readings, blessings before meals, and prayers before bed were an accepted part of family life. Several times a year the unconverted members of the family had the opportunity to give their souls to the Lord in an extremely emotional revival, becoming for at least a moment the center of attention in the community. Many leading citizens told over and over again the dramatic story of their own conversion experience.[2]

Even intellectual stimulation generated from the churches, as during the 1890's leading churchmen conducted long, heated debates over religious matters. Well attended public discussions of such topics as free will, alien immersion, the use of musical instruments in worship, the meaning and method of baptism, infant baptism and numerous other subjects aroused religious Texans' interest. Typically religious debates

---

[1] Texas Almanac, 1925, pp. 46-47. The statistics are for 1900.

[2] Texas Baptist and Herald, 13 January 1898, p. 10; Olin W. Nail, ed., History of Texas Methodism, 1900-1960 (Austin: Capitol, 1961), p. 20; Milton L. Rudnick, Fundamentalism and the Missouri Synod (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing Company, 1966), p. 16.

lasted from one and one-half to two hours and ran from four to five days consecutively. Ministers of rival churches spoke to denominationally mixed crowds, explaining and debating the dogma of their churches. Those unable to attend frequently had the opportunity to read a published account of the proceedings, either in pamphlet or book form or in a denominational newspaper. Specific dogma, the subject matter for these debates, was important to Texas churchmen and generated considerable public interest as well.[3]

Protestantism, with its emphasis on revivalism and concern with doctrine, as reflected in the debates, dominated the religious scene in Texas at the turn of the century. Protestant denominations claimed about 914,000 member, whereas the Catholic church had only about 308,000 communicants. The vast majority of the Protestants belonged to either Methodist groups, with about 317,000 members or Baptist groups, claiming 402,000 members. Only two other denominations had a membership of over 50,000; the Disciples of Christ and the Presbyterians, with about 73,000 and 62,000 members respectively.[4]

Texas Protestants were not yet identifying themselves as fundamentalists or modernists in the 1890's, but theological tenets underlying the fundamentalist movement, which reached its peak in the 1920's, were discernible at the turn of the

---

[3]Firm Foundation, 16 November 1897, p. 5; 30 November 1897, p. 4; 2 February 1897, p. 6; 9 November 1897, p. 6; Texas Christian Advocate, 15 August 1895, p. 9.

[4]Texas Almanac, 1910, p. 124. The statistics are for 1906.

century and remained important themes in Texas Protestantism throughout the twentieth century. In studying the origins and development of Texas fundamentalism, it is first necessary to identify the basic characteristics of the movement. Too frequently fundamentalists have been identified simply as those who opposed the teaching of evolution in public schools. Hence, they have been branded as arch-enemies of modern science and society. To consider them only within this context is, however, a mistake; the theological tenets of the movement must also be taken into account. Although most Texas religious leaders were orthodox or conservative, relatively few became associated with the organized fundamentalist movement. Theologically many of the conservatives agreed with the fundamentalists, and they can be differentiated primarily by the degree of their orthodoxy.

The basis of the fundamentalists' theological beliefs was their literal reading of the Bible, an important aspect of Texas Protestantism in the 1890's. The Bible had to be accepted precisely as it was written, word for word; if any part of it was interpreted allegorically or symbolically,then all Christianity was doomed, they insisted. Some disagreement existed within Protestantism concerning the nature of the inspiration of the Scriptures. The fundamentalists insisted upon verbal inspiration, which meant that the individuals who wrote the Bible received their messages directly and verbally from God and thus could have been mistaken on

no point. Most Texans agreed that the Bible was an inspired document, but some disagreed with the fundamentalist interpretation of the method of inspiration. Some conservatives claimed that inspiration was in thoughts and impulses not in words, while others claimed merely that the Hebrew people were inspired. Thus they believed that the Bible was infallible in spiritual matters but not necessarily accurate in matters of history or science. The fundamentalists claimed that true inspiration could have been achieved only through the use of words and that the Bible was literally dictated by God, meaning that no part of it could in any way be questioned or criticized.[5]

Stirrings of controversy concerning the nature, extent, and significance of the inspiration of the Bible and its accuracy began to be felt in the 1890's. During that decade a serious controversy concerning the meaning of the Bible divided the Texas Disciples of Christ. The Disciples of Christ had formed from a breach in the Baptist ranks in 1832 when Alexander Campbell and his followers, in an effort to overcome denominationalism and reestablish universal New Testament Christianity, rejected all man-made creeds and doctrines and urged a return to the Bible only as the infallible

---

[5]Firm Foundation, 8 February 1898, p. 8; Baptist Standard, 25 February 1909, p. 3; Reminiscences of Dr. R. A. Wharton, Sherman, Texas, typescript, University of Texas Archives, Austin, Texas; Gabriel Herbert, Fundamentalism and the Church of God (London: SCM Press, 1957), p. 10; Joseph M. Dawson, A Thousand Months to Remember: An Autobiography (Waco: Baylor University Press, 1964), p. 263.

guide to matters of church structure and worship.[6] Believing that the Bible alone contained the truth, Texas Disciples had to accept it as a literal record. Unfortunately for their unity, disagreements arose over just what that everlasting infallible truth was, and the Disciples split in the 1890's into two distinct groups with the splinter group developing into the Churches of Christ. Although the division was nationwide at that time, Texas was an important battlefield.[7]

In Texas, the split in the Disciples of Christ ranks developed from a bitter feud between two denominational newspapers, Firm Foundation, an Austin publication, and the Christian Courier, published in Dallas, over the true meaning of the Scriptures with the major issue being baptism. The Firm Foundation editors argued that since only one true church could exist (theirs), there could be only one true method and meaning of baptism. Thus, if one were baptized into an errant denomination--the Baptist, for instance--then he or she had not truly been baptized and must be immersed again upon entering the true church. The Christian Courier, on the other hand, insisted that once a person had been immersed, repeating the ceremony was not essential to salvation. The Christian Courier could not accept the Firm Foundation's argument that only members of the Disciples of

---

[6]William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America, rev. and enl. ed. (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1950), pp. 235-238.

[7]Colby D. Hall, Texas Disciples (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1953), pp. 136-138.

Christ were destined for heaven.[8] Division also developed concerning the use of instrumental music in worship services. Adhering to the philosophy of absolutely precise, literal following of scriptural instructions, the Firm Foundation argued that since the New Testament did not command the playing of instruments, their use in worship services was unscriptural. The Christian Courier claimed that since the Bible guide was not that complete, the reestablishment of the New Testament church did not necessarily preclude the use of instrumental music. This controversy became unbelievably heated and bitter, with the no-music faction destroying organs and bringing law suits to retain control of church property.[9] These controversies and divisions clearly illustrated the difficulty of a literal reading of the Bible, as both sides claimed to believe in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures.

While controversy raged among the Texas Disciples about the meaning of the inspired Bible, Texas religious leaders began to become aware of a new and disconcerting method of Bible study, referred to as higher or historical criticism. The higher critics used scientific and historical methods in

---

[8]Texas Baptist and Herald, 19 March 1898, p. 1; Firm Foundation, 1 March 1898, p. 69; 24 January 1893, p. 3; 28 February 1897, p. 1; 2 March 1897, p. 1; Christian Courier, 2 March 1899, p. 8; Hall, Texas Disciples, p. 150-151.

[9]Firm Foundation, 9 November 1897, p. 2; Texas Baptist and Herald, 19 March 1898, p. 1; Hall, Texas Disciples, pp. 145-149.

studying the Bible.[10] The critics rejected the superstitions surrounding the Bible and announced that it was merely a book, not a verbal inspiration from God. Using methods of literary criticism, they attempted to determine authors of various books of the Bible and freely pointed out errors and inconsistencies in the text.[11]

Although the state harbored few higher critics in the 1890's, Texans became concerned about this new approach to Bible study, expressing their belief that it threatened the entire basis of Christianity. Religious leaders clearly indicated their dedication to the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, but the controversy did not seem to affect the rank and file of Texas Protestants very deeply at the time,[12] probably because their rural way of life seemed intact, with outside forces threatening them little.

Controversy concerning Darwinism was also just beginning to develop in the 1890's and early 1900's. Charles Darwin's Origin of the Species first appeared in 1859, but not until

---

[10]Shailer Mathews, "The Faith of a Modernist," in American Christianity: An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents, 1820-1960, ed. Hilnie Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetsher, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), 2: 243-244

[11]Charles A. Briggs, "The Authority of the Holy Scripture: An Inaugral Address," in Ibid., 2:276-279.

[12]Texas Christian Advocate, 24 August 1899, p. 1; 1 June 1899, p. 2; Baptist Standard, 19 August, 1909, p. 1; 17 March 1910, p. 1; Christian Courier, 20 January 1910, p. 1; 23 June 1910, p. 1; 30 June 1910, p. 1; Nail, ed., History of Texas Methodists, p. 124.

the 1890's did conservative theologians begin in large numbers to express their fear that his theories concerning evolution seriously threatened religion. If one accepted the Bible literally as a direct dictation from God, then he must believe that the earth was created in six days, that Adam was the first man, that man had been civilized since the beginning of time, and that the species had remained the same since God created them.[13] The doctrine of the fall of man, another important dogma to fundamentalists, also depended upon the accuracy of Genesis. Orthodox Christianity taught that men were "children of wrath, dead, lost, hopeless, Godless, Christless, depraved in the bent of their souls."[14] Since man inherited from Adam, the first man, original sin and a depraved nature, the Genesis account had to be a literal record. Man could not be rising and progessing as evolution taught because he had fallen so far from the original state of perfection in Eden. If evolution were true, then the Bible was not accurate in a literal sense and man had not fallen from grace, notions that the fundamentalists could not tolerate.[15]

---

[13] Baptist Standard, 7 December 1911, Sweet, The Story of Religion, p. 343.

[14] Editorial, Southwestern Journal of Theology 3 (April 1919): 3.

[15] W. E. Denham, "The Fall of Man," Southwestern Journal of Theology 6 (January 1922): 23-27; Charles B. Williams, "Paul's Testimony to the Doctrine of Sin," in The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth, Compliments of Two Christian Gentlemen [Lyman and Milton Stewart] 12 vols. (Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company, 1909-1915), 8:49-63.

At the turn of the century Texas religious leaders expressed concern about the theory of evolution, but like the higher criticism controversy, it seemed to disturb the people themselves little.[16] The discussion of the 1890's lacked the sense of urgency and of impending doom that characterized the 1920's controversy. Religious conservatives like B. H. Carroll, professor of Bible at Baylor, could accept some aspects of evolution without experiencing severe criticism. In the 1890's he told his classes that the dates referred to in Genesis meant periods of time and not literal twenty-four-hour days, a position that would cause serious trouble in the 1920's. He also believed that evolution or development was possible within a species although he denied that one species could evolve into another.[17] Some Methodist spokesmen took a similar position concerning the length of time covered in Genesis, and by the end of the nineteenth century had seemingly reconciled science and religion.[18]

Few Texas Protestants, however, had actually accepted Darwinism, or for that matter, any other scientific doctrine

---

[16]Dawson, A Thousand Months, p. 263; Thomas F. Glick, ed. and comp., Darwinism in Texas: An Exhibition in the Texas Historical Center, April, 1972 (Austin: Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, 1972), p. 8.

[17]B. H. Carroll, "Creation," Course in the English Bible, Lectures III and IV, typescript, B. H. Carroll Papers, Texas Collection, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

[18]Texas Christian Advocate, 30 November 1899, p. 2.

that contradicted their old-time religion. Texas Protestants continued to emphasize the supernatural in religion, a characteristic which would later distinguish those who called themselves fundamentalists. They argued that the miracles occurred just as the Bible recorded them and could occur again. Their God was all-powerful and had to demonstrate his power by such actions as sending a flood to destroy the world, raising the dead, parting the Red Sea, and enabling Jonah to survive after being swallowed by a whale.[19]

Fundamentalists were also distinguished by their adamant defence of the orthodox doctrines concerning the life and death of Christ. They believed that Christ as both God and man was sent to bridge the gap between mortal and immortal. If His father was the Holy Spirit and He was both God and man, then His virgin birth had to be a literal fact; thus to question this doctrine was to question not only the divinity of Christ but also the very basis for salvation. Jesus's death and resurrection were also important to orthodox Christianity; in fact, Texas Protestants viewed the crucifixion and resurrection as the essence of the Christian

---

[19] The Fundamentalist, 1 April 1920, p. 2; 23 June 1921, p. 1. This paper published by the controversial pastor of the First Baptist Church of Fort Worth, J. Frank Norris, was variously titled The Fence Rail (January-March of 1917), The Searchlight (March 1917-April 1927), and The Fundamentalist (after April 15, 1927). It will be cited throughout as The Fundamentalist. Charles Hudson, "The Structure of a Fundamentalist Christian Belief System," in Religion and the Solid South, ed. Samuel S. Hill, Jr., et al (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), p. 134.

experience. In the crucifixion they believed that Jesus substituted His life for man's, atoning for man's sins and assuring him everlasting life. If Christ died to redeem man, He had to have experienced actual crucifixion and a physical resurrection. Only if this had actually occurred could man escape death and damnation.[20] Fundamentalists felt literally that their souls were at stake if this doctrine were questioned. Also important to fundamentalists were their concepts of a literal heaven and a hell of fire and brimstone.[21] These doctrines were the foundations of Texas Protestantism at the turn of the century.

One of the most distinguishing characteristics of Texas fundamentalists was their belief in the literal, bodily second coming of Christ. On this dogma they parted company with many conservative churchmen, and controversy concerning just when and how Christ would return to earth began to emerge in the 1800's. Texas fundamentalist leaders were without significant exception premillennialists, meaning that they believed Christ would return before the establishment of the millennium. On the other hand, some conservative Texas

---

[20]L. M. Sipes, "Regeneration--Man's Fundamental Need," Southwestern Journal of Theology 4(April 1920): 38-44; Baptist Standard, 19 August 1909, p. 1; Thomas Theodore Martin, The Dawson-Norris Issue, J. M. Dawson and Modernism: The Inside of the Cup Turned Out (Jackson, Tennessee: McCowat-Mercer Ptg. Company, 1932), pp. 6-12.

[21]Firm Foundation, 31 March 1925, p. 1; The Fundamentalist, 21 August 1919, pp. 2-3.

religious leaders were postmillennialists, which meant that they believed Christ would return after the millennium had been established. Others simply professed a belief that Christ would come again but admitted that they did not know when.[22] The postmillennial position made it possible to work for the establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth, whereas the premillennial view taught that the world would remain corrupt and depraved until Christ's second coming.[23]

Since nothing they could do would bring the kingdom any closer or hasten the millennium, the premillennialists spent a lot of time predicting and anticipating the second coming. Some described the end of the world in detail, predicting first that the dead will be resurrected and the living saints taken away. Then the anti-Christ will reign over all of the nations during a time of terrible trouble, while a false prophet controls religion. When the anti-Christ attacks Jerusalem, which will again be inhabited by the Jews, the Lord will make his lightning-like appearance and a great battle will follow in which the Lord will overthrow the anti-Christ and chain the devil. Then the millennium, the thousand years of peace, will be established.[24]

---

[22]A good summation of the different views of the millennium is found in Baptist Standard, 3 June 1954, p. 5.

[23]The Fundamentalist, 2 March 1919, p. 1; 14 August 1919, p. 1; 29 July 1920, p. 3; "The Menace of Millennialism" The Christian Century, 22 November 1923, in George W. Truett Papers, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas; J. Frank Norris, The Gospel of Dynamite (n.p.:n.p., n.p.), p. 7.

[24]The Fundamentalist, 6 November 1919, pp. 3-4.

As the fundamentalist movement developed in Texas one's position on the second coming became the most significant test of orthodoxy. As one prominent fundamentalist expressed it, "There is but one real view of the Second Coming and that is that Christ will come personally, visibly, literally, bodily to establish his reign of righteousness on earth. Any other view is to deny his coming, to deheart it."[25] If a Protestant was "right" on the second coming, he was not likely to be "wrong" on any of the other vital doctrines of Christianity. Anyone who believed in the second coming would necessarily accept the Bible literally and believe strongly in the possibility of miracles. He would accept the Genesis account of creation and reject higher criticism.

During the latter part of the 1800's Texas Methodists engaged in an intense controversy that involved, in part, disagreement over the second coming. A militant fundamentalist element within the Methodist denomination expressed itself through the Holiness or Second Blessing movement. Harbingers of the movement were roving evangelists who held emotional tent revivals emphasizing the second coming of Christ and the doctrine of perfection and santification. Insisting upon righteous living, they made extreme demands on their followers. As church leaders objected to their emotionalism and to their claims of faith healing, it seemed for a time as though the

---

[25]Ibid., 30 April 1923, p. 1.

movement would split the denomination. A Holiness association was formed and the church press and pastors heatedly discussed the issues involved. In the 1890's some of the Methodist conferences passed resolutions denouncing the Second Blessing doctrines, but by the early 1900's both sides had decided that the church could accommodate the differences in opinion by relegating the opposing doctrines to the non-essentials.[26] Since Methodists did not stress dogma, they could handle doctrinal differences by labeling disputed issues as non-essential, which meant that agreement on these points was not necessary for salvation. Thus the church reabsorbed its fundamentalist branch, its premillennialists and emotionalists.

Regardless of their disagreements over some aspects of dogma or doctrine, most Texas Protestants accepted a simple gospel message of regeneration of the individual soul. The preacher's business was soul saving and the role of the church was to convert as many sinners as possible. Intensely individualistic, Texas Protestantism was based on the dramatic conversion experience, and improved social conditions or environments had little if anything to do with that experience. A child or an individual did not grow into regeneration but

---

[26]Macum Phelam, A History of the Expansion of Methodism in Texas, 1867-1902 (Dallas: Mathis, Van Nort and Company, 1937), Nail, ed., History of Texas Methodism, pp. 50-51; Texas Christian Advocate, 25 August 1898, p. 8; 21 April 1898, p. 8; 25 August 1897, p. 8.

achieved or received it in one powerful, overwhelming moment.[27] The gospel of a "soul stained by sin" was the major concern of Texas Protestants.[28] Although Texas Protestant denominations became involved in such worldly pursuits as building schools, orphans' homes, and hospitals, avowals were made that these objects had not replaced the primary role of the church, which always remained soul saving. A frequently expressed fear was that the churches, becoming too concerned with social service, were losing sight of Christianity's spiritual work.[29]

Such emphasis on spirituality helps explain Texas Protestants' anti-institutional bias, which became an extremely important characteristic of the fundamentalist movement in Texas. The fundamentalists within Texas Protestantism seemed almost paranoid about the development of denominational institutions. To them, religion was personal, spiritual, and individualistic, and the growth of boards, denominational leaders and structure destroyed much of that character.[30]

---

[27]Sipes, "Regeneration--Man's Fundamental Need," pp. 38-44; Kenneth Bailey, Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), pp. 18-24.

[28]Journal of the 65th Annual Session of the West Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Gonzales, Texas, October 24-28, 1923 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 72.

[29]Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, Held at El Paso, Texas, November 11-15, 1920, Containing the Proceedings of the 72nd Annual Session (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 80.

[30]Firm Foundation, 23 February 1897, p. 4.

Many Texans seemed concerned that their lives were going to be controlled by some force outside themselves.

The conspiracy theme was strong among Texas fundamentalists, who believed that denominational leaders were conspiring to concentrate their forces and destroy the power of the local church. According to one fundamentalist, "Satan's ecclesiastical overlord machine domineered by a materialistic oligarchy headed by an evolutionary institutional clique and some denominational fence-straddlers, . . . have robbed the churches of their power."[31] Another fundamentalist warned that "Institutionalism is the evil leaven that corrupts the gospel of Christ."[32]

It was no accident that the fundamentalist movement developed and reached its heights in Texas just at a time when Protestant denominations were becoming more institutionalized and embarking on more projects than ever before. Building hospitals and schools required cooperation and money; to get such cooperation Protestant leaders did, at times, resort to coercion of various kinds. However, the anti-institutional bias of Texas Protestants became apparent long before the controversies of the 1920's, causing serious divisions in the 1890's. The struggle between those who sought

---

[31]A. Reilly Copeland, "A New Testament Church Versus Modern Evolution," tract in file on Fundamentalism, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

[32]The Fundamentalist, 30 April 1923, p. 1.

to build a powerful denominational structure and those who favored local church control was an old one among Texas Protestants.

The decade of the 1890's was an organizational period for Texas Protestants. Until the late 1800's most religious work was done in the state by local congregations or roving evangelists, but as the Protestant population grew a movement developed to create better organized and united denominations. However, this trend toward centralization sometimes caused greater divisions rather than unity. For example, it contributed significantly to the split which developed in the ranks of Texas Disciples of Christ. That group had no state organization until the 1880's and 1890's when they began calling statewide meetings. At first, these meetings were little more than evangelical endeavors, but gradually statewide programs began to develop from the meetings.[33] The movement toward more efficient organization coincided with the development of the controversies concerning instrumental music and baptism.

Since their origin, the Disciples of Christ had emphasized reestablishing the New Testament Church. Now the Firm Foundation branch of the denomination (a term disliked by both factions) contended that the church was the body of Christ

---

[33]Carter E. Boren, "Early History of the Disciples of Christ in Texas," (M. A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1937), pp. 94-95.

and that controlling it through boards and conventions destroyed it spiritually and scripturally. Since denominations did not exist during Christ's time and since the New Testament gave no instructions for creating them, they had to be avoided. The church should not as a denomination own schools, publish newspapers, or create mission boards. Individuals or groups who were members of the church could do all these things and more, but the church as an institution could not become involved. The Christian Courier, on the other hand, argued that Biblical instructions for organizing the church did not deny the right to embark on cooperative endeavors.[34] The anti-institutional bias remained an important tenet of the Church of Christ formed during this period of controversy in the late nineteenth century.

The 1890's was also a period of both organization and division among the rapidly growing Texas Baptist denomination. Throughout most of the 1800's Texas Baptists lacked unity, with rival leaders, conventions, newspapers, and colleges vying for control and support of the denomination. The most serious controversy arose between the two Baptist colleges in the state--Baylor College in Independence and Waco College in that city. As a movement to combine them gained momentum, intense competition and controversy developed. In 1885, under the leadership of B. H. Carroll, the two conventions in Texas,

---

[34] Firm Foundation, 8 June 1920, p. 3; Hall, Texas Disciples, pp. 140-144, discusses both sides of the controversy.

the Baptist General Association of Texas and the Baptist State Convention, consolidated under the title Baptist General Convention of Texas. The two schools also united, moved to Waco, and became Baylor University.[35]

For a time it seemed as though the settlement would bring peace to the troubled Baptists, but the more efficient organization only brought increased difficulties. As more state Baptist institutions were founded in the 1890's, including Howard Payne at Brownwood and Simmons at Abilene, as well as colleges at Jacksboro, Decatur, and Rusk, the expanded programs proved expensive; hence, some opposed establishment of the new schools. Two Texas newspapers, the Texas Baptist and Herald, edited by S. A. Hayden, and the Western Baptist, edited by R. T. Hanks, engaged in bitter argument and controversy over this new organizational phase for Texas Baptists, with Hanks supporting and Hayden opposing the institutions. In an effort to establish peace within Baptist ranks, J. B. Cranfill bought Hanks' paper which became the Texas Baptist Standard.[36]

Far from being settled the feud worsened. J. M. Carroll, the brother of B. H. Carroll, became corresponding secretary of the still young Baptist General Convention and proceeded to consolidate various missionary interests and other denominational endeavors with the State Mission Board. The result

---

[35]Joseph M. Dawon, A Century of Texas Baptists (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1947), pp. 35-40

[36]Ibid., pp. 52-55.

was a more efficient and better organized system, but one that also concentrated power in the hands of a few. Hayden accused both Cranfill and Carroll of fraud and attacked the reorganization of the system. The justification of Hayden's attack and the basis of his appeal to Texans was his defense of local church sovereignty and his opposition to board control of the churches. Throughout the decade of the 1890's he opposed the newly organized work of the denomination.[37]

In 1896, J. B. Gambrell became Board Secretary and unsuccessfully tried to establish peace. As Hayden's attacks grew more bitter, the state convention refused to seat him in 1897, 1898, and 1899. A lengthy court battle ensued in which Hayden sought $100,000 in damages against Cranfill, Carroll, and other Baptist leaders for plotting to put him out of the convention. The most significant long range result of this controversy was the ultimate establishment of the Baptist Missionary Association, which emphasized the local church rather than a united denomination.[38] Although this controversy over institutionalism was not directly concerned with what would later be termed the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, the role of the church did come under scrutiny and discussion, as it would in the later conflict.

---

[37] Texas Baptist and Herald, 17 March 1898, p. 2; 3 March 1898, p. 3; Dawson, A Century with Texas Baptists, pp. 54-62.

[38]

The question would recur many times during the 1900's as to whether the church should be controlled locally, concerning itself primarily with soul saving, or whether it was also an instrument of social change to educate and provide social services.

Texas Baptists also experienced criticism from outside the denomination in the 1890's which contributed to their divisions. In Waco, the center of the Texas Baptist denomination, William Cowper Brann published a journal entitled the Iconoclast which greatly displeased Baptist leaders. A modern day deist who disliked the Baptists' certainty that they possessed the truth, Brann opposed many things the Baptists stood for, including prohibition and evangelism. He attacked the Baptist Mission fund, claiming that not one heathen soul was saved for every $1,000,000 spent.[39] More serious, however, were his attacks on Baptist morality. In 1895 he accused Rufus Burleson, one of the leading Baptists of the state, of bringing a young Brazilian girl into his home and corrupting her morally. When she became pregnant by one of Burleson's relatives and was turned out of the Burleson home, Brann took the girl's side and his paper was filled with exposures of the case. Brann also made some disturbing remarks about the morality of Baylor girls in general, which caused controversy to become so heated that Baylor students almost lynched Brann, and Waco became literally

---

[39] Iconoclast 6(October 1896): 239.

an armed camp. Finally Brann was murdered, but by then the controversy had so disturbed Texas Baptists that unity was difficult.[40] Thus, throughout the 1890's sharp dissensions and divisions plagued Texas Protestants.

Although the elements of fundamentalism had been present throughout the history of Texas Protestantism, fundamentalist theologians did not become militant or aggressive until the emergence of their antagonists, the modernists. The so-called modernist movement began to develop within the Protestant denominations of the United States during the last half of the eighteenth century. The essence of modernist theology was its attempt to reconcile science and religion by rejecting those aspects of Christianity which scientific discoveries contradicted and by emphasizing the moral teachings of Christianity. Modernists taught that every man was divine and stressed the natural goodness and perfectibility of mankind. According to modernistic beliefs, Christ was not the son of a virgin, not did he perform miracles or rise from the dead. He was a saviour only in that he was conscious of God and guided by God. Modernism held that specific doctrine was unnecessary to religion, that all religions were basically different forms of one religion,

---

[40] J. D. Shaw, collector, Bran: the Iconoclast, A Collection of the Writings of W. C. Bran, 2 vols. (Waco, Texas: Knight Printing Company, 1898-1903), pp. 320-323; Iconoclast 7(November 1897): 339, 211; 8(May 1898): 74-75.

and that Christianity was unique only in that it was the highest form of religion. Since these religious liberals believed that the Bible was only a human statement of religion, they rejected the parts of it that they found unbelievable, especially the supernatural events and revelations.[41]

The year 1910 is frequently cited as an important beginning point for the fundamentalist reaction to liberal theology. In that year a series of pamphlets began to appear which gave an important summation of the tenets of orthodox Christianity. Entitled The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth, the booklets were published and distributed free to clergymen, evangelists, missionaries, Sunday School teachers, theology students, and other interested parties at the expense of Lyman and Milton Stewart, wealthy Los Angeles businessmen. The purpose of the booklets being to stem the tide of liberalism in theology, five basic tenets were developed as essential to the preservation of historical Christianity: the infallibility of the Scriptures, the virgin birth of Christ, His substitutionary atonement for man's sins, His resurrection, and His literal second coming.[42]

---

[41]Although these doctrines are all tenets of liberal theology, various modernists interpreted religion differently so that each accepted these beliefs to a different extent; hence a precise summation of modernism is difficult. For explanations see Harry Emerson Fosdick, Christianity and Progress (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1922); Shailer Mathews, "Ten Years of American Protestantism," North American Review 217(May 1923): 577-593; C. W. Eliot, "The Religion of the Future," in American Christianity, ed. Smith, Handy, and Loetcher, p. 234.

[42]Stewart Grant Cole, The History of Fundamentalism (New York: Richard Smith, Inc., 1931), pp. 53-62; Daniel B. Stevick, Beyond Fundamentalism (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), pp. 19-20.

Two Texans, both professors at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, contributed articles to the project. Professor J. J. Reeve's "My Personal Experience with the Higher Criticism" gave a scathing review of modernistic theology and historical criticism of the Bible. The author identified the evolutionary hypothesis as being the basis of the higher criticism movement and warned that science and rationalism were undermining evangelical Christianity. He contended that the modernist school replaced faith with reason and religion with philosophy. His greatest concern was that science and rationalism would undermine the belief in the supernatural aspects of Christianity which would destroy its very essence. With the constant emphasis on evolution and change, he warned that people were in danger of losing belief in the "absolute truth" which the Bible taught. Ultimately there would be no certainties, no real authorities; religion and God Himself would become merely a part of a theory. Reeve predicted a cleavage between the modernist and the orthodox views, writing, that "Churches are none too soon or too seriously alarmed. Christianity is beginning to see that its very existence is at stake in this subtle attempt to do away with the supernatural." He was confident, however, that orthodox Christianity would emerge the victor.[43] The other article in support of

---

[43]J. J. Reeve, "My Personal Experience with the Higher Criticism," The Fundamentals, 3:98-118.

fundamentalism written by a Texan was Charles B. Williams's "Paul's Testimony to the Doctrine of Sin." He stressed the significance of Adam's literal fall from grace, the enormity of sin in man's life, and the possibility of redemption by Christ alone.[44]

The appearance of the pamphlets in Texas served primarily to reaffirm tenets already accepted by the vast majority of Texas Protestants. Few modernists lived in the state, but some antagonists like Brann and his friend J. D. Shaw, also of Waco, had brought the issues to the public's attention. Shaw, a former Methodist preacher, published a newspaper entitled the Independent Pulpit in which he frequently defended liberal doctrines.[45]

Stirrings of a reaction to liberal theology and modernism began to develop early in the 1900's as Texas Protestants began to protest the intrusion of modernism into various aspects of their lives. In 1913, the Baptist convention, meeting in Fort Worth, passed and sent to the state textbook board resolutions denouncing the adoption of an ancient history text for use in the state schools because it conflicted with the Bible on significant points. For example, the book taught that Moses' code of laws was modeled after

---

[44]Charles B. Williams, "Paul's Testimony to the Doctrine of Sin," The Fundamentals, 8:49-63.

[45]The Independent Pulpit, April 1887, reproduced in Glick, ed., Darwinism in Texas, p. 12.

the Hannurabi code when in fact, according to Texas Baptists, God gave the code directly to Moses. The book also claimed that the Egyptians rather than the Hebrews developed the concept of life after death and that the Hebrew concept of God changed over the course of their history. The Baptist Standard, which had by that time become the official organ of Texas Southern Baptists, called upon every minister to insure that the public schools in his community did not undermine the faith of youngsters with such teachings.[46]

Protestant spokesmen more and more frequently protested trends toward modernism. Various Protestant newspapers published more frequent editorials on the subject and occasionally conservatives accused individuals of begin modernistic. In 1916, for example, B. A. Copass, a professor at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, accused a Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College professor of having written an unsound study of the Bible. In opposition to the A. and M. professor's book Copass declared that the Bible came directly from God and that the higher critics were trying to destroy it.[47]

The most significant indication that a fundamentalist reaction was developing in Texas was the Bible Conference

---

[46]Baptist Standard, 23 January 1913, p. 2.

[47]B. A. Copass to W. B. Bizzill, 24 February 1916, W. B. Bizzill to Copass, 21 February 1917, B. A. Copass Papers, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

movement. Large meetings to study the Bible, emphasizing its significance and inspiration, were held in several Texas cities, notably Fort Worth and Houston. Such well known fundamentalists as W. B. Riley and A. C. Dixon appeared at these conferences.[48] The movement did not make its full impact until after World War I. Until then other issues occupied Texas Protestants.

The turn of the century saw significant social, political, and religious changes in Texas. The early years of the twentieth century, the period known as the Progressive Era, was an optimistic age for the United States. Repeatedly the progressives reaffirmed their faith in mankind and their committment to progress. Calling for clean, moralistic government based firmly on the will of the people, they brought about significant economic and political changes. In the realm of religion, a greater concern for social and economic ills of the country led to the development of the social gospel movement, an approach to Christianity that seemed to support the progressives' conviction that man's situation could be improved. The social gospellers believed that it was well within the realm of Christianity to be concerned with people's life in the here and now as well as with their eternal souls.[49]

---

[48]The Fundamentalist, 13 April 1917, p. 1; 27 March 1919, p. 3; 4 March 1920, pp. 1-3; 11 March 1920, p. 1.

[49]Sweet, The Story of Religion, pp. 355-357.

Some interest in the social gospel was evident among Texas Protestants. A few leaders like William Connor, a professor at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, who had studied in Chicago under Walter Rauschenbusch, the leading social gospeller, expressed an interest in this approach to Christianity. Before World War I, Southern Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians had all expressed concern with social problems.[50] However, for the most part Texas Protestants, especially the more fundamentalist adherents, remained concerned with the salvation of individual souls and rejected the philosophy of the social gospel. Several factors explain this rejection. For one thing the social gospel had been connected with liberal or modernistic theology, since many of the ministers attempting to reconcile science and religion were also involved in efforts to improve society. The belief that man was evolving into a higher state encouraged the social gospel.[51]

In addition, the social gospel, many fundamentalists feared, would lead to greater institutionalization of religion. In order to improve man's social conditions, the

---

[50]James Joseph Thompson, "Southern Baptist Religious Thought, 1919-1931" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1971), p. 59; Bailey, Southern White Protestantism, p. 41.

[51]Baptist Standard, 16 May 1912, p. 2; Interview with Dr. Thomas Maston, 11 July 1974, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

churches would have to have boards and institutions, thus requiring more centralized control. The premillennial branch of Texas Protestantism clearly could not accept the social gospel. Since nothing man could do would alter the world situation, there was no need for the social gospel.[52] The social gospel movement, however, did not sweep Texas primarily because of the emphasis among Texas Protestants on the individual experience as the basis of Christianity.

Nevertheless, Texas Protestants were affected by the Progressive crusade. They joined loudly in the call for greater morality in politics and for the people to increase their voice in government. Like other Americans during the Progressive Era, Texas Protestants were concerned with machine politics and business domination of government. The Baptist Standard, for example, editorialized in 1914:

> For many years the government has ben [sic] run for business--not for humanity. Railroads were conducted in the interests of those who ran them without regard to the interests of the common people. The great banking interests of the country centered in Wall Street, were guided by men who were concerned strictly for money and their businesses. They brought on panics, they corrupted legislatures, they destroyed great properties, all in the interest of business. At last the whole country became aroused and a new statesmanship was brought in, constructed from the standpoint of humanity, even the lowest and most helpless of the human race. The nation had become aroused to a large appreciation of the necessity of caring

---

[52] The Fundamentalist, 11 January 1929, p. 1; 18 October 1929, p. 1.

> for the ignorant, the poor, the weak, the helpless, inexperienced childhood and especially of motherhood.[53]

The primary interests of Texas Protestants during the Progressive Era, however, was not bettering the economic and social conditions of the helpless, ignorant masses but enforcing a code of public morality. Although Southern Protestants had always professed an allegiance to strict morality, it was during the Progressive Era that they began in earnest trying to reform society, using the legislatures to enfore Christian goals, whereas until that time they had been concerned primarily with the morality of their own members.[54] During the Progressive Era, Texas Protestants crusaded against movies, gambling, liquor, desecration of the Sabbath, divorce, and numerous other worldly ills.[55]

In the enthusiastic crusade for prohibition, Protestant preachers did not hesitate to become involved in politics. In 1909 one Baptist editorialized, "Whatever is hurtful of morals, whether it be the social evil or the divorce evil or the whiskey evil, is the proper concern of the Christian ministry; for from even the narrowest view of Christianity, whatever hurts morals hinders the cause of Christ."[56] In

---

[53]Baptist Standard, 18 June 1914, p. 8.

[54]Bailey, Southern White Protestantism, pp. 36-37.

[55]The Fundamentalist, 7 August 1919, p. 4; Baptist Standard, 19 May 1910, p. 29; 15 December 1910, p. 9; 19 January 1911, p. 1; 30 March 1911, p. 1; 6 April 1911, p. 1; Christian Courier, 15 March 1917, p. 4.

[56]Baptist Standard, 18 February 1909, p. 1.

elections for state and national offices Texas religious leaders did not hesitate to choose sides based on a candidate's stand on liquor, gambling or some other public evil. Opposition arose to Jacob F. Wolters, Oscar Branch Colquitt, and James Ferguson because of their refusal to support the prohibition campaign.[57]

The rhetoric of Progressivism was used to oppose such candidates, the argument being that since they failed to support prohibition they were pawns of that most wicked special interest group of all, the liquor business. Religious writings pictured the liquor interests as an organized business conspiracy trying to gain control of the state from the good, honest, churchgoing people of Texas.[58] All in all, one of the most important supports the prohibition movement had in Texas was the work of Protestant leaders, especially the Baptists and Methodists.[59] Although concern with public morality was an important theme in Protestant religion in general, as the fundamentalist movement developed those who identified themselves openly and proudly as fundamentalists became more adament and militant on such issues than other Texas Protestants.

---

[57]Ibid., 22 August 1912, pp. 8-9; 6 June 1912, p. 1; 9 May 1912, p. 8.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Lewis L. Gould, Progressives and Prohibitionists: Texas Democrats in the Wilson Era (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1973), p. 48.

Thus Texas Protestants' fundamentalist heritage developed in the nineteenth and Early twentieth centuries. Long before the controversy of the 1920's orthodox beliefs later identified as fundamentalism, such as emphasis on the literal Bible, belief in the supernatural, acceptance of Christ's divine nature and His second coming, and concern with the autonomy of the local church, were the essence of Texas Protestantism.

CHAPTER II

THE FUNDAMENTALIST CRUSADE COMES TO TEXAS

With the outbreak of World War I Progressivism seemed to lose its momentum and leadership, as interest shifted to foreign affairs. When the war began in Europe Americans were shocked but hoped to avoid involvement. Then in 1917, the United States entered the war, characterizing its effort at first with the crusading zeal of the Progressive movement. Soon, however, the war became a sobering, disillusioning expe-rience that brought a shift in emphasis to many phases of American life.

The war effort had a significant impact on the Protestant churches of Texas causing some reevaluation and shift in emphasis. During the war Texas Protestants proved that in spite of all the talk about public morality and clean govern-ment, they had not lost sight of their primary aim which was soul winning. As Texas boys began joining the armed forces, centers sprang up across the state to minister to them and save their souls before they left to fight. Protestant spokesmen warned of the temptations that plagued the soldiers and urged Texans to do their Christian and patriotic duty by contributing generously to the evangelical effort in their behalf.[1]

---

[1]Christian Courier, 8 March 1917, p. 12; "Christianity and our Soldiers," Southwestern Journal of Theology 2(April 1918): 3-7; B. A. Copass, "The Evangelistic Call of the Army," Southwestern Journal of Theology 2(July 1918): 36-42.

Texas religious leaders almost unanimously supported the war effort. Following the habit of thought established by their orthodox religion, they portrayed the world struggle in terms of absolute good versus absolute evil. Identifying the Germans as the epitome of evil, they asserted that the United States was fighting for Christianity as well as democracy.[2] One Baptist leader called the war "the surgery of civilization" and contended that it "may become the highest expression of benevolence."[3]

The most significant influence of the war on Texas religious life was its impact on the rising fundamentalist movement. Although, the fundamentalist reaction to liberalism began to develop before World War I, the emotionalism of the war gave it the impetus that brought it to fever pitch in the 1920's. World War I seemed to negate many of the Progressive assumptions about the nature of man and the hope of America. Surely, many orthodox Protestants felt, the war proved the natural depravity of man and the hopelessness of his situation on earth. At first the war was charged with idealism and fought for such noble goals as making the world safe for democracy and ending all wars; but when the bloody conflict ended, Americans had to face

---

[2]Baptist Standard, 19 June 1917, p. 6; Christian Courier, 15 March 1917, p. 3; Bailey, Southern White Protestantism, p. 42.

[3]Baptist Standard, 29 June 1916, p. 10.

the reality that these ends had not been accomplished. Consequently a period of disillusionment and reaction set in.[4]

The war itself seemed to renew people's need for a strong, exacting, and above all secure religion. The world appeared to be crumbling, and people needed to find security in something. Religious leaders in Texas contended that the war came as punishment because the world had turned away from religion, and now mankind's only hope was a return to the faith of their fathers.[5] The war also contributed to the fundamentalist appeal because it strengthened the position of the premillennialists, whose preachers claimed that the war fulfilled part of the prophesies. According to them, the Bible had predicted the holocaust in detail.[6]

During the war Texas Protestants began blaming the state of the world on the liberal, modernistic and rationalistic trends that had developed during the Progressive

---

[4]Frederick Louis Allen, Only Yesterday, An Informal History of the Nineteen Twenties (New York: Harper, 1931), p. 21; Norman Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), pp. 23-25; Sweet, The Story of Religion, pp. 402-410.

[5]Christian Courier, 1 March 1917, p. 4; Editorial, Southwestern Journal of Theology 3(April 1919): 3-6; Thompson, "Southern Baptist Religious Thought," p. 16; Rollin Lynde Hartt, "The War in the Churches, The Great Split in the Protestant Denominations Over the Issue of Fundamentalism," World's Work 46(September 1923): 469-477.

[6]The Fundamentalist, 3 July 1919, p. 3; 11 September 1919, p. 3; 29 July 1920, p. 3.

years. Since German theologians had been leading proponents of the modern theology before the war, it was easy for Texas Protestants to connect liberalism with Germany and therefore with absolute evil. They insisted that public schools and colleges must return to teaching the Bible rather than rationalistic philosophy.[7] The Baptist Standard asserted, "A nation has no moral nor civil right to ignore God."[8]

The war fostered a fighting spirit at home as well as abroad, as the people were inflamed into intense hatred of Germany and everything connected with it. This wartime temper lasted long after the actual battles were over. As Frederick Lewis Allen noted in Only Yesterday, "The nation at war had formed the habit of summary action and it was not soon unlearned."[9] The war effort seemed to demand unanimity of opinion and Texans proved themselves willing to take whatever steps necessary to enforce conformity. One significant example of Texas Protestant's demand for orthodoxy and agreement during the war was the controversy concerning the beliefs and teachings of J. L. Kessler at Baylor. In

---

[7]Henry C. Mabie, "Current Unbelief: Its Root and Remedy," Southwestern Journal of Theology 2(January 1918): 11-18; Thompson, "Southern Baptist Religious Thought," pp. 9, 136.

[8]Baptist Standard, 14 June 1917, p. 1

[9]Allen, Only Yesterday, p. 201.

1917, Kessler, who was accused of sympathizing with Germany, opposing the war effort, and being a modernist, lost his position.[10] This incident foreshadowed the fundamentalist-modernist controversy that developed full force in the 1920's, illustrating the increasing demand for conformity and the tendency to connect modern theology with a foreign foe.

Yet the war time temper cannot fully explain this complicated movement. Social and economic factors undoubtedly played an important role in the movement. Texans awakened in 1920 to a world very different from the one they had known before World War I. Certainly the physical world had changed drastically in ways that would require extensive and difficult readjustments. Modern technology with inventions like the automobile, airplane, movies, and radio had revolutionized society.[11]

Perhaps most difficult to accept for the generation of the 1920's was the fact that America was rapidly becoming a nation of cities rather than farms, having returned an urban census report for the first time in 1920. With the

---

[10]James B. Leavell to Jesse Yelvington, 4 December 1924, Samuel Palmer Brooks Papers, Texas Collection, Baylor University, Waco, Texas; The Fundamentalist, 9 December 1921, p. 1-2.

[11]David A. Shannon, Between the Wars: America, 1919-1941 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), pp. 91-93; William E. Leuchtenburg, The Perils of Prosperity, 1914-32 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), pp. 158-159. Some of the background information on fundamentalism also appeared in Patsy Ledbetter, "Defense of the Faith: Fundamentalist Controversy, 1920-1929 (M.A. Thesis, North Texas State University, 1970).

emerging cities came secularism, materialism, increased crime, a changing value system. Women bobbed their hair, shortened their hemlines, smoked and drank in public as never before, while the new emphasis on sex in books, movies, and daily conversations shocked the old timers. In short, urbanization seemed to be destroying the old way of life.[12]

Texas remained predominantly rural, but the cities were growing rapidly. A review of the census reports revealed that in 1900 Texas was 82.9 percent rural, 17.1 percent urban. In 1910 it was 75.9 percent rural and 24.1 percent urban and by 1925 it was 67.6 percent rural and 32.4 percent urban.[13] Rural Texans, because of modern technology, were no longer isolated from their city cousins. There had always been tension between the city and the country, but in the decade of the 1920's the radio, newspapers, movies, and automobile brought the new values into direct conflict with the old as never before.

Those who championed the old order could find some justification for their contention that society was degenerating. Not only were moral values changing, but the crime rate was also rising rapidly, with gangsters actually controlling some cities. The newspapers capitalized on this situation by widely publicizing the most bizarre crimes, which seemed

---

[12]Leuchtenburg, Perils of Prosperity, p. 225; Bailey, Southern White Protestantism, p. 44-47.

[13]Texas Almanac, 1925, pp. 46-47.

especially shocking to a nation that had so recently been predominantly agrarian. Radical political ideas which seemed to challenge the very existence of democratic government were also being circulated. Accelerating the rapid changes in the nation were large numbers of immigrants, mostly from Southern and Eastern Europe. Since the culture of these people differed greatly from that of the United States, their presence too seemed to threaten the old order.[14]

In the midst of such rapid and unprecedented change, it is not surprising that large numbers of people reacted with panic. Seeking a single cause of the rapid change and apparent degeneration of society, these people endeavored to find a single remedy for America's ills. Some saw the dangers of liquor as the major contributing factor and believed prohibition would end all social ills. Others saw the greatest social dangers in immigration, Catholicism, radical political ideas, new moral values, or modern scientific ideas. In seeking remedies for the country's problems, many Americans sought simply to reestablish the past.[15]

The same social forces that caused the renewed interest in fundamentalist theology led to the Ku Klux Klan movement.

---

[14]Allen, Only Yesterday, pp. 264-265; Dwight Lowell Dummond, America in Our Time (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937), pp. 337-342; Firm Foundation, 30 January 1923, p. 1.

[15]Paul A. Carter, The Twenties in America, The Crowell American History Series, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968), pp. 67-73; Leuchtenburg, Perils of Prosperity, pp. 1-11.

Although Klansmen and fundamentalists were not necessarily the same people they had in mind similar goals. Both sought to halt the transition of American society and defend the old against the new. The Klan stood for white supremacy, opposed immigration, and espoused belief in a staunch moral code.[16] They gave support to fundamentalist churches, sometimes appearing in their white robes with offerings for a church of their liking, and frequently Texas Protestants expressed sympathy with the goals of the organization.[17]

The leader of the Klan could have been speaking for the fundamentalist movement when he wrote,

> We are a movement of plain people, very weak in the matter of culture, intellectual support and trained leadership. We are demanding, and we expect to win a return of power into the hands of the everyday, not highly cultured, not overly intellectualized, but entirely unspoiled and not de-Americanized average citizens of the old stock.[18]

Like the Klan, the fundamentalists represented the "growing sentiment against radicalism, cosmopolitanism, and alienism

---

[16]For interpretations of the relationship of religious fundamentalism to other conservative movements see Leuchtenburg, Perils of Prosperity, pp. 204-224; Dumond, America in Our Time, pp. 337-360. Richard Neibuhr, "Fundamentalism," Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, ed. by Edwin Robert Anderson Seligman and Alvin Johnson (New York: Macmillan Company, 1937): 3: 526-527, emphasizes the rural versus urban aspects of the controversy.

[17]Christian Courier, 26 May 1921, p. 4; "The Ku Klux Klan and Mr. Heaton," The Churchman 29(31 May 1924), 12-13; Lon Scarborough to R. E. Bell, 2 December 1922, R. E. Bell Papers, Texas Collection, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

[18]Hiram Wesley Evans, "The Klan's Fight for Americanism," The North American Review 223(March, April, May, 1926): 49.

of all kinds."[19] Fundamentalism was opposing, as one friend of the movement pointed out:

> (1) new theology in Scripture (2) ecclesiasticism in the ministry (3) unionism in religion (4) worldliness in the church (5) bossism in politics (6) anarchy in government (7) trusts in commerce (8) communism in business (9) boycott in trade (10) evolution in education (11) sex in literature (12) nude in art (13) sensual in theatre (14) lust in amusement (15) Jazz in music (16) rebellion in the home (17) lawlessness in the community.[20]

Although fundamentalist found a wide variety of targets, they focused on modern science. The theories of Darwin had sparked a heated controversy in the 1890's, but by 1918 most scientists apparently thought that the debate was over and assumed that the differences had been worked out.[21] Modern, liberal theologians had managed to incorporate the theory of evolution into Christianity by dismissing the Genesis account of creation as allegory. To them, evolution meant that man had risen and was still rising, rather than that he had fallen and was doomed.[22]

---

[19]Ibid., 35.

[20]A. Reilly Copeland, "The Inside Story," tract in A. Reilly Copeland Papers, Texas Collection, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

[21]Robert Moats Miller, American Protestantism and Social Issues (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958), pp. 154-155.

[22]Henry Higgins Lane, Evolution and Christian Faith (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1923), pp. 187-200; Arthur Thompson, "General Aspects of Recent Advances in the Study of Organic Evolution," Methodist Review Quarterly 60 (April 1921): 202-211; El Paso Times, 23 February 1923, p. 10; Dallas Morning News, 9 November 1925, p. 2.

Conservative theologians had, of course, never accepted this approach, and after World War I, the impulse to return to the old-time religion meant that they had to disprove scientific or modernistic theories that contradicted that religion. Rationalism was the basic cause of all man's problems, they warned, because it undermined the Bible. Evolution taught that the Bible was inaccurate, destroyed the supernatural in religion, denied the deity of Jesus Christ, and contradicted Christian beliefs in regeneration and salvation.[23] Opposition to the theory of evolution became more urgent, more aggressive and better organized. Early in the decade of the 1920's the lines were clearly drawn--one could believe in the Bible or in evolution but not in both.

Convinced that all manner of evil resulted from a knowledge of evolution, fundamentalists pointed out that it connected man with brute animals and destroyed his divine nature. Was man created in the image of God or of gorilla, they asked? They even related the high divorce rate to evolution, arguing that since monkeys often swapped mates, a man who believed himself related to them would tend to follow their example. Evolution, according to the

---

[23]Firm Foundation, 4 March 1919, p. 2; 27 July 1919, p. 2; 26 October 1925, p. 2; Texas Christian Advocate, 26 March 1925, p. 3; 13 May 1926, p. 6; Baptist Standard, 5 January 1922, p. 8; James Conant, The Church, the Schools and Evolution (Chicago: Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1920), pp. 23-30.

contenders for the faith, caused a materialistic outlook toward life and led to crimes even more horrible than divorce, such as the malicious deeds of the Loeb-Leopold murder case. As was true of the other reactionary movements of the decade, the fundamentalist movement was charged with fear. When mankind lost faith in the Bible, the fundamentalists explained, reverence for all authority would break down and civilization would collapse. Fundamentalists interpreted their part in the conflict as a defense of their homes and families. They felt that the public schools were destroying the faith of their children and thus condemning their souls to eternal damnation in hell.[24]

The fundamentalists were dogmatic in their beliefs, but excessive accusations occurred on both sides of the conflict. At times those defending evolution seemed almost as dogmatic as those opposing it. As the New York Times observed, "Almost daily some one is called a 'son of an ape,' while as often somebody on the other side is taunted with enjoying the notion of being descended from an ancestor made of mud."[25] Cries of "infidel" from the fundamentalists were hardly more frequent than cries of "moron" from the modernists. Apparently

---

[24]William Jennings Bryan, In His Image (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1922), pp. 111-116; Houston Post Dispatch 6 October 1924, p. 7; Conant, The Church, the Schools and Evolution, p. 2; The Fundamentalist, 6 April 1923, p. 8; Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), pp. 126-127.

[25]New York Times, 10 June 1923, sec. 7, p. 2.

neither side attempted to understand or to compromise with the other. Some evolutionists declared that the theory did indeed destroy all need for religion. With a few modernists even attempting to establish a new religion centering around Darwin's theory, fundamentalists had some justification for considering evolution a religious tenet.[26]

Fundamentalists also had some justification for their contention that science was replacing religion in the 1920's. During that decade of prosperity, Americans were so engrossed in business--in getting and spending--that many had little time for serious spiritual activities. The church, obviously losing its hold on modern man, was no longer the center of the community or of family life as it had been at the turn of the century. To the fundamentalists of the 1920's, too many worldly pursuits divided people's attention. Science, especially, seemed to be the new religion of the materialistic age, as people turned away from the church for an explanation of the universe. No longer awed by natural occurences, since science seemed to explain everything, many people ceased to believe in the supernatural. Science gained tremendous prestige as people increasingly turned to the scientist rather than the preacher to solve their daily problems and

---

[26]Knight Dunlap, "Evolution or What Have You?" American Mercury 12(December 1927): 458; New York Times, 28 April 1924, p. 10.

to provide them with desired luxuries. As one fundamentalist leader pointed out, "To call a thing scientific is to establish it forever."[27] The new science of psychology seemed even to explain the human soul. Thus, while church attendance generally did not decrease during this period, the institutions faced many new challenges.[28]

In their campaign against evolution the fundamentalists often lost all sense of reason. Their arguments were characterized largely by ignorance and by their failure to understand scientific doctrines. As the Honey Grove Signal, an East Texas newspaper, proudly declared, "We don't know anything about evolution, and cherish no hope of ever learning anything about it."[29] To most of the fundamentalists evolution meant only that man evolved from monkeys, and they never attempted to understand the process by which species developed. Similarly they failed to understand the length of time involved in the evolutionary process. William Jennings Bryan, major spokesman for the fundamentalists, pointed out that because man had not changed since King Tut evolution could not be true; and fundamentalist minister

---

[27]William Bell Riley, Inspiration or Evolution, (Cleveland: Union Gospel Press, 1926), p. 34.

[28]Allen, Only Yesterday, p. 197.

[29]Quoted in Tyler Daily Courier Times, 10 July 1925, p. 2.

Thomas Theodore Martin contended that if insects developed before birds, as evolution taught, they would have destroyed all vegetation before fowls appeared. Some insisted that dinosaurs and mammoths died out, not because of evolution, but because they were too large for the ark to transport.[30]

Since fundamentalists did not understand the intellectual concepts which were challenging their values, the movement became extremely anti-intellectual in nature. Their anti-intellectualism was most clearly revealed in the attack upon colleges and teachers. Bryan, for example, contended that the country needed less education and more religion and that education without religion was worthless, even dangerous. Some fundamentalists condemned colleges and professors as Satan's agents and insisted that no public funds be extended to schools that contradicted the Bible.[31]

Fundamentalists often expressed fear of being dominated by intellectuals. John Roach Straton, a militant New York Baptist preacher, thought that the real issue at stake in

---

[30]New York Times, 28 August 1924, p. 16; Waco News Tribune, 22 February 1923, p. 1; Martin, The Inside of the Cup, p. 11; Dallas Morning News, 15 December 1925, p. 5.

[31]Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism, pp. 117-141; The Fundamentalist, 6 January 1922, p. 1; Riley, Inspiration or Evolution, p. 115; Conant, The Church, the Schools and Evolution, pp. 9-10; William Jennings Bryan; The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan (Chicago: John C. Winston Company, 1925), p. 553-556.

the controversy was whether or not the country was to be ruled by an "'aristocracy' . . . of skeptical school men and agnostics." He regarded the teaching of evolution as an invasion by "outside agnostics, atheists, Unitarian preachers, skeptical scientists, and political revolutionists."[32] Thus, the conflict took on the appearance of a struggle of the masses against an evil force of intellectualism.

Most fundamentalists were convinced that evolutionists could not be saved, and that intellectuals could only cause souls to be lost to Satan. Billy Sunday announced unequivocally that Charles Darwin was in hell. Bryan answered the argument that intelligent men could not agree with his theology by pointing out that only 2 percent of the people had a college education, while the other 98 percent still had souls.[33] To fundamentalists, spiritual experiences were much more significant than intellectual concepts; hence they viewed intellectualism with distrust and dislike.

In spite of their lack of intellectual support, perhaps because of it, the fundamentalists gained enough followers to become a major force in American life. More than mere individual expressions of orthodox belief, fundamentalism

---

[32]John Roach Straton, "The Most Sinister Movement in the United States," in Controversy in the Twenties: Fundamentalism, Modernism, and Evolution, ed. Willard B. Gatewood, Jr. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969), p. 355.

[33]Maynard Shipley, "The Fundamentalists' Case," American Mercury 13(February 1928): 226; New York Times, 8 December 1923, p. 18.

became a highly developed movement with effective leaders, organizations, and institutes to carry out its goals. Fundaemntalist organizations appeared prior to the 1920's and in fact date back almost to the previous century's controversy over higher criticism. One of the earliest attempts to organize fundamentalist sentiment was the Bible League of America, which appeared in 1902. Attempting to restore faith through rational argument, the Bible League was a forerunner of later fundamentalist organizations, such as the World's Christian Fundamentals Association. Although its official publication, Bible Student and Teacher, criticized scientific discoveries, the organization did not resort to the emotional and coercive approach which became characteristic of later fundamentalist organizations.[34]

Among fundamentalists, the most influential organization and the one which lasted longest was the World's Christian Fundamentals Association. Begun in 1916 as a meeting of a small group of orthodox churchmen, it spread its branches across the United, States and into Canada. Most active among its leaders was William Bell Riley, a Minneapolis Baptist preacher, but other well-known fundamentalists, such as Straton and James M. Gray, dean of the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, were also instrumental in its operation and affairs, Almost all active fundamentalists were connected

---

[34]Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, p. 56.

in some way with this association, which in 1919 declared war on evolution and modernism. In the following decade, with Riley's magazine, Christian Fundamentals in School and Church, as its official publication, it took such steps toward preserving orthodoxy as investigating colleges, actively supporting anti-evolution bills, preparing conservative Sunday school lessons, issuing a list of safe textbooks, holding numerous conferences, and issuing countless pieces of literature.[35]

A number of lesser organizations developed. One of the best financed was the Bible Crusaders of America, which with the backing of George F. Washburn, a wealthy real estate dealer, published the magazine Crusaders Champion. The most interesting of the associations was the Supreme Kingdom, formed by Edward Young Clarke who was also a Ku Klux Klan leader until he was charged with several crimes, including adultery, theft, using the mails to defraud, and carrying whiskey. Modeled after the Klan and offering such inducements to membership as singing divisions, life insurance, and sick benefits, the Kingdom's primary goal was to enrich Clarke, and when this became evident the organization declined. Another group, the Research Science Bureau attempted to attack evolution on scientific grounds but had little influence.[36]

---

[35]Riley, Inspiration or Evolution, p. 185; Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, pp. 49-56.

[36]Maynard Shipley, The War on Modern Science, A Short History of the Fundamentalist Attacks on Evolution and Modernism (New York, Alfred Knopf, 1927), pp. 45-61; Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, pp. 61-71.

More effective in awakening the public were groups like the Defenders of the Christian Faith, which dispatched evangelists called Flying Fundamentalists to hold anti-evolution rallies across the country. A rash of similar organizations appeared, including the Bryan Bible League, Anti-evolution League, Schoolbag Gospel League, National Reform Association, and National Association for the Promotion of Holiness. Such organizations helped produce the tons of written material espousing their cause, as most of them published their own journal. Holding thousands of meetings, they undoubtedly greatly influenced public opinion. In addition, orthodox institutes of higher education were formed to train theologians to carry on the fight. The Moody Bible Institute was the most significant, but the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, William Jewell College located in Liberty, Missouri, and Wheaton College of Illinois were also influential.[37]

More important than either the organizations or the institutes in gaining for the fundamentalist nationwide attention was the effectiveness of their leaders, who were accomplished orators and especially adept at stirring the emotions of their audiences. While modernists and scientists appealed only on rational grounds, the fundamentalists awakened their listeners' inner feelings. Moreover they displayed amazing

---

[37]Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, pp. 67, 72-74; William Cogg, "The West Point of Fundamentalism," American Mercury 16(January 1929): 104-112.

energy in writing and speaking. Riley alone wrote a forty-volume series, The Bible of the Expositor and the Evangelist, as well as fifteen other religious books.[38]

Certainly, leadership was one of the most important ingredients of Texas fundamentalism's success because in John Franklin Norris the state had one of the most flamboyant and controversial leaders of the entire movement. Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Fort Worth for almost forty years, Norris divided the Southern Baptist denomination and developed a nationwide following of fundamentalist churches. Without him, the controversy in Texas would have probably been relatively mild.[39]

J. Frank Norris was born in 1877 in Dadeville, Alabama, where his father, Warner Norris, was a poorly paid steel worker. Warner Norris drank heavily, and the family was poverty-stricken. In an effort to start anew the family moved, when Frank was eleven years old, to Hubbard City, Texas,

---

[38]Stanley Wlaker, "The Fundamentalist Pope," American Mercury 7(July 1926): 257-258; Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, pp. 31-32.

[39]The best biographical study of Norris' life is Gwin Morris, "He Changed Things: A Biography of J. Frank Norris" (Ph.D. dissertation, Texas Technological University, 1972). Other studies include Ray Tatum, Conquest or Failure? Biography of J. Frank Norris (Dallas: Baptist Historical Foundation, 1966); Homer G. Ritchie, "The Life and Career of J. Frank Norris," (M. A. thesis, Texas Christian University, 1967); William Connolly, "The Preaching of J. Frank Norris" (M. A. thesis, University of Nebraska, 1961); C. Allyn Russell, "J. Frank Norris: Violent Fundamentalist," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 75(January 1972): 271-302.

where his father became a tenant farmer. Neither the family's financial condition not Warner Norris' drinking problem improved. Mary Norris, Frank's mother, found solace in religion and instilled her religious fanaticism in her young son. When, as a child, J. Frank had recovered from a serious illness, she was so grateful to God that she carried him to the banks of a nearby river where, she told her son years later, "I said to the music of the falls 'God gave this babe to me' and He snatched you from the jaws of death, and I lifted you up and said 'I give him back!' . . . and she said she heard the voice of God and He said 'You have given the world a preacher'."[40] At least such was Norris' version of the incident, as he told it years later.

Frank was a near invalid for about three years during his teens, as a result of a gunshot wound. During that time his mother spent long hours reading the Bible to him telling him stories of great men, and convincing him of his own exalted destiny. Even when he was a child, she had assured him that he would be a prophet and instilled in him the ambition to become a great man. Thus, from his home life Norris acquired a hatred for liquor, a belief in the fundamentals of Christianity, and a desire to preach to huge crowds.[41]

---

[40]Quoted in Tatum, Conquest or Failure?, p. 41.

[41]Morris, "He Changed Things," pp. 34-35; Tatum, Conquest or Failure?, pp. 26-42.

In spite of extreme financial difficulties Norris earned degrees from Baylor University in Waco, Texas, and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, where he graduated with high honors. He then began his long, sensational career as a Baptist minister. On May 5, 1902, he married Lilliam Gaddy, whom he had met at Baylor. The daughter of a Baptist missionary, her religious training and family background made her an ideal wife for Norris. Attracted by his ambitious, enthusiastic approach to religion, she gave his ministry her full support and made few demands upon him at home. They had four children: Jim Gaddy, J. Frank, Jr., George Louis, and Lillian Gaddy--but Norris was too concerned with building his ministry to be a dedicated family man.[42]

After completing his education, for several years he pastored the McKinney Baptist Church of Dallas, where he quickly demonstrated his unusual talent by building the congregation from thirteen to one thousand. He won recognition from the denominational leaders who requested that he become editor of the Baptist Standard. While editing the Standard Norris learned the value of controversy to his ministry. Acquiring 51 percent of the voting stock of the paper, he was able to use it in any way he chose. Through

---

[42]Morris, "He Changed Things," p. 37; Tatum, Conquest or Failure? p. 150.

it he began his first big fight, an attack on race track gambling, and largely because of his agitation the state legislature passed a law prohibiting such activities. His method of constantly attacking the establishment and keeping some controversial issue before the readers of the Standard, however, antagonized the Baptist denominational leaders. Under pressure, he sold his interest in the paper, but this experience indicated that controversy could gain him publicity and power.[43]

In 1909, he was called to the more prestigious pulpit of the First Baptist Church of Fort Worth, a position which he held until his death of a heart attack on August 21, 1952. During that time his church grew to a membership of over 12,000, and, beginning in 1935, he pastored the Temple Baptist Church of Detroit along with his Fort Worth church, commuting between the two and claiming a combined membership of 25,000. His controversial newspaper, which was variously title The Fence Rail, The Searchlight, and The Fundamentalist, reached a circulation of over 80,000, and he influenced thousands more through his powerful radio station KTAT, later KFSL. He also established the Bible Baptist Seminary at Fort Worth, which is still in operation, and acquired a significant following of fundamentalist churches.[44]

---

[43]Morris, "He Changed Things," pp. 44-79.

[44]Russell, "Violent Fundamentalist," pp. 275-276, 282-283.

Norris' success can be explained largely by the tactics he used, constantly engaging in some crusade against the forces of Satan--liquor, gambling, Catholicism, Sunday movies, religious modernism, ecclesiasticism, and later, Communism. Norris seemed to thrive on notoriety, contending, "The main business of the preacher and prophet is to mix up with the devil on every inch of ground." Several times his church was either damaged or destroyed by fire. When he was indicted for arson concerning one of these fires he succeeded in making it appear that the evil forces in Forth Worth had burned the church and attempted to frame him.[45] In 1926, he was confronted with more serious publicity when he was indicted for murder in the shooting death of lumberman Dexter E. Chipps. A friend of the Fort Worth mayor Henry Clay Meacham, whom Norris was attacking, Chipps came to the pastor's church study where Norris, apparently frightened by his threats, shot him. Although Chipps was unarmed, Norris was acquitted on a plea of self-defense. Again he showed little remorse and attempted to capitalize on the event by charging that evil forces had hired Chipps to assassinate him.[46]

---

[45]The Fundamentalist, 10 April 1919, p. 4; J. Frank Norris, Inside the Cup or My 21 Years in Fort Worth (n.p.:n.p., 1932), p. 3.

[46]Louis Entzminger, The J. Frank Norris I Have Known for 34 Years (n.p.; n.p.,n.d.), pp. 107-109; Nels Anderson, "The Shooting Parson of Texas," The New Republic 48(1 September 1926), 35-37.

In the pulpit Norris was a master showman. A tall thin man with piercing, intense blue eyes, he began his sermons calmly speaking in a voice so low that only the first rows could understand, but he built into a crescendo; growing louder, waving his arms, pacing back and forth, loosening his tie, sometimes removing his coat, he worked his audience into a frenzy of excitement.[47]

A dominant theme of his ministry was fear, and he never failed to warn his audiences of the eternal damnation they faced if they failed to heed his message. The "Texas Tornado," as Norris was called, frequently illustrated his emotion-packed message in graphic terms. When a district attorney, who had helped prosecute the pastor for arson in the burning of his church, was killed in an automobile accident, someone found a broken liquor bottle containing a portion of the victim's brain and carried it to Norris. Taking the exhibit into the pulpit, Norris used it to illustrate a sermon titled "The Wages of Sin is Death." Although the people were terrified and some even fainted, they loved this kind of sensationalism and Norris gave them what they wanted.[48]

Norris seemed preoccupied with numbers and openly sought to increase membership in his church. He set membership goals using such gimmicks as "One Bring One Sunday" when

---

[47]Anerson, "The Shooting Parson," pp. 35-37; The Fundamentalist, 11 September 1919, p. 4.

[48]Entzminger, J. Frank Norris, p. 112.

everyone was asked to bring a visitor and "Baby Day" when babies were featured. He was the first pastor to use newspaper advertisements in an effort to increase church attendance.[49] He also used attention getting tactics like taking a monkey into the pulpit to illustrate the falsity of evolution or cross examining a witness from the pulpit.[50] In one well publicized event he baptized a cowboy who brought his horse into the church as a witness.[51] Much of Norris' success can be explained by his ability to determine the tactics, methods, and causes that would best appeal to his audiences.

Although Norris' church was located in a city, he appealed throughout his ministry to those who identified with the country. Those who had recently migrated from rural areas and who still like to think of themselves as "country folk" were drawn to Norris. Calling upon the "fork of the creek boys" to destroy modernism, he referred to himself as "a country Baptist preacher who lives in a cow town up here and fights the devil for a living."[52] Since Norris knew that Texans generally distrusted intellectuals, one of his favorite

---

[49]The Fundamentalist, 4 September 1919, p. 1; 12 June 1919, p. 1; 18 September 1919, p. 1.

[50]Russell, "Violent Fundamentalist," p. 281; The Fundamentalist, 12 October 1923, p. 1.

[51]The Fundamentalist, 8 December 1944, p. 4.

[52]Ibid., 14 October 1921, p. 4; 5 October, 1923, p. 1.

tactics was to identify himself with the common people against the "frizzled-headed professors." He used humor and ridicule to make his followers feel that they were laughing with him at intellectual snobs. For example, he defined an evolution professor as "an animal with Van Dyke whiskers, hair parted in the middle because every block has an alley through the center."[53]

Norris' basic appeal to Texans, however, was his emphasis on the fundamental tenets of faith that they had always held dear. He did not develop a new theology or philosophy, but played heavily on Texans' fear that they were about to lose what they already had--their old value system and old religious structure. The two major theological themes of his ministry were the infallible, verbally inspired Scriptures and the imminent second coming of Christ. Both messages had tremendous appeal to Texans. Norris also opposed the institutionalization of religion and fought "machine" domination, which, as another old and familiar aspect of Texas Protestantism, formed the basis of his attack on the Southern Baptist Convention.[54]

In the 1920's many Texans felt like fighting; they were not sure what, but here was a man who would lead them. In this mighty struggle, Norris frequently pictured himself as a

---

[53]Ibid., 29 September 1922, p. 2; 20 November 1925, p. 1.

[54]Russell, "Violent Fundamentalist," pp. 278-279.

prophet trying to overcome the forces of evil, usually led by the rich or powerful. He identified himself with the Biblical prophets, saying he troubled the church "like Isaiah troubled the grafters of Jerusalem, John the Baptist troubled Herod's Court."[55] Considering himself the representative of the weak and downtrodden, Norris was constantly publicizing how some group, such as the liquor interests, the Roman Catholics, or the Baptist denominational machine, was determined to destroy him. He always pictured himself as victorious, however, and was fond of detailing the horrible fate that had befallen those who opposed him.[56]

In reality most Texas Protestant leaders were almost as theologically conservative as Norris. Many believed that the Bible was the inspired word of God, though some denied the verbal dictation theory; most believed that Christ would return to earth, though not all accepted the premillennial position.[57] Hence the difference between the orthodoxy of Norris and the Protestant leaders who did not actively participate in the fundamentalist movement was largely a matter of degree. Conflict between Norris and other

---

[55]Ibid., 28 October 1921, p. 3.

[56]J. Frank Norris, The Inside History of the First Baptist Church (Fort Worth: n.p., n.d.), pp. 12-15.

[57]Thurmon Earl Bryant, "The Ethics of George Washington Truett" (Th.D. Dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1959), pp. 28-34; 69-70; Scarborough to W. P. Trogmorton, 22 March 1922, Lon R. Scarborough Papers, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

Protestant leaders arose primarily over his methods and his opposition to denominational work. While most Protestant leaders preferred to work quietly to eradicate heresy, Norris loved a public show. Norris' opponents in the 1920's hoped to establish denominational cooperation to accomplish broad, far-reaching programs, a tendency toward institutionalization of religion, whereas Norris remained concerned primarily with the local church.

One significant reason for the impact of Norris' ministry and of fundamentalism in general in Texas was the lack of organized resistance. Maynard Shipley, a leader of the national opposition to anti-evolution forces, and founder of the Science League of America, corresponded with Texas intellectuals and teachers, warning that freedom of thought was at stake but little effort was made to organize opponents to fundamentalism within the state.[58] The Texas Academy of Science opposed anti-evolution actions but it was limited almost entirely to the Austin area and had little influence across the state.[59] Some Texas intellectuals,

---

[58]Maynard Shipley, "A Challenging Situation, A Plain Statement to All Friends of Scientific Freedom;" "Shall Evolution be Taught in Our Schools and Colleges;" "Doctrine of the American School of Science and Religion," leaflets in Frederick McAllister Papers, University of Texas Archives, Austin, Texas.

[59]O. C. Charlton to W. S. Sutton, 8 August 1910, Texas Academy of Science Record Book, University of Texas Archives, Austin, Texas.

like the geologist William F. Cummings, sought to reconcile science and religion, arguing that the seven days of Genesis are in reality the seven epoches revealed by geological science, but his rational approach was no match for Norris' emotional appeal.[60]

Thus fundamentalism with a powerful leader, had a significant impact in Texas from both a secular and a religious standpoint. The conservatives who continued to control the Protestant denominations were repeatedly forced into more orthodox positions, and restrictions were placed on freedom of thought and teaching.

---

[60]William F. Cummings, "Seven Epochs of the World," "Genesis and Geology," "Plan of Creation," "The Seventh Day," "Evolution," Typescripts in William F. Cummings Papers, University of Texas Archives, Austin, Texas.

CHAPTER III

EMERGENCE OF INTRA-DENOMINATIONAL DISPUTES IN TEXAS

As the decade of the 1920's opened Texas Protestants hailed the beginning of a new era of evangelism. Religious leaders believed that the war had renewed interest in church work and that post-war prosperity opened new possibilities for ever increasing donations. The time seemed ripe to consolidate and expand denominations while building new institutions and enlarging old ones. Consequently for Texas Protestants the decade of the 1920's became a period of increasing denominationalism, with new boards being created and power being centralized. Just as in the 1890's, adverse reaction to such moves was almost certain.

As Texas Protestants announced optimistic goals and programs they organized more efficient systems of management, patterned in some ways after the business organizations of the period. The "organization" man, with administrative and executive abilities became an important figure in Texas Protestant denominations. The Texas Disciples of Christ launched in 1919 a program labeled the "Cooperative Campaign." Under the direction of J. B. Holmes, the Corresponding Secretary of the Texas Christian Missionary Society, the

program's goal was to collect $350,000 to be distributed among the colleges and other church associated institutions. Although the campaign fell far short of its goal, collecting only about one half of the projected figure, Holmes instituted new methods of collection and created a permanent fund for the Society.[1]

Texas Presbyterians also embarked on a new comprehensive fund-raising program to expand their work in every way. It too fell short of their hopes but it illustrated their new ambitions.[2] The Episcopal church in Texas also took steps toward establishing a more efficient organization. All of the diverse activities and unrelated committees of the church were united under one program with one administrative system directed by Diocesan Executive Boards.[3]

One of the more far reaching of the new Protestant enlargement programs was the Baptists' ill-fated Seventy-Five Million Campaign. Lon R. Scarborough, president of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, directed this Southern Baptist program to collect seventy-five million dollars over a five year period for mission

---

[1]Hall, Texas Disciples, pp. 174-180.

[2]George Paschal, Jr., and Judith Benner, One Hundred Years of Challenge and Change: A History of the Synod of Texas of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1968), pp. 126-127.

[3]DuBose Murphy, A Short History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Texas (Dallas: Turner Company, 1935), pp. 118-120.

work, domestic and foreign education, hospitals, orphanages, and other benevolent services. Scarborough called upon Baptists to meet this newest and greatest challenge telling them, "Our supreme need is to do this great thing. At the parting of the ways we stand--one way leads into the narrow spheres and meager endeavor. The other way leads on to great victories in the world wide fields of conquest for the master."[4] However, Baptists had a tradition of opposition to such programs and adverse reaction was almost inevitable. Unfortunately for the peace of Texas Baptists, the program coincided with the development of the nationwide reaction to modernism, and it soon became apparent that Texas Protestants were not in a mood to cooperate with the campaign.

Protestants still dominated the religious scene in Texas, just as they had at the turn of the century, with the sects most influenced by the fundamentalist movement having the greatest number of members. In 1926 the largest denomination in Texas was still the Southern Baptist with approximately 465,000 members, while the Negro Baptists had about 234,000, and other Baptists sects including the Primitive Baptists and the American Baptist Association had a combined total of over 60,000. The second largest denomination was the Methodist Episcopal Church South with over 380,000 members.

---

[4]Lon Scarborough, "Evangelism, Enlightment, Enlistment: Baptist Seventy-Five Million Campaign," pamphlet in Scarborough Papers.

About 108,000 Texans belonged to other Methodist bodies, including Negro groups. Other significant denominations in Texas included the Presbyterians, reporting a membership of about 79,000, the Disciples of Christ, about 77,000, the Churches of Christ, about 99,000, and Episcopal church, about 33,000. The denomination which opposed fundamentalism with the most vigor in Texas was the Unitarian church, but its numerical strength was not great enough to have much influence since it claimed only about 280 members.[5]

Early in the decade came indications that conditions were not so united in the Protestant ranks as the leaders had hoped. This disunity became readily apparent as Texans suspected that modernism and higher criticism were invading the Lone Star state. Reaction to modernism began in Texas with the Methodists, a denomination little disturbed by the movement outside the state. Methodism had little formal creed, making it more accomodating to a variety of beliefs.[6] According to Walter Vernon, a student of Methodism in North Texas, Texas Methodists were disturbed primarily because they lacked education and because they failed to understand their own religion, which had never stressed dogma.[7] Texas

---

[5]Texas Almanac, 1929, pp. 219-224.

[6]Philip L. Frick, "Why the Methodist Church is so Little Disturbed by the Fundamentalist Controversy," Methodist Review 107(May 1924): 422-426.

[7]Walter Vernon, Methodism Moves Across North Texas (Dallas: Historical Society, North Texas Conference, Methodist Church, 1958), pp. 280-283.

Methodists first became alarmed in 1919 when Shailer Mathews, dean of the University of Chicago Divinity School and one of the high priests of modernism, delivered an address at Southern Methodist University. Some Methodists accused him of denying the inspiration of the Scriptures and criticized denominational leaders for exposing the young people of Texas to such heresy.[8]

Conservatives, already suspicious of Southern Methodist University, believed their worst fears realized in 1921, when John Rice, professor of Bible in Southern Methodist University, published a book titled, The Old Testament in the Life of Today. Rice could be classified as a mild modernist since in his book he attempted to illustrate how the religion of the Hebrews had evolved into Christianity. Rice approached the Bible as literature, subject to criticism and analysis, and clearly did not accept the theory of the direct, instantaneous inspiration of the Scriptures. Contending that the Old Testament consisted primarily of Hebrew folklore, which had been verbally repeated for generations before being written down, he referred to the prophets as "little more than roving deverishes."[9]

Such stories as the Genesis account of creation, of Jonah's being swallowed by a whale, and the book of Daniel

---

[8]W. S. Rowland to Bishop Edwin Mouzon, 20 June 1919, Bishop Edwin Mouzon Papers, Perkins Theological Library, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

[9]John Rice, The Old Testament in the Life of Today (New York: MacMillan, Company, 1920), pp. vii, xxxiii, 21.

were not literal fact and furthermore, he argued, were unnecessary to the revealed spirit of God. Seeing this spirit as the essence of the Old Testament, he tried to distinguish between the parts of the Bible still essential to an understanding of God, and those that were written to an ancient generation. Concentrating on the parts of the Bible that still applied in modern life, he pointed out inconsistencies and traced origins of various parts of the Old Testament. The symbolic meanings of parts of the Old Testament were far more important than the literal stories, he believed. For example, he interpreted Abraham's failure to sacrifice his son as a deviation from the old Hebrew faith which portrayed God as a hard, cruel master. About the Eden story, Rice wrote

> We may not think of a snake bringing sin into the world by sinister suggestion, but we can think of man coming in his upward struggle from instinct to self-consciousness and to consciousness of higher spiritual laws and then falling before the first temptation and breaking them, for the tragedy of Eden is repeated in every human soul.[10]

Thus, to Rice, the story of the fall was highly symbolic.

Outside the South Rice's book received a friendly reception,[11] but from his fellow Texans, it brought down an avalanche of criticism. The columns of the Methodist journal in the state, the Texas Christian Advocate, were opened to discussion

---

[10]Ibid., pp. 64-65, 137.

[11]Methodist Quarterly Review 70(January 1921): 170.

of the book. Although the editor declared his neutrality in the discussion, most of the letters printed were critical of Rice. S. A. Steel, author of the regular column, "From the Pelican Pines," was one of Rice's staunchest foes. He accused the professor of being a higher critic and of reducing the Bible to the level of Mother Goose rhymes. According to Steel, modernist arguments claiming that parts of the Bible were myths could only sterilize Christianity and undermine faith.[12] Another critic, Reverend R. A. Langston, argued that by questioning the fall of man and denying that a literal Eve ate a literal apple in a literal garden of Eden, Rice was also rejecting the New Testament doctrine of redemption,[13] which Rice obviously did not intend to do. Other critics bitterly accused Rice of being a social gospeler and of advocating a philosophy very close to that of Nietzche. Because he said that man once lived by instinct, the Southern Methodist Bible professor was accused of being a Darwinian evolutionist. By the fall of 1921 some Methodists were demanding Rice's dismissal.[14]

From the beginning, however, some of the more liberal Methodist laymen, pastors, and church leaders defended Rice,

---

[12]Texas Christian Advocate, 24 April 1921, p. 7; 11 August 1921, p. 2.

[13]Ibid., 4 August 1921, p. 3.

[14]Ibid., 18 August 1921, p. 2; 8 September 1921, p. 2; 15 August 1921, p. 2.

saying that there was nothing heretical in his book and urging a broader spirit of understanding. Rice's students signed a resolution testifying to his fine work and contending that his teaching strengthened their faith. According to them, Rice taught that the Bible was God's word and encouraged love and honor for the holy book.[15] Most significant of Rice's defenders was Bishop Edwin D. Mouzon, a member of the Southern Methodist University Board of Trustees and a liberal theologian. Mouzon published an article in the Texas Christian Advocate defending Rice and pointing out that the New Testament rather than the Old was the modern Christian's guide. Arguing the the Bible was not a book of science or history, he contended that Rice's work would help bring about a better understanding of the Scriptures.[16] In a later letter concerning this controversy, Mouzon wrote in a spirit very different from that exhibited by most Texas churchmen:

> Years ago when I was a young preacher, I thought most of these things through and came to the conclusion that theologians had best leave scientific matters to the scientists--that one might accept the evolutionary theory . . . and still hold fast to the truths of Christianity. . . . My own opinion is that a faith that is afraid of the truth is already full of doubt. My own faith is unafraid. I have a contempt that is both intellectual and religious for dogmatic ignorance.[17]

---

[15]Ibid., 9 June 1921, p. 8; 6 October 1921, p. 12; 29 September 1921, p. 5.

[16]Ibid., 28 July 1921, p. 8.

[17]Mouzon to Ellis Shuler, 31 March 1922, Mouzon Papers.

Few people seemed willing in 1921 to exhibit that kind of openmindedness.

Much of the attack on Rice was spearheaded not by Rice's Methodist brethern but by the Baptist fundamentalist, J. Frank Norris, who accused Rice of destroying the faith of young people. In a review of The Old Testament in the Life of Today, Norris denounced Rice and those like him who studied in northern universities,"where they got the forty-second echo of some beer guzzling German professor of rationalism."[18] In his newspaper, The Searchlight, and from the pulpit he issued emotional calls for the people to demand the resignation of the "infidel" Rice. He told Texas Methodists that in this crisis they would have to decide whether they stood for "the old Bible, inspired of God, or a Bible that is composed of Myth, fable, and tradition."[19]

To those Methodist leaders who told Norris that the Rice affair was non of his business, Norris answered that if someone put a dead horse on his front porch or built a pig pen near his kitchen it would become his business; thus when anyone attacked the Bible it was his business and his duty to expose them.[20] Under Norris' leadership, the General Pastors' Association of Fort Worth passed resolutions

---

[18]The Fundamentalist, 12 May 1921, p. 1.

[19]Ibid., 16 June 1921, p. 1.

[20]Ibid., 12 May 1921, p. 1.

affirming their faith in the whole Bible, thus indirectly scorning Rice. Methodist pastors opposed the resolutions and walked out of the meeting, but other Baptists, including Lon R. Scarborough, President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and B. A. Copass, a professor at the seminary, joined in the condemnation of Rice.[21]

The first battle of the war against modernism in Texas was a victory for the forces of fundamentalism; Rice resigned and went to pastor a church in Oklahoma. The First Methodist Church invited him to come to Forth Worth, but Norris promised that if he came he would be "attended to in first class style."[22] Prior to his resignation Rice replied to the charges against him in the pages of the Texas Christian Advocate in a manner which indicated he was not quite the modernist that his critics claimed. He believed, he said, that the Bible was indeed inspired by God but revealed progressively to the Hebrew people rather than to individuals, as the fundamentalists contended. He did not openly defend evolution or advanced modernist doctrines.[23] The controversy left a bitterness and division among Texas Methodists and

---

[21]Ibid., 2 June 1921, p. 1; 30 June 1921, p. 1; M. M. Mizzell to Lon Scarborough, 4 November 1921, Scarborough Papers; "Review of a Book and Related Matters," typescript in Copass Papers.

[22]Texas Christian Advocate, 17 November 1921, p. 8; The Fundamentalist, 14 October 1921, p. 4.

[23]Texas Christian Advocate, 22 September 1921, p. 8.

especially in Southern Methodist University that would not soon heal. Both faculty and the student body supported Rice, and when he resigned the faculty bitterly blamed President Hiram A. Boaz for not standing by the professor and for not defending academic freedom.[24]

The controversy also produced dissension and bitterness within the Methodist conferences of Texas. At that time the denomination was divided into five conferences, the Texas Conference (East Texas), Central Texas Conference, North Texas Conference, Northwest Texas Conference, and West Texas Conference. In 1921 the Rice controversy led to a declaration from four of the five conferences of their fundamentalist convictions. Reaffirming its faith in "the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures," the Texas Conference declared its opposition to "rationalistic teaching from any source."[25] The North Texas Conference took an even stronger stand and made it clear just whom they were opposing. The delegates not only reaffirmed faith in the inspiration of the Bible but also congratulated Southern Methodist University for Rice's resignation, asked church institutions to employ no more

---

[24]Hiram A. Boaz, Eighty-Four Golden Years (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1951), pp. 110-111.

[25]Journal of the 81st Annual Session of the Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Beaumont, Texas, November 17-21, 1921 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 52.

disloyal teachers, and urged removal from Methodist schools of Rice's book and any others that contained objectionable material.[26]

The Northwest Texas Conference instructed its representatives on the various boards to

> stand for the elimination from our schools and colleges and from editorial control of any and all of our church and Sunday schools [and] for the withdrawal from all mission fields, as well as for the elimination from all connectional places and from all positions of influence or power among us all persons who held unorthodox views.[27]

While claiming to support authentic scholarship, the West Texas Conference nevertheless repudiated any scholarship that assailed "the divine origin and integrity of the Holy Scriptures," and additionally called for wholesome teachings in the schools.[28] Only the Central Conference, the division to which Rice had belonged, remained silent on the issue. The Rice controversy marked the beginning of a decade of witch hunts for modernists within the ranks of Texas Protestants.

---

[26]Journal of the 55th Annual Session of the North Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Dallas, Texas, October 26-31, 1921 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 58.

[27]Journal of the 12th Annual Session of the Northwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Amarillo, Texas, October 5-9, 1921 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 49.

[28]Journal of the 63rd Annual Session of the West Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at San Antonio, Texas, October 19-21, 1921 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 67.

The Baptists were next to purge their institutions and denomination of modernists and their influence. Norris had greatly enjoyed helping turn the infidel out of Southern Methodist University; moreover, having received tremendous support from his readers, he realized the popularity of his stand. He now trained his searchlight on the Baptists, beginning what was to become for Norris a life-long battle. Conflict had been developing between Norris and the Baptists for some time. In 1920 he launched a back to the Bible movement in his congregation, ceased using the denominational "helps" or Sunday school quarterlies, and announced instead that his Sunday school would henceforth study the Bible only. He contended that he wanted his church and Sunday school to be a "Bible-studying, Bible-loving, Bible-understanding, and Bible-honoring membership." Indicating clearly that he disagreed with some of the interpretation in the denominational literature, he later denounced them as modernistic.[29]

Norris's attacks on the Baptists have usually been explained as a result of his drive for power and love of controversy. In part this explanation stands up, but there were also doctrinal differences between Norris and the denominational leaders. Theologically the major difference concerned the second coming of Christ. Throughout his ministry, Norris

---

[29]The Fundamentalist, 16 December 1920, p. 2; 30 December 1920, p. 2; 10 February 1921, p. 1.

stressed the premillennial second coming of Christ. Although he had criticized Scarborough, the seminary, and other Baptists for being postmillennial, or for failing to take a definite stand on that question, denominational leaders refused to make one's belief about the second coming a test for orthodoxy.[30] Another important difference concerned Norris' emphasis on the local church and his anti-institutional bias. Norris was extremely jealous of his power over his own church and congregation; hence, he resisted denominational attempts to organize cooperative programs.[31] Anti-institutionalism had for many years been an important theme of dissident Texas Protestants; since Hayden had divided Texas Baptists over this very issue in the 1890's, it is not surprising that Norris followed this line of attack.

Warning that an attack on Baylor was imminent began circulating in the summer of 1921. In July, an Oklahoma fundamentalist editorially condemned A. J. Hall as a modernist for his statement that a child could grow into regeneration. Hall denied the accusation; the President of Baylor, Samuel Palmer Brooks, defended him; and the controversy soon blew

---

[30]Norris to Scarborough, 28 October 1921, Scarborough papers; The Fundamentalist, 4 May 1923, p. 1.

[31]Ibid., 20 April 1923, p. 1.

over.[32] However, at about the same time, Scarborough warned Brooks that Southern Baptists attending the Northern Baptist Convention had become alarmed at the rationalism and evolutionism in northern schools. Since southern conservatives clearly planned to demand investigations of their own schools, Scarborough admonished Brooks that he and the board had better eradicate heresy from Baylor before it became a public issue. Brooks received similar warnings from E. C. Routh, editor of the Baptist Standard, but still he failed to act.[33]

In Baylor, the major concern of conservatives was Grove S. Dow, chairman of the Sociology Department, who had published a book entitled Introduction to the Principles of Sociology. Uncertain as to where and how the human race began, Dow estimated that mankind had been on the earth for about one hundred thousand to one million years but had been civilized only about six thousand years. In explaining the process by which humans became social and civilized beings, Dow indicated that man had once been a much less intelligent creature, probably kin to the anthropoid ape, and that it was only gradually, during thousands of years of development, that man began to establish family and community

---

[32]Undated newspaper clipping, Baptist Messanger; Brooks to A. J. Hall, 5 July 1921; Brooks to C. P. Stealey, 14 July 1921, Brooks Papers.

[33]Scarborough to Brooks, 11 July 1921; E. C. Routh to Brooks, 29 July 1921, Brooks Papers.

relationships. While not exactly claiming that man had evolved from another species, he did point out that the Bible was unclear concerning creation.[34] Like Rice's work, Dow's was well accepted in other parts of the country, being adopted as a text in more than fifty universities and colleges.[35]

After borrowing the book from Scarborough, Norris began a full scale attack on Baylor in October 1921, with bold headlines in The Searchlight declaring, "Infidelity in Baylor University," According to Norris, Dow's book was a heresy worse than atheism. He contended that the Bible made it absolutely clear that Adam, the first man, was created instantaneously as a superior and intelligent being. When Eve was created as his wife, man's family and social life immediately became established. Advertising his intention to expose the teaching of evolution at Baylor, he preached an inflamatory sermon condemning Dow, as well as the administration that allowed such heresy. He then printed the sermon in The Searchlight and circulated one hundred thousand copies of it.[36] Meanwhile other conservatives, notably the Tennesse evangelist Thomas Theodore Martin, were joining in the criticism of the book and calling for Dow's resignation.[37]

---

[34]The Fundamentalist, 21 October 1921, p. 1.

[35]Unidentified newspaper clipping, Brooks Papers.

[36]The Fundamentalist, 21 October 1921, p. 1; 11 November 1921, p. 1; 2 December 1921, p. 4; Norris to Scarborough, 4 November 1921, Scarborough Papers.

[37]J. D. Sandifer to Scarborough, 19 November 1921, Scarborough Papers.

As a result of the well-publicized campaign, Brooks received a barrage of complaints, condemnations, threats and demands for Dow's resignation. The rank and file were disturbed and did not mind telling Brooks directly. "Satan never had a better agent than such a teacher," contended one irate Baptist.[38] Others declared they would never send their children to such a school.[39] Brooks acknowleged the intensity of the criticism when he wrote:

> I do not think I ever saw the country so surcharged with criticism, with a desire to crucify somebody, particularly was this true last fall with respect to Baylor. . . . There is scarcely a week that I do not get letters of strong censure,--high criticism of something that we have done. Now and then I get evidences of sympathy and faith in the institution, but he then says he thinks I am theologically rotten.[40]

Scarborough was also receiving frequent reports that the common people all over the country were siding with Norris.[41]

Brooks tried to explain the situation and how it happened that such a heretic was teaching good Baptist boys and girls. It seemed that Dow wrote the book in 1920 and asked Brooks to read it, but Brooks was unable to do so until after the book had gone to press. After reading it Brooks, of course, claimed he had recognized the troublesome parts, conferred with Dow, and both men agreed that it needed revision. It was too late

---

[38]B. T. Franabarger to Brooks, 24 October 1921, Brooks Papers.

[39]William Riddle to Brooks, 23 November 1921, Brooks Papers.

[40]Brooks to William L. Poteat, 17 April 1922, Brooks Papers.

[41]J. M. Mizzell to Scarborough, 4 November 1921; K. A. Woods to Scarborough, 26 November 1921, Scarborough Papers.

to change the first edition, but before the controversy broke and Norris began using the issue to attract attention, Dow had already agreed to omit the objectionable phrases in the next edition. Brooks defended Dow, saying that while Dow had made a mistake in his choice of words, he was doctrinally sound, neither believing in nor teaching Darwinian evolution. Dow's students signed a petition to the effect that they had never heard him teach the Darwinian theory of evolution.[42]

Brooks' defense of the professor, however, only caused him more trouble. Norris began a relentless attack on the Baylor president, demanding his resignation also. The Fort Worth fundamentalist declared that there would be "NO PEACE AHEAD UNTIL THE TEACHING OF RATIONALISTIC AND CHRIST DENYING THEORIES ARE . . . THROWN OUT OF OUR BAPTIST SCHOOLS."[43] Although most Baptist leaders apparently agreed with Norris that such teachings had no place in Baptist schools, they opposed his methods of exposure, fearing that he would interfere with the denomination's work, especially with the Seventy-Five Million Campaign. Norris replied to their

---

[42]Brooks to the Committee Appointed by the Baptist General Convention of Texas to Examine into the Heresy Charges Against Baylor University, undated; Brooks to Franabarger, 26 October 1921; Brooks to Riddle, 8 December 1921; Brooks to M. M. Wolfe, 19 December 1921, Brooks Papers.

[43]The Fundamentalist, 2 December 1921, p. 4.

complaints about his trouble-making by maintaining that he disturbed the church as the prophets of old had disturbed the establishment.[44] Baptist leaders, nevertheless, began to discuss ways of controlling and limiting Norris' influence.[45]

The Texas Baptist denomination was a democratically controlled organization that depended upon the support and approval of the general membership,whose confidence the leaders could regain only by eliminating heresy from Baylor and any other Baptist institutions in the state. As in the Rice controversy, the fundamentalists were victorious. Dow, who like Rice, was not as modernistic as Norris and other critics claimed, could not withstand the criticism. He resigned, saying that his detractors had taken his words out of context and warped their meanings. Brooks expressed regret at losing Dow and continued to believe that he had been unfairly treated.[46] Other Baptist leaders, however, expressed relief, realizing that the Baptist denomination was too much controlled by the rank and file to tolerate such teachings, while Norris jubilantly took credit for Dow's resignation.[47]

---

[44]Scarborough to Sandifer, 26 October 1921; Scarborough to Mizzell, 8 November 1921; Sandifer to Scarborough, 21 November 1921, Scarborough Papers; J. B. Cranfill to Brooks, 19 October 1921, Brooks Papers; The Fundamentalist, 28 October 1921, p. 3.

[45]Scarborough to Sandifer, 25 November 1921, Scarborough Papers.

[46]Brooks to W. B. Bizzell, 17 December 1921, Brooks Papers.

[47]Scarborough to A. P. Stokes, 18 April 1922, Scarborough Papers; The Fundamentalist, 16 December 1921, p. 1.

Because of the Baylor controversy, as well as Norris' continued agitation, the Baptist leaders apparently believed that they must move to regain the confidence of their people. When the Texas Baptist General Convention met in November, 1921, Brooks himself made a motion that the convention appoint a seven man committee to investigate Baptist schools and determine the doctrinal soundness of their teachers.[48] The convention then resoundingly passed a resolution describing precisely what Texas Baptists expected of their denominational schools, thus trying to demonstrate they they were every bit as orthodox as Norris. This resolution put the convention on record as "unalterably opposing the teaching of Darwinian evolution or any other theory that discredits the Genesis account of creation."[49]

In reaction to the criticism earlier levied against Hall the convention also rejected any teachings that attempted to place culture and social service above personal evangelism. In keeping with these beliefs the convention called upon the schools to prevent "false teachings" that question the integrity or the divine inspiration of the Bible. Although they wanted their schools to be doctrinally pure, convention delegates also realized that the bitter attacks damaged the

---

[48]Samuel P. Brooks, "Concerning Evolution in Baylor University," The Baylor Bulletin, 26(December 1923): 1.

[49]Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, Held at Dallas, Texas, December 1, 1921, Containing the Proceedings of the 73rd Annual Session (n.p.:n.p., n.d.), p. 35.

denomination's image and urged that public criticism cease.[50] Most Baptist leaders apparently hoped to clean out the heresies without making a public issue of the situation.

The committee appointed by the convention proceeded to a thorough accomplishment of its task. To determine the beliefs and establish the orthodoxy of each person working for Texas Baptists schools, the committee circulated a questionaire among all teachers and administrators, visited the schools, talked with teachers and students and any other person claiming to have information. In addition to Baylor, which was the primary target of the fundamentalists and the major concern of the committee, the group visited Baylor College, Southwestern Seminary, Simmons College, and Howard Payne College. Except for Baylor University all schools received unqualified support of their orthodoxy, although two Baylor College professors resigned to protest the investigation of their private beliefs.[51]

To aid in the investigation of Baylor University, Brooks invited the committee to interview students and teachers, examine books, attend classes or take any other steps necessary to determine the nature of Baylor's instruction. He denied that he or any of his teachers were Darwinian

---

[50]Ibid., p. 18.

[51]Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, Held at Waco, Texas, November 16-20, 1922, Containing the Proceedings of the 74th Annual Session (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 153.

evolutionists.[52] By the time of the investigation Dow had resigned, but the committee uncovered one other undisputed heretic. His relies to the questionarie were so unsatisfactory that he was called in for questioning. When the interviews revealed that he was not a Baptist and that he was too unorthodox to be retained by the University, the president acted quickly to dismiss this unidentified professor. In their report the committee assured the convention that the professor "taught in a department where there was not occasion for him to express his views." While testimony from his students revealed that the heretical professor had had no adverse influence on young Baptist minds. Hall also testified before the committee and disproved the charges against him.[53]

Most troublesome for the committee to deal with was the science department at Baylor. The committee asserted that Baptist schools should teach science, but discovered that finding texts without references to evolution was impossible. Although the investigators asserted that no Baylor science teachers believed in evolution as fact, they did discover some minor heresies in the teachings of Lula Pace and O. C. Bradbury, who accepted some aspects of the doctrine of evolution and apparently taught it as a working hypothesis.

---

[52]Brooks to the Committee Appointed . . . to Examine into the Heresy Charges Against Baylor University, Brooks Papers.

[53]Texas Baptist Annual, 1922, p. 156.

Their answers to the questions posed them were so out of harmony with the accepted Baptist position that the committee required them to explain their position in writing to the convention. Both expressed an unquestioning faith in the Bible as the inspired revelation of God's will, but unfortunately for the peace of the Texas Baptists they qualified their convictions. The controversial part of their statement read:

> The first three chapters of Genesis state historical or literal facts. These facts are stated in allegorical or figurative language. The word "day" is used to express a period of time which may be of indefinite length. The fall of man is recorded as having taken place in the Garden of Eden. This is a historical fact. The manner in which he disobeyed God is expressed symbolically, that is, by eating forbidden fruit.[54]

The committee members themselves disagreed over just what should be done with these heretical faculty members. One committeeman, J. H. Edmonds, of Hamlin, refused to endorse the committee report for fear that it would connect him with Pace and Bradbury's theistic evolution. He expressed his protest to President Brooks before the convention met, contending, "As easily as I could believe that the creation of Adam and Eve was an allegory I could believe that the Virgin Birth of Christ Jesus was an allegory."[55] A number of other conservative Baptist leaders voices opposition, and even

---

[54]Ibid., pp. 156-157.

[55]J. H. Edmonds to Brooks, 6 September 1922, Brooks Papers.

Scarborough himself admitted in private correspondence that teaching at Baylor was probably not as sound as it should be. The extremely conservative seminary professor, B. A. Copass, informed Brooks that Baptists were united in opposition to evolution and called Pace an evolutionist of the rankest kind. Copass wrote directly to Pace demanding an explanation of her views. She replied simply that she believed God had used evolution as his method in creating the universe.[56]

The final conclusion of the committee was that nothing taught in Baylor or any of the Baptist schools in any way undermined the faith of Texas young people, but the report warned administrators at the schools that they must in these trying times take even more than usual precautions to employ only Baptists and to scrutinize constantly the beliefs of their teachers.[57] In spite of this conclusion, the report was obviously going to be a source of controversy among Texas Baptists as a whole, and when the convention met, another committee was appointed to report on the findings of the first committee. Although both committees agreed that the schools were basically sound, harsh and bitter criticism of their methods and conclusions developed.[58]

---

[56]Scarborough to J. W. Gillon, 24 January 1922; Copass to Brooks, 11 November 1922; Copass to Lula Pace, 9 November 1922; Pace to Copass, 11 November 1922, Brooks Papers.

[57]Texas Baptist Annual, 1922, pp. 158-159.

[58]Brooks, "Concerning Evolution," pp. 5-6.

Of course, J. Frank Norris was again the most vocal critic of the modernists. His church obviously having profited from the Dow controversy, he announced, "The First Baptist Church gets religious when it gets into a terrible bout for a great cause. We are now entering the greatest of our career."[59] He claimed three hundred and fifty additions to the church during the Dow controversy, as well as a tremendous increase in subscriptions to The Searchlight.[60] Now the statement calling Genesis allegorical and figurative gave him just the justification that he needed for an even more extensive attack on Baylor. Although he appeared before the committee himself and testified that Brooks was responsible for the false teachings, he contended that the committee had not been thorough in its investigations and that Baylor harbored even more evolutionists. He gave wide publicity to Pace and Bradbury's statement even before the convention met, choosing always the damaging phrases, which he took out of context.[61] Throughout the decade Norris used their statement and the committee report concerning them in almost every slanderous attack against Baylor and Brooks. Bradbury resigned in 1923; although Brooks contended that the attacks did not cause his resignation, most people seemed to assume

---

[59]The Fundamentalist, 9 December 1921, p. 1.

[60]Ibid., 16 December 1921, p. 2.

[61]Ibid., 10 February 1922, p. 1; 29 September 1922, p. 1.

that they did.[62] Pace continued to teach in Baylor under very adverse conditions until her death in 1925. During that time she was accused of making atheists of her students and betraying Christ. When she died Brooks lamented the damage done this fine Christian woman by the constant slander against her.[63]

Norris expanded his attack on Baylor to include the entire Southern Baptist denomination, concentrating expecially on fund raising drives such as the Seventy-Five Million Campaign. He claimed that money given by good-hearted, common folk was being misappropriated and hinted strongly that fraud was involved, with reports being padded, auditors accounts changed, and figures juggled. Accusing Baptist leaders, especially Scarborough, of following a closed book policy, he contended that honest Baptists could not find out how money was being spent. He charged that the money was being used to print tracts condemning him, that the larger schools were getting more than their share of the proceeds, and that money which hard-working Baptists gave was paying the salary of evolution-minded professors. He told stories of longtime contributors to Baylor sending their children there only to have their faith destroyed, and urged

---

[62] J. T. Stroder to Brooks, 3 March 1923, Brooks Papers.

[63] The Fundamentalist, 26 June 1925, p. 3; 5 October 1923; 17 July 1925, p. 1; Bryon Smith to Brooks, 21 June 1923; Lula Pace to Carl Smith, 5 July 1923, Brooks Papers.

his followers not to contribute to this unscriptural campaign until the leaders "Put the monkeys out and open[ed] the books."[64]

This new line of attack by Norris was clearly a manifestation of fundamentalists' anti-institutional bias. Although on Norris' part it might have been largely a personality conflict between him and denominational leaders, a struggle for power and influence, a large number of Texans responded to him for other reasons. People who loved the country or small town churches and who felt that as the denomination grew richer it grew less personal and less religious were concerned about the new trends. There existed among the country Baptists a general feeling that the leaders had lost contact with the people themselves and no longer cared about the "forks of the creek boys."[65] They felt they were losing control of their denomination and its schools; the thought that they might be losing that control to modernists made it even more frightening.

If Norris' charges were true then they constituted proof of the wickedness of over-institutionalization. Norris admitted that leaders like Scarborough and George Truett, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Dallas, were orthodox but claimed that they had grown to love the denomination and its

---

[64]The Fundamentalist, 13 October 1922, p. 1; 24 March 1922, p. 2; 6 October 1922, p. 1; 14 April 1922, p. 1; 21 April 1922, p. 1.

[65]J. Matt Harder to Truett, 11 February 1923, Truett Papers.

institutions more than they loved God. In defense of the denomination and the money raising campaign they had been led to defend evolution and modernism, Norris asserted.[66] Defending the autonomy of the local church over the boards, he shouted, "I'm not going to play mule tail to any ecclesiastical mule on the top side of the earth." They would not tell his church what to believe or what to give or which cause to support, the Fort Worth fundamentalist declared.[67]

In his private correspondence, Scarborough admitted some "mistakes" in the handling of the Seventy-Five Million Campaign money.[68] How extensive or serious the mistakes were is impossible to determine but apparently the records contained damaging information. Of all the denominational leaders, Scarborough became the most aggressive and vindictive in combatting Norris. Deciding to fight back, he sought information to use against the Fort Worth pastor. With the collaboration of Brooks, he sent spies to Norris' church to find out what he was saying and doing.[69] Several friends and denominational leaders warned Scarborough that the wisest course of action was to ignore Norris, but Scarborough did

---

[66]The Fundamentalist, 12 May 1922, p. 4.

[67]Ibid., 29 September 1922, p. 2.

[68]Scarborough to T. T. Martin, 10 January 1922, Scarborough Papers.

[69]Brooks to Scarborough, 17 March 1922; Scarborough to Brooks, 2 March 1922, Scarborough Papers.

not agree. In the spring of 1922 he began accusing Norris of alien immersion and his church of un-Baptist practices.[70]

Norris was also guilty, accoring to Scarborough, of inter-denominationalism, and Norris was in fact one of the few Southern Baptists to play a leading role in formulating policies for the nationwide fundamentalist crusade. He attended the 1922 conference of the World's Christian Fundamentalist Association and worked on the committee to prepare a Bible study course. In addition he played an active role in the Baptist Bible Union, another organization formed to combat modernism.[71]

For these activities Scarborough accused him of associating with non-Baptists, participating in an interchurch movement, and trying to split the Southern Baptist denomination. Scarborough also flayed Norris for his failure to cooperate with the denomination in fulfilling his obligation to the Seventy-Five Million Campaign, which was especially important to Scarborough since he directed it.[72] Norris denied the charges of alien immersion and answered the accusation of inter-denominationalism by saying that it was infinitely better to

---

[70]Scarborough to Sandifer, 27 February 1922; E. Godbald to Scarborough, 31 March 1922; Scarborough to D. W. Price, 3 March 1922; Scarborough to R. A. J. Leach, 17 March 1922, Scarborough Papers; The Fundamentalist, 24 March 1922, pp. 1,2.

[71]Baptist Standard, 20 July 1922, pp. 14-15.

[72]Lon Scarborough, "The World Wide Conference of Critics, and Discontents," typescript in Scarborough Papers; Baptist Standard, 12 October 1922, p. 12.

associate with fundamentalists of other denominations than with modernistic Baptist like Shailer Mathews who had spoken in Truett's pulpit. He justified his failure to cooperate with Baptist programs by defending the rights of the local church.[73]

Unfortunately for Scarborough, the rank and file of Texas Baptists often assumed that the attacks on Norris meant that the denomination was selling out to the modernists.[74] Of course, the accusation was not true, but it placed Texas Baptists in the uncomfortable position of having to prove their fundamentalism thus Norris forced Texas Baptist leaders into a more fundamentalist stand than they would otherwise have taken. Scarborough contended that he had not one drop of modernist blood in his veins and that he would dismiss any teacher from Southwestern who "had a streak of modernism or Darwinian or theistic evolution in his teachings as big as the finest feather on an angel's wing."[75] During 1922, the Baptist Standard seemed almost as intent on disproving evolution as Norris himself.[76]

---

[73]The Fundamentalist, 12 May 1922, p. 1; Fort Worth Star Telegram, 15 September 1922, clipping in Scarborough Papers.

[74]W. H. Horton to Scarborough, 27 March 1922, Scarborough Papers.

[75]Baptist Standard, 14 May 1923, p. 9.

[76]Ibid., 12 January 1922, p. 6, 10; 26 January 1922, p. 7; 23 February 1922, p. 13; 30 March 1922, p. 14.

Although Brooks corresponded sympathetically with such well known liberals outside the state as William Faunce, President of Brown University, and William L Poteat, President of Wake Forest College of North Carolina, in Texas he had to declare over and over again his orthodoxy, and still Norris might use almost anything Brooks said against him. For example, when the Baylor president stated that he would not accept any theory of evolution that omitted God, Norris called him a theistic evolutionists, contending that evidently Brooks would accept evolution if God were included in the process. When Brooks declared his fidelity to Biblical truth Norris argued that this meant Brooks believed that Biblical errors were possible.[77] Demanding Brooks' resignation Norris announced, "I will clean his plow, skin his monkeys and hang their hides by the tail on the wire fences of Texas."[78]

In 1922 Norris began another battle which developed into a life-long war with his attacks on Joseph M. Dawson, pastor of Waco's First Baptist church and a close associate of Brooks. Dawson and Norris had been rivals in college at Baylor, and apparently Norris held a grudge against Dawson because he, rather than Norris, had graduated at the head

---

[77]William Louis Poteat to Brooks, 8 November 1921; Brooks to William Faunce, 28 December 1921, Brooks Papers. The Fundamentalist, 24 November 1922, p. 3; 8 December 1922, p. 1.

[78]The Fundamentalist, 27 October 1922, p. 1.

of the class. Later Dawson had edited the Baptist Standard while Norris controlled it, leading to further disagreements between the two men.[79] In the 1920's Dawson was probably the closest approximation of a modernist among Texas Baptists, as well as being one of the few who advocated a social gospel approach to religion; thus theologically as well as personally he and Norris were poles apart.[80] The public conflict between the two began in 1922 when Dawson wrote an article published in the Baptist Standard contending that the days of creation were not necessarily literal days of twenty-four each; according to Norris, his position was theistic evolution and a denial of the divine inspiration of the Bible.[81]

Because of Norris' continued attacks and because of his uncooperative spirit, the Tarrant County Baptist Association refused to seat his delegates in September 1922. Apparently Baptist leaders felt that this action would halt his agitation

---

[79]Morris, "He Changed Things," pp. 13-14; Joseph M. Dawson, "Darwinism and Dawsonism: A Memoir (1972)," in Glick, ed., Darwinism in Texas, pp. 27-33; A good study of the entire conflict between these two men is Donald Glenn Bouldin, "The J. M. Dawson--J. Frank Norris Controversy: A Reflection of the Fundamentalist Controversy Among Texas Baptists" (M. A. Thesis, Baylor University, 1969).

[80]James Dunn, "The Ethical Thought of Joseph Martin Dawson" (Th.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966), pp. iii-iv.

[81]Baptist Standard, 16 February 1922, p. 15; The Fundamentalist, 24 February 1922, p. 2; 31 March 1922, p. 3.

or at least diminish his influence.[82] Instead Norris stepped up his attacks, picturing himself as the victim of an unscriptural ecclesiastical machine and claiming that the association turned him out because of his exposure of evolutionists in Baylor and of flaws in the Seventy-Five Million Campaign.[83]

In 1921 and 1922, fundamentalist sentiment, which had long been present in Texas, turned personal, bitter, and vindictive. With its attacks on individuals, first Rice, then Dow, Pace, Bradbury, and Dawson, the movement had taken a new course. While in previous years, fundamentalism had been a generalized, though dominant feeling, in the early 1920's fundamentalists began to organize their forces, define their position, and single out specific targets for abuse. In the early years of the controversy, Texans illustrated not only their dedication to the fundamentals of the faith but also their intolerance for opinions that varied even slightly from that faith.

---

[82] Fort Worth Star Telegram, 15 September 1922, clipping in Scarborough Papers; Norris, The Inside History, pp. vii, viii; Morris, "He Changed Things," p. 193-194.

[83] The Fundamentalist, 27 October 1922, p. 1; 3 November 1922, p. 3; Morris, "He Changed Things," pp. 195-196.

CHAPTER IV

EXPANSION OF THE FUNDAMENTALIST MOVEMENT IN TEXAS

As fundamentalist agitation gained momentum in 1923 and 1924, more people became involved in the controversy, and the religious conflict had an increasingly significant impact on the secular scene. A few individual expressions of liberal beliefs convinced the fundamentalists that the challenge to orthodox Christianity was becoming more serious, and in response fundamentalists' rhetoric grew more bitter as they kept the issues constantly before the people. While Norris agitated the Baptists, further trouble was brewing among Methodists and Episcopalians.

In 1922 William E. Hawkins, an evangelist who felt it was his duty to cleanse the Methodist church of heresy, began publication of a newspaper opposing rationalism. Like Norris, Hawkins had ceased using Sunday school literature from the denomination and had made conformity to orthodox teachings the test for true Methodism. As with the Baptists, the major targets of Hawkins and his followers were the denominational schools.[1] During the summer of 1922, Gerald Birney Smith, a modernist theologian spoke at Southwestern University School of Theology in Georgetown. Hawkins branded

---

[1]Nail, History of Texas Methodism, p. 126.

Smith a rank infidel as well as an advocate of German rationalism. Accusing Smith of denying the Virgin Birth, Hawkins circulated a pamphlet to expose Smith's heresy. He also formed a League of Laymen to fight modernism.[2] His newspaper, The Open Forum, implored people not to send money to Methodist schools unless they supported the whole Bible, and he accused the Texas Christian Advocate of refusing to print articles critical of Smith or Methodist schools.[3] Norris supported Hawkins' attack from the first, calling upon the Methodist common people to destroy such infidelity.[4]

Hawkins expanded his attack in the fall of 1922 when two young women, Ruth Reed and Ruth Kennedy, charged that evolution was being taught at Texas Woman's College in Fort Worth.[5] Texas Methodists were not, however, as united in their opposition to modernism as the Baptists, since several of their leaders actively opposed fundamentalism. In addition to Bishop Mouzon, Bishop John Moore, the leading Methodist in the Central Conference, which included Dallas and Fort Worth, took a liberal stand on evolution and other controversial

---

[2]"Southwestern University, Dr. Smith of Chicago University and the Underlying Significance." tract in Cummings Papers.

[3]The Open Forum, August 1922, copy in Cummings Papers.

[4]The Fundamentalist, 25 August 1922, p. 1.

[5]The Texas Methodist, September 1922, copy in Scarborough Papers. Hawkins changed the title of The Open Forum to the Texas Methodist for this issue.

issues. Advocating freedom of thought, he argued that exposure to a variety of ideas would not undermine the faith of young Methodists.[6] Norris and Hawkins both opposed Moore and tried without success to destroy his influence within the Methodist church.[7]

In January 1923, Hawkins called a protest meeting in Fort Worth in investigate the charges of evolutionary teachings in Texas Woman's College. A farmer, W. C. Pool, protested in that meeting and in a later inquest held by Norris that his daughter learned evolution from a Professor Read who taught Bible at Texas Woman's College. In response to these charges a committee was established to investigate the schools. Reporting the affair in The Searchlight, Norris invited Pool into his pulpit to discuss conditions in the Methodist schools. Pool testified that the investigation committee was covering up the facts, refusing to listen to the complaints of those testifying against Methodist schools, operating in secret, and concealing Read's true character.[8]

Dissatisfaction with the Methodist schools led to continued assaults from Hawkins and others until the climax of agitation came in early May 1923, when the World's Christian Fundamentalist Convention met in Norris' church and included in its

---

[6]Texas Christian Advocate, 24 May 1923, p. 2.

[7]The Fundamentalist, 18 April 1924, pp. 5-6.

[8]Ibid., 5 January 1923, p. 4.

proceedings a trial of the Methodist schools, a two and one half hour ordeal conducted by Hawkins. Six young men and women testified against Southern Methodist University, Southwestern University, and Texas Woman's College. Students and former students took the stand to read from their notes the "false" teachings they had received at supposedly orthodox Methodist schools. The students claimed that one professor denied the Virgin Birth, while they alleged that another had read to his classes contradictory passages of the Bible. Testimony offered at the mock trial again condemned the Methodist investigation committee for not properly fulfilling its duty. While the trial provided a good show for fundamentalists who had come to Fort Worth from across the nation, it only increased division and bitterness within the Protestant community.[9]

Although most Texas Methodists were apparently orthodox, they appeared less influenced by Hawkins' attacks than the Baptists were by Norris'. Hawkins' agitation did not lead to a serious break within the church, probably because the denomination was not as democratically controlled as the Baptists, and leaders like Moore had better control of the local churches. Fundamentalist agitation probably did, however, influence the Methodist conferences of Texas to declare again their orthodoxy in 1923, illustrating their

---

[9]Ibid., 26 January 1923, pp. 1-3; 4 May 1923, p. 1; 11 May 1923, pp. 1-4; Austin Statesman, 2 May 1923, p. 1.

failure to conform to broader Methodist movements. In the summer of 1923, with the memory of Norris' trial of the Methodist schools strong in the minds of many, a training program for Sunday school workers convened at Lake Janaluska, North Carolina, where orthodox Methodists were shocked by the modernistic leanings of one of the speakers, a Dr. Bland of Toronto Canada. Bishop James Cannon, Jr., one of the most orthodox voices in the Methodist church, criticized the speaker harshly for doubting parts of the Old Testament, especially the book of Genesis, while more liberal Methodist leaders defended him.[10]

Texas Methodists quickly lined up with the conservatives in the controversy engendered by the Sunday school training program. Three of the five Texas conferences passed strong resolutions condemning the North Carolina program, while none officially supported it. The North Texas Conference declared that the teachings of the Lake Janaluska meeting were out of harmony with historical Methodism and disavowed any connection with such teachings.[11] The Northwest Texas Conference had passed the same resolution and further protested the Methodist Quarterly Review's defense of modernism. Affirming belief in the inspiration of both the Old and New Testaments, the

---

[10]Texas Christian Advocate, 23 August 1923, p. 2.

[11]Journal of the 57th Annual Session of the North Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Gainesville, Texas, October 17-21, 1923 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 33.

Northwestern Texas Conference resolved "We firmly believe that man is the offspring of God and not of a gorilla nor of any other evolutionary process."[12] The Central Conference, which had failed to declare its orthodoxy in the Rice controversy, now disavowed connection with the Lake Janaluska speaker and the delegated affirmed their belief in the Bible "book by book." Warning fellow Methodists that "we must not make a fetish of mere learning," the resolution added that teaching in Methodist schools must remain orthodox.[13] In response to fundamentalist agitation, Texas Methodist conferences were anxious to disprove charges that their denomination was selling out to modernism.

While Texas Methodists were declaring their orthodoxy, another denomination, the Episcopal Church, was experiencing an unsettling brush with modernism. In 1923, a prolonged controversy began to focus on the ministry of Lee W. Heaton in Fort Worth. Heaton, who had come to Fort Worth as Rector of Trinity Church in 1919, had proved himself a very active and dedicated minister. Trinity Church, which had been established several years earlier during a conflict within St. Andrews Church in Fort Worth had not

---

[12] Journal of the 14th Annual Session of the Northwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Plainview, Texas, October 31-November 4, 1923 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 33.

[13] Journal of the 58th Annual Session of the Central Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Temple, Texas, November 14, 1923 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.) p. 42.

prospered or grown until Heaton arrived. Housed in a run-down shack in an undesirable location, it had fewer than 200 members. Heaton, after securing the funds to purchase a large lot in a better location, had the building moved. He and his parishioners worked long hours to raise money and to improve the structure themselves; hence by the time the controversy broke in 1923, Trinity had, under Heaton's direction, confirmed 221 additional members and baptized 183. Sunday school classes had grown from 101 to 335 pupils.[14]

Although he had a good record at Trinity, Heaton's ministry was somewhat out of place in Texas, since he possessed a strong tinge of social gospelism. He had repeatedly brought attention to social problems, helped organize a tubercular camp, served on a commission to survey living conditions of laborers, and organized women's groups for extensive social service work. Workers in his church had been instrumental in establishing social service departments in elementary schools to care for the material and medical needs of poor children, but his most ambitious dream for social service involved extensive plans for a Trinity Community Center. Since his church was located in an area where parks, auditoriums and other recreational facilities were lacking, he planned to build a complex incorporating a swimming pool,

---

[14]"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Mr. Heaton's Work and Character," The Churchman 129(14 June 1924): 15-18.

gymnasium, nursery, library, club rooms, and other facilities which would be used especially in working with children. He believed that "The ideal church is pledged to human service as well as to the worship of God," and he taught a religion of love that seemed satisfying and fulfilling to his parishioners.[15]

Heaton's concept of the role of the church was enough to make him suspect in the fundamentalist climate of Fort Worth, but even more disturbing and controversial was his theology. Theologically his most serious offense lay in trying to reconcile science and Christianity. He believed that the church's dogmatic stand on certain issues was serving merely to alienate many thinking people; to correct this, he maintained that the church must become more open-minded to divergent beliefs, contending that dogmas not essential to Christianity could be safely discarded. His serious troubles began in March 1923 when in his Palm Sunday sermon, entitled "What Is Truth?" he questioned the necessity of the belief in the Virgin Birth. He reasoned:

> Consecrated Christian men differ much in their interpretation of the ancient creeds, and each succeeding generation must reinterpret for itself "the faith once for all delivered to the saints." For instance: There are those who cling with unquestioning minds to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth as a statement of physical fact; while others have been moved to analyze it, and have discovered in it new spiritual truths that transcend what the forms of words so

---

[15]Ibid., pp. 15-16.

> imperfectly express. There are those among us who believe that Jesus was in all things and in every way both God and Man; the Incarnation of God, and the son of Joseph. This is my own opinion. And there is room in the Church both for those who must reconcile theology with religion, as well as for those who religion is theology.[16]

Some members of Heaton's parish carried their objections immediately to the Bishop Coadjutor of the Diocese of Dallas, Harry T. Moore. Since Moore was a conservative churchman who hope to cleanse the church of unorthodox teachings, Heaton was unlikely to receive a sympathetic hearing from him. Moore conferred with the Wardens of the church and ultimately framed a statement for Heaton to sign and read to his congregation, asking the people to put out of mind any conclusions which they may have reached concerning his teachings. He was also required to promise that he would not discuss the controversial points for the next few months, during which time he was to be placed under the guidance of Bishop Moore. The bishop would outline a course of study and confer with him, presumably to instruct him in the areas where he had gone astray. Admitting that his sermon was perhaps unwise, Heaton seemed willing to cooperate with the Bishop.[17]

When Heaton's congregation learned of his troubles, they called a meeting without his knowledge or consent and

---

[16]"The Case Against the Reverend Lee W. Heaton," prepared by John D. Covert, Senior Warden, and Austin F. Anderson, Junior Warden of Fort Worth, Trinity Church, p. 1, Pamphlet on file in the Episcopalian Archives, Austin, Texas.

[17]Ibid., pp. 6-7.

passed a resolution signed by three hundred and eight members confirming their faith in the Apostles' Creed and their loyalty to the Episcopal Church. In addition they expressed the belief that the church should be broad enough to include people of different opinions. The resolution included one especially interesting statement, coming from a Texas congregation:

> We stand for the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour and find nothing in this faith which contradicts or denies or conflicts with the scientific theory of evolution; but on the contrary, this theory as to the power of the creator seems to us to bring into clearer view both the majesty of the Creator and the glory of His revelation of Himself in the Incarnation. We hold it to be the right of both the Fundamentalist and Modernist to remain in the Communion of the Church, and believe that the Catholic faith of the Church includes that which is true in both of these positions.

From this statement it appeared that Heaton had expounded on evolution as well as the Virgin Birth. The same resolution protested any move by the Bishop that might sever the relationship of Heaton with Trinity Church.[18]

After several conferences, Moore, unconvinced of Heaton's orthodoxy, required him to prepare a written statement explaining his beliefs. Although his statement did not deny the possibility of the Virgin Birth, he argued that belief in this doctrine was not essential to salvation. It may or may not have occurred, he contended, but whether it did or not was of no critical importance to Christianity.

---

[18]Ibid., pp. 4-5.

The Virgin Birth was not necessary to the Incarnation, which Heaton claimed to accept with all of his heart and soul. Citing several leading Episcopalian churchmen who agreed with his view, he pointed out that the Virgin Birth had not been a part of the earliest teachings of Christianity but developed in later generations. Upon receiving Heaton's written statement Moore convened a meeting of the Standing Committtee of the Diocese on November 27, 1923. The committee then formally charged Heaton with heresy for denying the Virgin Birth.[19]

The case attracted nationwide attention, particularly after The Churchman, a national, liberal Episcopalian journal, sent an investigator to Fort Worth who wrote a series of eight articles defending Heaton.[20] The New York Times also carried the story, while Norris' Searchlight printed a fundamentalist interpretation of events.[21] At the national level, Episcopalian churchmen such as Percy Grant and Leighton Parks, both rectors of New York churches, had expressed views similar to those of Heaton. At the peak of the controversy concerning Heaton's heresy, Bishop William Lawrence, one of the most respected leaders of the church, delivered an

---

[19]Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[20]"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Appalling Conditions Revealed by Churchman Survey," The Churchman 129(3 May 1924): 10.

[21]New York Times, 17 December 1923, pp. 1-2; The Fundamentalist, 1 June 1923, p. 1;

address during services honoring the thirtieth anniversary of his consecration which expressed his acceptance of the liberal view. The national controversy and division in the church complicated efforts to condemn the younger man for heresy. To clarify the situation and establish the church's position on various theological questions, the House of Bishops met in Dallas in November, 1923, drafting a pastoral letter intended to end the controversy. Basically a fundamentalist document, it insisted that belief in the Virgin Birth was a necessary prerequisite for the ministry.[22]

The bishops' letter only proved to be a further source of dissension. Liberal ministers across the nation proclaimed their defense of Heaton, rejected the doctrines set forth in the letter and objected to the bishops' assumption of power. So strong was the opposition to the fundamentalist stand that the Episcopalian Modern Churchman's Union took on new life in its opposition to excessive orthodoxy. Affirming the right of ministers to interpret the Bible in the light of modern science, it rallied to Heaton's defense and offered $1,000 to aid in defending him in the upcoming heresy trial. The association brought him to New York, made preparations to defend him, and gave his case wide publicity .[23]

---

[22]Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, pp. 164-165; New York Times, 21 January 1923, p. 1; 17 December 1923, pp. 1-2; "Bishop Moore Forces Trial for Heresy in Dallas Diocese," The Churchman 129(22 December 1923): 24-25.

[23]New York Times, 14 December 1923, p. 16; 16 December 1923, p. 12; 17 December 1923, pp. 1-2.

Outstanding New York liberals, such as Grant and Parks, spoke from their pulpits in Heaton's behalf and claimed that orthodox leaders were using him as a test case. Parks insisted that someone like Lawrence or himself should be tried instead of this young unknown man, since they all held the same views. While in New York, Heaton brought attention to the Texas situation, stating that he stood alone as an opponent of fundamentalism in Fort Worth,since all other ministers there were under the influence of J. Frank Norris. Bishop Moore reportedly stated that Heaton's trial would be the beginning of a movement to cleanse the church of modernism. Apparently much modernism remained to be cleansed.[24]

Realizing that a heresy trial in the midst of such controversy could be disastrous for the denomination, especially since the issue had drawn so much attention, Moore in January, 1924, halted the proceedings that would otherwise have resulted in such action. In effect, Heaton's defenders argued, Moore convicted the young minister without benefit of trial, since he declared that the charges against Heaton were well founded but announced that he was reluctant to try Heaton since higher officials in the church held

---

[24]"Bishop Moore Forces Trial," p. 25; "Along the Battlefront in Dallas: The Rev. J. Frank Norris and Mr. Heaton," The Churchman 129(17 May 1924): 13; New York Times, 17 December 1923, pp. 1-2.

similar views. He concluded, "The Diocese of Dallas rests the matter until opportunity may be given those in authority to proceed and point out the course of wisdom and justice in such matters." Thus, he left the case undecided, while seriously undermining Heaton's effectiveness as a minister. The Modern Churchman's Union objected to Moore's decision, maintaining that Moore had stigmatized Heaton without giving him a chance to clear himself.[25]

Heaton's troubles had just begun, however. Splitting from his congregation, the fundamentalist members organized a new church named Saint John's just a few blocks away. According to Heaton, this new church received the support and encouragement of Moore. Its purpose was obviously to weaken Heaton's influence; since the Episcopal church was weak in Texas and the Fort Worth area already had two churches, building another church was not justified. This move financially hurt Heaton's church, which was involved in a building campaign, and he had to cut his own salary to meet his church's expenses.[26]

Heaton and Moore also became involved in other squabbles that harmed the church. For example, The Churchman printed a series of letters between the two men in which Moore

---

[25]"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Appalling Conditions Revealed," p. 10; Austin Statesman, 4 January 1924, p. 3.

[26]"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: St. John's Mission Opposes Trinity Parish," The Churchman 129(10 May 1924): 10-12.

refused to visit Heaton's church for confirmation ceremonies; the reason given was that Trinity Parish had not turned over title of its property to the Diocese as required. Although Heaton expressed a willingness to cooperate, the congregation feared that the property might be given to the new church. According to The Churchman, St. John's Church had the support of the Ku Klux Klan, as well as that of J. Frank Norris. It reported that Klan members attended services dressed in full regalia. Heaton's opponents, meanwhile, solicited and obtained funds from all over the country to fight modernism in Fort Worth.[27]

Fort Worth was already the home of one of the most pugnacious fundamentalists of them all--J. Frank Norris--and a confrontation between Norris and Heaton seemed almost inevitable. It occurred at a meeting of the Fort Worth Ministerial Association. Heaton, who must have been something of a curiosity in Fort Worth, was invited to read a paper explaining modernism. He apparently expected his audience to at least be open minded when he explained his belief that religion needed to change with the times and meet the needs of each new generation. All times are modern to those living in them, he explained, and people who have

---

[27]"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Bishop Moore and Mr. Heaton," The Churchman 129(24 May 1924): 16-18; "Along the Battlefront in Dallas: The Ku Klux Klan and Mr. Heaton," The Churchman 129(31 May 1924): 12-13.

new ideas or who reject elements of the old traditions always appear to be modernists. He cited Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Jesus himself as seeming to their generations to be modernists. Pointing out that Jesus set aside the old laws, replacing them with a religion of love, he argued that the modern church must be loving and understanding and accepting of both those who break with the tradition and those who do not. He questioned the absolute infallibility of the Bible but argued that what really mattered was that the individual soul had Christ.[28]

When Heaton opened himself to questions it immediately became apparent that his audience was far from accepting or even being tolerant of his views. Other Fort Worth pastors, led by Norris, began badgering him. Under the circumstances he handled the situation fairly well, but not understanding their methods, he was obviously taken aback by their tactics. When asked about modernists' beliefs concerning Christ, Heaton replied that modern churchmen were trying to reexpress Christianity in a way that would make it understandable to the younger generation and to those acquainted with modern science. When asked about the Bible, Heaton contended that it was a spiritual book only and never intended as a biology, anthropology, or geology text, arguing further that parts of the Bible, such

---

[28]"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Norris and Heaton," pp. 13-14.

as Job, were actually anti-Christ in their pessimism. He denied direct verbal inspiration of the Bible, expressing instead his belief that the Hebrew race was inspired and that over a long period of time God had revealed himself through them. In addition, he pointed out discrepancies and contradictions in the Old Testament.[29]

Realizing that the entire session reflected badly on the pastors of Fort Worth, the association passed a resolution not to print the account, but Norris' own stenographer had recorded it all, and The Searchlight printed the entire exchange. Norris also published a letter from Heaton requesting that the account not be published and calling the session a "ridiculous heckling." Heaton's letter called for love and peace, saying, "I ask that you pray God that we may be kept from the heresy of hate and ugly fruitless bickering over things hard to understand and learn to live in peace and love together through Jesus." He asked that God forgive Norris for all the "harm you have done others and the hatred you bring into Fort Worth in the name of the God of Love."[30]

In another letter, Heaton, claiming that he bore no ill will to Norris, expressed disappointment in the Baptist minister's methods, as well as his undignified manner. In

---

[29]Ibid., pp. 14-15; The Fundamentalist, 11 April 1924, pp. 1-4.

[30]The Fundamentalist, 11 April 1924, p. 2.

the letter Heaton summarized one of the most important goals of his ministry, one whose fulfillment men like Norris could prevent: "I want to see modern science won as an ally to Jesus Christ and I believe that we can do that without the sacrifice of a single vital principle."[31] Rantings and ravings of fundamentalists, in their determination to destroy men like Heaton, made this alliance next to impossible in Texas.

In 1925, Heaton made one last effort to get the Bishop to act in his case by either dropping the charges or trying him. Moore refused and Heaton resigned from the ministry. His congregation remained loyal, but he could not get the cooperation of other churchmen nor do effective work as long as the dark cloud of modernism hung over his head. With deep regret he left the work to which he had dedicated his life and deserted the attempt to reconcile science and religion.[32] As the decade of the 1920's progressed fewer and fewer voices like that of Heaton's would be raised in Texas.

Heaton at least had the distinction of being a genuine modernist. Agitation among the Baptists continued to be directed against professors whose sins were greatly exaggerated,

---

[31]"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Norris and Heaton," p. 15.

[32]"Lee Heaton Resigns: The Correspondence," The Churchman 130(26 December 1925): 10 13.

but it must have seemed to fundamentalists that no sooner was one evolution professor expelled from a Baptist institution than another cropped up. One serious controversy began late in 1922 during the same convention at which the report on Pace and Bradbury's beliefs was delivered. At that convention a young Baylor student, Jesse Yelvington, brought new charges against Baylor by making an emotional announcement that evolution was present at Baylor in the person of Professor Andres Sendon, a Spanish teacher. Although the convention passed over the incident, it did not calm Yelvington, who wrote Brooks early in 1923 calling Sendon a cynic on the Bible and threatening further trouble unless he resigned.[33]

The charges against Sendon did not stem from his classroom performance, since as a Spanish teacher he had little opportunity to teach evolution or Biblical criticism. The conflict had begun several years earlier when both Sendon and Yelvington were students at Baylor living in the same boarding house. They had argued heatedly from time to time and apparently did not get along well together. Topics of their debates included evolution and Biblical accuracy, and Yelvington usually did poorly in the arguments, which did not improve his opinion of Sendon.[34]

---

[33]The Fundamentalist, 24 November 1922, p. 1; Jesse Yelvington to Brooks, 16 February 1923, Brooks Papers.

[34]The Fundamentalist, 8 December 1922, p. 1; Yelvington to Brooks, 27 February 1923; Mrs. J. B. Fumbley to Brooks, 3 December 1924, Brooks Papers.

Yelvington first complained to Brooks about Sendon's views, and Brooks spoke with the accused. Sendon convinced Brooks that he was arguing only for the sake of argument and did not truly believe much of what he said. After Sendon became an instructor at Baylor, further questions arose about his orthodoxy, causing Brooks to write Sendon's pastor asking for support in behalf of the Spanish instructor. The pastor testified that Sendon had rejected any belief in evolution that he might have once held and declared him both an outstanding Christian and Sunday school teacher.[35] Nevertheless, the attacks on Sendon continued along with demands for his resignation. In this case, as before, Brooks defended Baylor and its teachers. Desiring that they have at least a degree of personal and academic freedom, he realized at the same time that the university depended on the support of the people, and thus he had to disprove the heresy charges.

Meanwhile, further trouble developed with still another professor, involving this time not only the unorthodoxy of his beliefs, but also his morality and private life. Early in 1923, Norris wrote to Brooks that he had information concerning the morality of a Baylor professor.[36] Then in April he published a scandalous poem, titled "Milady's

---

[35]Brooks to W. W. Melton, 26 February 1923; Melton to Whom It May Concern, 28 February 1923, Brooks Papers.

[36]Norris to Brooks, 12 February 1923, Brooks Papers.

Stockings," which declared the author's preference for his love's wearing silk rather than cotton stockings. The author, Norris told his readers, was a Baylor professor who had deserted his wife and baby for another woman. Norris, knowing how people love a scandal, especially one involving sex, gave the incident an air of mystery by refusing at first to reveal names and details. According to the Fort Worth fundamentalist the author of the poem also taught and believed in evolution, proving that such beliefs destroyed morals and bred "free-lovism."[37]

Gradually the story unfolded, like a radio serial, in the pages of The Searchlight. After the wife had sued for divorce, Norris announced that the culprit was John Caskey, an English teacher at Baylor who had not only made fun of fundamentalism but had defended modernism in class. Not only had this infidel deserted his wife several months before his baby was born, but he had also refused to pay her hospital bills.[38] Brooks again defended his teacher; indicating that Norris had not told the full truth, he claimed that the young man was in fact badly "persecuted" in family matters.[39] Caskey remained on Baylor's faculty in spite of the attack, until the spring of 1925,when he

---

[37]The Fundamentalist, 6 April 1923, p. 1; 13 April 1923, p. 1.

[38]Ibid., 29 June 1923, p. 1, 4.

[39]Brooks to F. S. Groner, 5 May 1923, Brooks Papers.

resigned, with Norris again gleefully taking credit for forcing him out.[40]

Both the Sendon and Caskey affairs soon took a back seat to one of the most bitter controversies of the decade which began developing in March 1923, when Dale Crowley, another Baylor student, launched an attack on Baylor and Brooks. Speaking in a pastor's conference in Houston, Crowley accused Brooks of being a heretic and declared that he defended the views of a rank evolutionist. Crowley claimed that in a Baylor history class the instructor, Charles Fotergill, had given the students the impression that he believed in the evolution of species, and a heated argument had developed between him and the class. After class Crowley confronted him individually and the teacher admitted that he could not accept the entire Bible literally. Specifically he cited the story of Noah's ark and argued that the ark could not have been large enough to contain two of each kind of animal. Crowley then took the matter to Brooks,who, according to Crowley, defended evolution and said that he believed man was created by a process. Next Crowley went from Brooks to other Baptist leaders but got no results; Fotergill, he informed the Houston gathering, was still teaching in Baylor.[41]

---

[40]The Fundamentalist, 3 April 1925, p. 1.

[41]E. P. West to Brooks, 27 March 1923; J. E. Boulet to Brooks, 10 April 1923, Brooks papers; Dale Crowley to Scarborough, 12 June 1923, Scarborough Papers.

Brooks, again placed on the defensive, tried to build a case in support of the teacher. He wrote George Truett that Fotergill was "no worse than I am," because they both believed that the six days of Genesis were not literal twenty-four hour days.[42] Brooks also began writing to people who had known Fotergill before he came to Baylor, seeking information about his private life and beliefs. He soon discovered that Fotergill had had some unfortunate experiences in the past with the church. While attending a Baptist church in Floresville, Fotergill had apparently been seized with doubts and had denied the validity of such essential truths as the Virgin Birth, Christ's deity, the resurrection, the direct inspiration of the Scriptures, and the Genesis account of creation. Although he certainly was not an atheist or agnostic, he was apparently a modernist or a theological liberal. He had caused a serious disturbance in the church and finally had become so beset by doubt that he asked the church to withdraw his letter. His former associates argued that unless his beliefs had changed he definitely should not be teaching in a Baptist school.[43]

Such testimony was certain to hurt Baylor, unless it could be established that Fotergill's beliefs had changed.

---

[42]Brooks to Truett, 22 June 1923, Truett Papers.

[43]W. H. Anderson to Brooks, 13 October 1923; I. E. Gates to Brooks, 12 November 1923; H. H. Stagg to Brooks, 27 October 1924; W. R. Wiseman to Brooks, 15 November 1924, Brooks Papers.

Brooks attempted to prove that the history instructor had undergone a dramatic conversion experience in which he renounced his former heresies. According to Brooks when Fotergill came to Baylor as a student, he asked other students to pray for him. As a result of their prayers, Fotergill had been saved and had mended the error of his ways, becoming a devoted Christian and church worker.[44]

In addition to the Fotergill heresy other controversies plagued Texas Baptists during 1923. Norris acquired a number of books used at Baylor and preached several sermons in which he quoted from them at length.[45] Typical of the response among Baptists to Norris' attack were the resolutions passed by the Parker County Baptist Association which declared that evolution was being taught in public and church schools, especially at Baylor. The association then demanded the immediate resignation of all evolutionists.[46] Baptist leaders received constant demands that evolution and any similar heresies be combatted, and Brooks was constantly pressured to publish a clear unequivocal statement against evolution.[47]

In addition to outside agitation, a split developed within the ranks of the conservative Baptists themselves.

---

[44]Brooks to Pat Neff, 4 October 1923, Brooks Papers.

[45]The Fundamentalist, 14 September 1923, p. 1.

[46]Ibid., 14 September 1923, p. 1.

[47]T. L. Burchett to Brooks, 12 October 1923, Brooks Papers; E. F. Adams to Coppas, 2 August 1923, Coppas Papers.

B. A. Copass and Jeff Ray, professors at Southwestern Seminary, accused Brooks of being a theistic evolutionist and demanded a statement from him; meanwhile contributions to Texas Baptist causes and especially to Baptist schools continued to drop.[48]

Obviously Brooks and Baylor University were facing serious difficulty when the Texas Baptist Convention met in November, 1923. Once again Brooks had to defend himself and establish the orthodoxy of his faculty, which he attempted to do with a lengthy statement answering the charges of Norris and others. Under pressure from his fellow Baptists, he declared that the University would not tolerate infidelity or any teaching that discredited the Scriptures, and he condemned Darwinian evolution. Asserting belief in the fall of man, the Virgin Birth of Christ, His literal resurrection, the necessity for New Birth, as well as Christ's second coming, he assured Texas Baptists that the President and faculty at Baylor believed, "that God made man and everything else just as He said He did in Genesis."[49] Brooks' very orthodox stand proved the basis for an effort to patch up the differences among Texas Baptists. Norris jubilantly announced the end of trouble among Texas Baptists, claiming

---

[48]Jeff Ray to Brooks, 16 August 1923, Brooks Papers; The Fundamentalist, 19 October 1923, p. 1.

[49]Annual of the Baptist Convention of Texas, Held at Galveston, Texas, November 15-17, 1923, Containing the Proceedings of the 75th Annual Session (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 42-43.

that the war was over at last. The Baptist Standard also proclaimed that Texas Baptists were at peace and united once again. Although the convention did not seat Norris' delegates, they voted to forgive him.[50]

Unfortunately the peace among Texas Baptists was only temporary. How sincere either side was is difficult to determine but after the convention Norris took credit for having straightened out and purified the denomination. He made it appear that Brooks had admitted the error of his and his faculty's ways and that because of Norris' prodding those at Baylor had repented and promised to do better. Such propaganda angered Brooks, since he felt that he had not been wrong in the various controversies and that he had not admitted error. In December, 1923, he published an article in the Baylor Bulletin repeating the various statements that he and his faculty had made concerning evolution and declaring that "The university has never been fundamentally wrong in the person of any of its teachers." Baylor, he said, had not changed its position, but the critics of Baylor had.[51]

Brooks' article opened the way for a new storm of controversy in 1924. Norris did not immediately seize upon

---

[50]The Fundamentalist, 23 November 1923, pp. 1-4; 30 November 1923, p. 1; Baptist Standard, 22 November 1923, p. 3.

[51]Brooks to J. L. Ward, 20 June 1927, Brooks Papers; Brooks, "Concerning Evolution in Baylor University," p. 1.

this issue by bringing it to the attention of the public. Although he wrote members of Baylor's board of trustees about the article threatening to renew his attack, he waited to act until the fall of 1924.[52] During the first months of the year he continued to urge unity and cooperation among Texas Baptists and concentrated on attacking Baptists from outside the state, such as John R. Sampley of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and William Poteat of Wake Forest, an admitted evolutionist.[53] Possibly Norris hoped to maintain peace with Texas Baptists long enough to be reinstated in the organization. When the Tarrant County Baptist Association readmitted his church temporarily in September 1924, his messengers immediately began pushing for a resolution to condemn Brooks and Baylor. To prevent the passage of a more radical statement, the Association passed a resolution disapproving of Brooks' statement in the Bulletin that the university had never been fundamentally wrong.[54]

Meanwhile, the Crowley-Fotergill controversy intensified. Dale Crowley had continued to demand Fotergill's resignation, publishing his story in a little newspaper titled the Sword,

---

[52]Brooks to Ray, 23 June 1924, Brooks Papers.

[53]The Fundamentalist, 11 April 1924, p. 1; 18 April 1923, p. 1., 3; 7 March 1924, p. 1, 4; 29 February 1924, p. 1.

[54]Scarborough to Brooks, 13 September 1924, Brooks Papers; The Fundamentalist, 19 September 1924, p. 1. 2.

which he distributed to Baylor students and other interested parties. Getting no satisfactory action from Brooks and other Baptist leaders, Crowley resorted in September, 1924, to taking his case to Norris. The information came just at a time when Norris could make the maximum use of it. Since his peace with the Baptists was falling apart, Norris gave Fotergill's accusations more publicity than before.[55]

Brooks, understandably furious when Norris began to capitalize on the case, became anxious to retaliate against Crowley for the trouble he had caused. Under Brooks' leadership, the faculty voted in favor of a series of resolutions to suspend Crowley for being disloyal and disrespectful. Claiming that he meant no disloyalty and that his only goal was to save Baylor from the heresy of evolution and modernism, Crowley requested a hearing before the entire faculty where he proposed to disprove the charges against him. Brooks refused his request.[56]

Since it gave his critics more ammunition, Brooks' action against Crowley was probably a mistake. Norris pictured Crowley as the underdog against the organization, the victim sacrificed to the pagan god of evolution. A Searchlight cartoon caricatured Brooks as a Goliath defending

---

[55]The Sword, 11 October 1924, in Brooks papers; The Fundamentalist, 26 September 1924, pp. 1-3; 10 October 1924, p. 1.

[56]Resolutions Concerning Dale S. Crowley; Crowley to Brooks, 23 and 24 October 1924, Brooks Papers.

evolution and claiming that the university had never been wrong, while it portrayed Crowley as David reciting Scriptures.[57] Norris used this case repeatedly as the prime example of machine control within the church. Placing himself in the position of defneding the little man against the big, against trusts and institutuionalism, Norris made use in this case of Populist-Progressive political methods.[58]

Forced to resign in November, 1924, Fotergill stated, "I have been misunderstood and unscrupulously maligned by designing persons regarding my religious beliefs," although he admitted he doubted the story of Noah's ark.[59] Crowley continued his association with Norris and the fundamentalist movement. He became pastor of a large church in Texas City where the congregation divided badly under his leadership. After pastoring a newly created fundamentalist church in Denton for a while, he left for Jonesboro, Arkansas, where he became involved in a violent controversy over who was rightfully pastor of the church. This dispute resulted in a confrontation between the two men in which Crowley shot and killed his opponent; thus he continued to be a controversial figure within the fundamentalist movement.[60]

---

[57] The Fundamentalist, 21 November 1924, p. 1.

[58] Ibid., 31 October 1924, pp. 1, 2; 17 October 1924, pp. 1, 4.

[59] Brooks to Truett, 27 November 1924, Brooks papers; The Fundamentalist, 7 November 1924, p. 1.

[60] The Fundamentalist, 14 November 1925, p. 1; R. V. Vandiver to Brooks, 26 September 1925, Brooks Papers; The Fundamentalist, 2 October 1931, p. 3; 27 October 1933, p. 1; A. R. Copeland, "Opinions, Good Books and Excerpts," typescript in Copeland Papers.

Because of Brooks' controversial article in the Baylor Bulletin and the Crowley affair, the split in the ranks of Texas Baptists deepened. Leaders like Scarborough and Copass, whom Brooks needed as allies, asked him to explain his Bulletin statements. Did he mean, they wanted to know, that he still supported Dow? Brooks replied that he did not think his teachers had been perfect but that they had not been wrong in their motives.[61] The conservatives were not satisfied. Copass, who had long been a critic of Brooks, believed that Fotergill was guilty and that Crowley should be reinstated in Baylor. He complained also that Brooks' stand on evolution had been up to that point too vague, which Copass attempted to remedy by writing up a precise statement for Brooks and asked him in demanding terms to sign it. Brooks received many requests for new anti-evolution, anti-modernist stands, which he usually managed to answer diplomatically, but in response to Copass, his patience had obviously been strained. He replied that he was sorry Copass' teaching duties did not keep him occupied so that he felt compelled to help administer Baylor. He wrote, "You issue me a questionaire to be endorsed. My dear brother, if I signed all the questionaires that are given me directly or implied by the chief agitator [Norris], by editor Routh . . . and now by you, I fear that I would need a guardian thereafter."[62]

---

[61]Scarborough to Brooks, 18 September 1924; Copass to Brooks, 14 September 1924, Brooks to Scarborough, 20 September 1924 , Brooks Papers.

[62]Brooks to Copass, 23 October 1924, Brooks Papers.

Other conservative Baptists also seemd to be turning against Brooks. Probably the most damaging actions came from E. C. Routh, editor of the Baptist Standard. In addition to writing editorials that placed Baylor in a bad light, he printed letters demanding that evolution be eliminated, yet he refused to print letters and articles defending the institution. Because of his attacks on Brooks, agitation developed to replace Routh as editor of the Standard, since he seemed to be siding with Norris. According to Brooks, the disunity and dissatisfaction among his own people concerned him more than the attacks from Norris.[63]

By 1924, Norris had acquired a significant ally in the fight against Baylor and modernism, A. Reilly Copeland of Temple Baptist Church in Waco. Like Norris, Copeland felt compelled to fight evil wherever he perceived it and saw himself as a prophet specially appointed to combat the forces of Satan. Copeland connected the evolutionists in Baylor with the bootleggers and gamblers downtown and attacked them all with equal force.[64] In 1924, when a Methodist, W. A. Buice, was discovered teaching at Baylor, Copeland wrote Brooks that he must surely admit that the university was

---

[63]Brooks to E. C. Routh, 24 October 1924; Routh to Brooks, 27 October 1924; Brooks to Z. T. Cody, 28 October 1924; W. H. Sewell to Brooks, 29 October 1924, Brooks Papers.

[64]A. Reilly Copeland, "The Inside Story," tract in Copeland Papers; The Fundamentalist, 9 January 1925, p. 1.

wrong since he reasoned, "If Baptists are fundamentally right, then all non-Baptists are fundamentally wrong."[65] As did other fundamentalists, Copeland interpreted the world in terms of absolute good versus absolute evil, unable to see any shading in between. Copeland also took up the defense of Crowley demanding, ironically, freedom of speech and press. Also he, like Norris, became involved in an intense struggle against political bosses in Waco, causing him to become involved in court battles over libel charges.[66]

By the time of the Texas Baptist Convention of 1924, denominational leaders agreed that the agitation must stop or the denomination would be seriously damaged. To halt it they felt they had to accomplish two things: oust Norris from the Association permanently and prove the orthodoxy of Baylor's president and faculty. Norris, they had decided, could not be trusted since each time he promised peace and harmony he found a new excuse to renew his attacks. When Norris sent messengers to the state convention in November, 1924, delegates voted overwhelmingly not to seat them, giving as reasons the church's failure to cooperate in Baptist causes and Norris' constant agitation. After this rejection,

---

[65]Copeland to Brooks, 11 November 1924, Brooks Papers.

[66]The Fundamentalist, 24 October 1924, p. 1: 7 November 1924, p. 1, 4; 16 January 1925, p. 1; 15 January 1926, p. 3.

Norris' church could not be readmitted except by approval of two-thirds of the association. Of course, Norris again accused the association of machine denomination and claimed that his only sins had been opposition to evolution and criticism of the unscriptural Seventy-Five Million campaign.[67]

The convention could not exclude Norris without serious repercussions because of the size of his following; thus, while refusing him fellowship, they had to deny his charges once more. In the previous convention Brooks had assured Texas Baptists of his and his faculty's orthodoxy, but this year he and his faculty drew up and signed an extensive creedal statement declaring themselves to be committed to the fundamentals. The statement, designed to calm any fears about Baylor's orthodoxy, asserted that God created man as recorded in Genesis and that the Scriptures were divinely inspired. The faculty and president also asserted their belief in such fundamentals as the Virgin Birth, the deity of Christ, his vicarious atonement, his literal ressurection, his performance of miracles and his personal return to earth. Even the Methodist "infidel" W. A. Buice signed the statement.[68] The convention, while obviously

---

[67]E. G. Townsend to Scarborough, 11 October 1924; E. C. Routh to Scarborough, 18 October 1924; Brooks to Scarborough, 24 October 1924, Scarborough Papers; Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, Held at Dallas, Texas, November 20-22, 1924, Containing the Proceedings of the 76th Annual Session (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 24-25. The Fundamentalist, 20 February 1925, pp. 1-4.

[68]The Fundamentalist, 28 November 1924, p. 1, 2, 4; Texas Baptist Annual, 1924, pp. 61-62.

determined to demand orthodoxy from its schools, was just as determined to stop attacks and agitation that hurt the denomination financially and spiritually.

Intense agitation within the Protestant denominations had a significant impact on secular, as well as religious affairs. If modernism was creeping up on religious denominations and institutions it was, fundamentalists felt, taking secular institutions by storm. Religious leaders became deeply concerned about the secularization of education and about the influence of state institutions upon the religious convictions of young people.[69] As the Baptist state convention grieved, "State institutions of learning are busily engaged in weaning the coming generation of educated men from faith in the supernatural revelation of God . . . through teaching atheistic evolution, rationalism and radical socialism."[70] The Firm Foundation, which was associated with the Churches of Christ, warned that teachers did not have the proper regard for the Bible and worried about the ill effects of teaching evolution, editorilizing:

> There is not a nation under the sun that can survive with this doctrine taught in its public schools and pulpits and higher institutions. . . . No nation

---

[69]John A. Williams to Brooks, 20 October 1923, Brooks Papers; Minutes of the Synod of Texas Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Meeting at Nacodogches, Texas, October 6-11, 1920 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 12-13; Firm Foundation, 12 July 1921, p. 2.

[70]Texas Baptist Annual, 1920, p. 43.

> can leave God out of creation; no country can maintain civilization, and deny the Bible account of creation. The doctrine strikes at the very root of civilization. It will breed wars and bloodshed. It will produce anarchy. It will destroy respect for God. It teaches that Jesus Christ was a bastard.[71]

Motivated by such fears, the fundamentalists took their campaign to the state legislature in 1923.

In the state house of representatives, J. T. Stroder, of Navarro County, and S. J. Howeth, of Johnson County, sponsored the first Texas anti-evolution bill. Stroder, the most vocal political advocate of anti-evolution legislation, was also concerned with the religious controversy. A Baptist, he wrote Brooks of his pleasure at O. C. Bradbury's resignation and asked that Lula Pace and Sendon also resign.[72] Declaring that evolution teaches "that man sprang from a protoplasm, to a tadpole, to a polliwog, to a frog, to a monkey, to an ape, to a baboon, to a 'guerilla,' to a bear, to a Chinaman, to a Jap, to a negro, to a white man," Stroder hoped to pass legislation designed to prevent any person at a Texas public institution from writing or teaching from books that explained evolution. He also aimed to prevent evolutionists from teaching or holding public office. Violations, Stroder hoped, would be punished by fines from $1,000 to $5,000 and confinement in prison for

---

[71] Firm Foundation, 30 January 1923, p. 3.

[72] J. T. Stroder to Brooks, 3 March 1923, Brooks Papers.

not less than ten or more than thirty years, with each day's offense being considered a separate violation.[73] Realizing he would have to compromise on the penalties, since most people did not favor such harsh punishment, Stroder felt he had good reason for considering evolutionary teaching an enormous crime. To him it was synonymous with German rationalism and was destroying society by teaching anarchism, socialism, and free-loveism. He identified the curses of this doctrine as being

> 'atheism,' 'infidelity,' 'materialism,' 'Agnosticism,' 'pantheism,' 'naturalism,' 'natural selection theory,' 'struggle for existence,' 'blood-and-iron policy,' 'survival of the fittest theory,' 'might makes right theory,' 'to the victor belongs the spoils policy,' "War God theory,' 'no God theory,' 'do as you please to do,' 'end justifies the means policy,' 'Socialism,' 'freeloveism,' 'transmutationism,' 'evolutionism,' 'liberalism,' 'latitudinarianism,' 'mensheism,' 'Bolshevism,' 'I.W.W.-ism,' and 'anarchism,'[74]

The first of the anti-evolution bills, introduced in the House in January, 1923, prohibited teaching any aspect of evolution in public schools or colleges and universities supported in whole or part by tax money; it also forbade the textbook committee to adopt books that taught the theory, either directly or indirectly, or that discredited the

---

[73]Unidentified newspaper clipping, Brooks Papers.

[74]J. T. Stroder, "Hot Shot--But Facts," typescript in Brooks Papers.

Genesis account of creation. The bill, was referred to the committee on state affairs, which reported it unfavorably on January 17.[75]

On the following day a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education touched off a heated debate. Stroder delivered an emotional appeal, claiming that 95 percent of the people of Texas supported his fight against "the most abominable thing that ever cursed our American continent." Stroder announced that William Jennings Bryan had pledged his aid to help Texas "down this most terrible blight on our fair land." The Navarro County representative received loud applause, and although the legislature did not recommit the bill the minority report was ordered printed to be read at a later session.[76]

The Stroder bill received its second reading on February 12, and a few days later J. Frank Norris interjected his influence into the secular debate as well as the religious one. He addressed the legislature on February 16, and according to him "skin[ned] the chimpanzee theory." In summing up fundamentalist objections to teaching evolution in public schools, he identified evolution as a tenet of faith and

---

[75]Texas, H. B. No. 97, "A Bill to Be Entitled an act prohibiting the teaching of evolution . . .," typed copy, Legislative Library, Austin, Texas; Texas, Legislature, House Journal, 38th Leg., reg. sess., 1923, p. 49.

[76]House Journal, 38th Leg., reg. sess., 1923, p. 185; Waco News-Tribune, 19 January 1923, p. 1.

said that teaching it was equivalent to teaching Bolshevism, Mohammedanism, Buddhism, or Catholicism in public schools. According to the Fort Worth minister, the theory originated in Germany and was more destructive than German militarism, since by destroying faith in the Bible, it would end authority of all kinds, and eventually destroy civilization.[77]

On February 24, the House debated the bill again, and the Austin Statesman referred to these proceedings as the most heated and bitter debates of the Thirty-Eighth legislature. Calling anyone who believed in evolution an "atheist of the worst form" Stroder again related the doctrine to free love, socialism, and anarchism. The bill's other sponsor, Representative Howeth, who was a Baptist minister argued emotionally that the theory would eventually destroy the Bible and cause the downfall of civilization. During this debate several representatives spoke against the bill. Strongest opposition came from Lloyd E. Price, of Morris County, who attempted to kill the measure, contending that the legislature's defense of the Bible was about as logical as sending the Texas Rangers to defend Jerusalem would be. He called the bill fanatical and compared it with witchcraft and the Spanish Inquisition. Eugene Miller, of Parker County, also opposed the bill, branding it the most radical piece of legislation the House had ever considered. He contended that it would mean abolition of the state medical college.[78]

---

[77]The Fundamentalist, 23 February 1923, p. 1.

[78]Austin Statesman, 25 February 1923, p. 1.

On March 3 the House held final debate and took action on the bill. Joining Stroder in speaking for the measure were L. C. Stewart, of Reeves County, and J. A. Dodd, of Texarkana. Dodd, pleading that "God be given an equal show with the devil," argued:

> The state forces me to pay taxes to support schools, then forces me to send my children to those schools and there shows my children the road to hell through teaching them the hellish infidelity of evolution. We owe it to our children and to our mothers who loved their Bible and taught us its meaning to abolish forever from our schools this iniquitous fallacy which holds that the Bible is a liar and that man is a monkey. . . . I would rather my children would grow up in total ignorance all their lives than that they should spend all eternity in a burning hell.[79]

In the final debate the only representative speaking out against the measure was J. R. Hardin, of Kaufman. He declared that by considering such "monkey business" the Texas legislature was merely proving the accuracy of Darwin's theory. Contending that evolution and religion were completely separate, he told his colleagues, "The teachers are not presuming to tell the preachers what they should preach; neither should the preachers dictate to the teachers what they should teach." After Hardin's attempt to have the bill postponed indefinitely was tabled, it passed to engrossment by a vote of sixty-nine to thirty-two.[80] Not all of those

---

[79] House Journal, 38th Leg., reg. sess., 1923, p. 1165; Austin Statesman, 3 March 1923, p. 2.

[80] Austin Statesman, 3 March 1923, p. 2.

who opposed engrossment did so because they disapproved of the bill. For example, Wright Patman, of Linden, explained that he opposed the bill because no one had yet proved that the theory was being taught in Texas. If it were taught, he believed that it should be prevented and agreed that he would vote for a bill providing adequate penalties.[81]

Texas fundamentalists rejoiced that Texas seemed about to take definite action against the heresy of evolution and urged the people to write their state senators in favor of the bill.[82] The senate referred the bill to the Committee on Education, which returned a favorable report on March 12. In spite of committee recommendations, the Senate allowed the bill to die on the calendar.[83]

The failure of the Stroder-Howeth bill did not dishearten the anti-evolutionists. When the Third Called Session of the Thirty-Eighth Legislature met in May, the House struck another blow at evolution, this time by passing a House Concurrent Resolution, which reasoned that the state constitution stipulated that the government would not interfere in religious matters and that no one could be forced to support a place of worship. Since tax money

---

[81] House Journal, 38th Leg., reg. sess., 1923, p. 1165.

[82] The Fundamentalist, 9 March 1923, p. 1.

[83] Texas, Legislature, Senate Journal, 38th Leg., reg. sess., 1923, pp. 1064-1065, 1149, 1509.

supported the school systems, then teaching atheism, agnosticism, or any theory that linked man to other life forms was unconstitutional and against the best interests of the state's citizens. On May 28, the House adopted this resolution by a vote of eighty-one to nine, clearly indicating the strength of anti-evolution sentiment in the House; however, the senate also allowed this measure to die in committee.[84]

Assaults on the theory of evolution were not the fundamentalists' only line of defense against modernism. The early 1920's also witnessed a tremendous surge of interest in Bible reading in public schools. For several years there had been agitation for such a practice on a local level, and Bibles had been placed in many schools, with Protestant denominations urging that Bible reading and study be incorporated as a regular part of school activities.[85] In the Methodist church, the Texas Conference, Central Conference, and North Texas Conference, all passed resolutions requesting the legislature to consider legislation making Bible reading

---

[84]Texas, Legislature, House Journal, 38th Leg., 3rd called sess., 1923, pp. 73-74, 83; Texas, Legislature, Senate Journal, 38th Leg., 3rd called sess., 1923, pp. 340.

[85]"Minutes of the Austin Bible Society," 30 October 1921, University of Texas Archives, Austin, Texas.

in the public schools compulsory.[86] The state Baptist convention also supported such action.[87] The Texas Synod of the Presbyterian Church of the United States encouraged a movement to have Bible study accepted for credit in the public schools and colleges of the state.[88] Compulsory Bible reading also received secular support from the state attorney general and the governor, as well as the state teachers' association.[89]

By 1923 a Bible in the Public Schools Association had been formed, and the president, Will Evans, of Bonham, led considerable agitation for a state enforced compulsory Bible reading law. A bill introduced in the House by W. T. McDonald, of Huntsville, and Lee J. Rountree, of Bryan, provided for opening exercises in all public school class rooms or assembly rooms to consist of Bible reading without

---

[86] Journal of the 83rd Annual Session of the Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Marshall, Texas, November 22-27, 1922, (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 25; Journal of the 56th Annual Session of the Central Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Weatherford, Texas, November 15, 1922 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 44-45; Journal of the 56th Annual Session of the North Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Sherman, Texas, October 18-23, 1922 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 45.

[87] Texas Baptist Annual, 1920, p. 38.

[88] Minutes of the Presbyterian Educational Association of the South, 26 July 1921 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 2-3; Journal of the 68th Annual Session of the Texas Synod of the Presbyterian Church of the U.S., September 11-14, 1923 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 190-191.

[89] Austin Statesman, 8 January 1923, p. 1; "Resulutions Adopted by the T.S.T.A., Fort Worth, December 1, 1923," Texas Outlook 7(December 1923): 8.

comment, followed by a religious or patriotic song. Officials who failed to carry out these duties could be discharged and fined. On January 23, the bill was reported adversely from committee and ordered printed. It received its second reading on February 14 and was tabled subject to call, but the House never voted on it.[90]

Another major concern of the fundamentalists was their belief that atheists and agnostics had gained control of training young Texans' minds. Again they hoped for legislative action to correct the situation. On March 1, 1923, Representative Eugene Miller, of Gainer, introduced a bill in the state legislature to prohibit atheists or agnostics from teaching in public schools. If passed, it would require all school officials, such as teachers, professors, instructors, and superintendents to take an oath asserting their belief in a supreme being. This bill was reported favorably on March 5, but the House never acted on it; even without legislative encouragement fundamentalist concern that agnostics and atheists had gained positions of influence in Texas schools continued.[91]

Conditions at the University of Texas also disturbed fundamentalists, since it seemed to them a hotbed of modernism.

---

[90]Dallas Morning News, 9 January 1923, p. 2; Austin Statesman, 8 January 1923, p. 1; House Journal, 38th Leg., reg. sess., 1923, pp. 32, 271, 693.

[91]House Journal, 38th Leg., reg. sess., 1923, pp. 1082, 1275.

The various legislative measures would have included the universities had they passed, but in the absence of legislative action more subtle pressures proved effective at the university in Austin. Both a candidate's religious affiliations and his philosophy became important in filling positions at the University of Texas. Eugene C. Barker, eminent historian and department chairman, admitted submitting to conservative pressures in refusing to employ a competent professor because of the professor's liberal beliefs. When some of his colleagues accused him of losing his nerve and abandoning his principles, he answered, "one gets tired in the course of time of bumping his head against mud walls."[92]

In 1923 and 1924, the fundamentalist controversy became a significant issue in an administrative and political controversy at the University of Texas. When the position of University president became vacant, it was clear that religious beliefs would be an important consideration in filling the position. University authorities rejected one well qualified individual because he did not belong to a church and because rumors, apparently unfounded, circulated that the candidate was an atheist.[93]

---

[92]Eugene C. Barker to A. C. Kray, 15 May 1923, Eugene C. Barker Papers, University of Texas Archives, Austin, Texas.

[93]"Report on the Names Suggested for Presidency of the University of Texas," typescript in Barker Papers.

The fundamentalist chairman of the Board of Regents, Lutcher Stark, led the movement to elect Pat Neff, governor of Texas and a Baptist fundamentalist, to the position of university president. When strong opposition to both men developed Stark attributed it to their conservative religious views. He claimed that religious radicals were trying to "get his scalp." In rather tortured grammar Stark continued: "They are afraid that because I am a fundamentalist . . . that it will handicap liberal teachings in the University faculty because they have liberal views, but I do and will continue to oppose all those who are not God fearing men and we will not have any socialists up there."[94]

Some faculty members and the Ex-Students Association opposed both Stark and Neff. Hogg accused Stark of trying to use the fundamentalist controversy to get Neff into the presidency. He contended that Stark realized when the educators from across the nation connected the fundamentalist question with the university they would refuse the position, not wanting to become involved in the controversy. Neff could then step into the presidency in order to "save the university." Although Neff was never appointed, Hogg argued that Stark had used the controversy to frighten qualified people from applying for the position.[95]

---

[94] Austin Statesman, 8 April 1924, p. 1.

[95] C. S. Boucher to Barker, 12 May 1923, Barker Papers; Austin Statesman, 22 May 1924, p. 1.

Fundamentalism's most significant impact on the University of Texas came in 1924 when the Board of Regents, led again by fundamentalist Stark, acted to suppress modernism, by passing the following resolution: "No infidel, atheist, or agnostic shall be employed in any capacity in the University of Texas. . . . No person who does not believe in God as the Supreme Being and Ruler of the Universe shall hereafter be employed."[96] This decree required that all employees from the president to the janitors be religiously orthodox. Even before the adoption of the resolution, religious affiliation had been a significant consideration in hiring at the university, but now the university's position was official and well known.

Little opposition developed to fundamentalism's influence on the state's secular institutions. Although Brooks voiced opposition to both compulsory Bible reading and anti-evolution laws, as president of Baylor, he could ill afford to take very definite action.[97] Although university and college professors disliked restrictive measures, concern for their positions also prevented their taking action, and the educated community of the state lacked unity in opposition to fundamentalists. The Alcade, the alumni publication of the University of Texas, editorialized that while atheists and

---

[96]Mirian Allen De Ford, "The War Against Evolution," The Nation 120(20 May 1925): 566.

[97]Brooks to W. J. Gray, 17 February 1923, Brooks Papers; Dallas Morning News, 20 January 1923, p. 3.

agnostics had a right to teach their own kind, most Texas boys and girls came from religious homes and "should not be taught by men and women who deny the existence of God."[98]

The detrimental effect of fundamentalist restrictions was noted, however. In 1925, when William Splawn was inaugurated as president of the University of Texas he warned,

> Great universities impose no restrictions on the intellectual independency of the faculties; and their governing boards tolerate no interference with them by others. We have not had these conditions here. It would serve no useful purpose to particularize, but it is not secret to my academic colleagues here or elsewhere that a call to the University of Texas arouses no thrill of elation, but only hesitation and doubt; and that for a long time since we have been losing more good scholars than we are replacing.[99]

By 1925, fundamentalism was a force to be reckoned with in both religious and secular circles with the state of Texas.

---

[98]Quoted in "Americana," The American Mercury 3(October 1924): 174.

[99]"Address at the Inauguration of President Splawn, June 8, 1925," typescript in Barker Papers.

CHAPTER V

THE APEX OF TEXAS FUNDAMENTALISM

Nationwide, 1925 was the climactic year for the fundamentalist movement because of the highly publicized Scopes Trial. By that year, Tennessee had passed a law against teaching evolution in the public schools of the state and a tremendous secular leader of the movement had emerged in William Jennings Bryan. Since the 1890's Bryan had built his political career as the crusader for the masses against the "interests," the Wall Street captialists, the trusts, and the political bosses. He had advocated and seen passed a number of liberal reform measures, but in the 1920's he became a national crusader for religious conservativism.

Most students of Bryan's career conclude that a significant change took place in Bryan's philosophy during the latter part of his life, but Lawrence W. Levine suggests, in his study of Bryan's last years, Defender of the Faith, that Bryan remained a political reformer and continued to speak for the same groups, the rural South and West. In fact, Levine points out that Bryan saw in the teaching of evolution an explanation for the failure of Americans to listen to the voice of reform in the 1920's. How could people aspire to nobler and higher ideals if they believed

that they were brutes, he queried?[1] Certainly the same people who sympathized with Bryan's attack on machine politics and organized big business responded to the movement which opposed machine religion.

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to consider Bryan the typical fundamentalist spokesman, and the significance of the Scopes trial to the movement as a whole has probably been greatly exaggerated. Bryan differed greatly from the fundamentalist faction in Texas, since he sought to use religion as a tool to bring about social reform. He was not a premillenialist nor did he share the fundamentalists' concept of the depravity of man. Actually his goals and aims for religion resembled more closely those in Texas who were accused of being modernists. The major point on which Bryan agreed essentially with the fundamentalist theologians was his acceptance of the literal accuracy of the Bible.[2] His popularity and oratorical abilities made it convenient for fundamentalists to use his talents in behalf of their cause, and they did not hesitate to do so.

Throughout his life Bryan's reform efforts rested on his Christian zeal, and in a very real sense he was crusading for the same essential truths in the 1920's as in his earlier

---

[1]Lawrence W. Levine, Defender of the Faith: William Jennings Bryan: The Last Decade, 1915-1925 (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 260-272.

[2]Ibid., pp. 246-272.

career, for rural America, for the common man, for the old value system against the new, and for the accuracy of revealed religion. Bryan's support for legislation to prevent the teaching of evolution stemmed from a belief that had always guided him--that the people could not judge wrong. Just as he had believed in the 1890's that if the people wanted silver they should have it, he believed in the 1920's that if the people wanted anti-evolution laws they should have them. According to his philosophy nothing should be taught in the schools that the majority of the community did not approve.[3] "The hand that writes the pay check rules the school," he contended.[4] Whereas his faith in democracy and majority rule had helped bring about viable reforms in the political arena, it proved restrictive and stulifying when applied to education.

Bryan had an active hand in shaping anti-evolution bills, advising legislatures, and speaking and writing in behalf of fundamentalist legislation. When the Tennessee legislature passed and the governor signed the act providing fines for teaching evolution, Bryan, although he thought the punishment clause unnecessary, wired Governor Austin Peavy his congratulations. Peavy assumed that the law would not be enforced, and indeed it was opponents of the

---

[3]Dallas Morning News, 9 July 1925, p. 1.

[4]Quoted in Levine, Defender of the Faith, p. 278.

law, not its friends, who arranged for the arrest and trial of John Thomas Scopes for teaching evolution in the small town of Dayton, Tennessee, in order to test the constitutionality of the law. The American Civil Liberties Union supported and the well known lawyers Clarence Darrow and Dudley Field Malone volunteered to defend him, while Bryan agreed to aid the prosecution.[5]

The ensuing trial, beginning July 10 and ending July 21, 1925, received nationwide attention and front page press coverage. It was, it seemed, Christianity versus atheism, fundamentalism versus modernism, religion versus science, and agrarianism versus urbanism, all in one grand battle. The climax of the trial came when the defense called Bryan himself to the stand, and Darrow subjected him to a gruelling questioning.[6] Certainly if this was the monumental battle to the end as it had been billed there were spokesmen much better informed about the position of fundamentalism than Bryan, and Darrow's questions revealed serious inconsistencies in Bryan's thinking. Nevertheless after brief deliberation the jury found Scopes guilty, which both sides had expected from the beginning. When Bryan died a few days after the

---

[5]Ray Ginger, Six Days or Forever? Tennessee v. John Thomas Scopes, 2nd ptg., paperback ed. (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969), pp. 5-8, 18-21, 45-46.

[6]Ibid., pp. 92-189 gives a complete account of the trial proceedings but is biased in favor of Darrow.

trial fundamentalism lost an important national figure. Scopes' lawyers planned to appeal the case to test the law, but they were thwarted when a higher court overturned the verdict on a technicality and the Tennessee law remained on the books until the 1960's.[7]

Many newspapers, especially the northeastern press, had for years taken delight in twisting Bryan's statements to make him look ridiculous, and they reported the trial proceeding as a tremendous victory for Darrow. Most historians in their accounts of the trial have accepted this interpretation and assumed that Darrow dealt a serious blow to the forces of fundamentalism, however, the fundamentalist presses hailed the trial as a great victory for their side. Norris, for example, reported, "Bryan Wins Greatest Victory of his Career--Bible Triumphs over Infidelity."[8] In the fundamentalist camp there was little evidence that Bryan's ignorance had in any way been exposed by Darrow's questioning. Most likely whose who had thought Bryan ill-informed before the trial began saw it as an exposure of his shallow mind. Those who agreed with him and who were doing battle alongside him still loved him dearly and thought him one of the greatest men who ever lived.

---

[7]Ibid., p. 192, 202-210.

[8]The Fundamentalist, 24 July 1925, p. 1.

The most significant impact of the trial and its aftermath in Texas was that it led to an intensified discussion of the issues and to more declarations and clarifications of positions. Texans were among Bryan's most receptive audiences; a predominantly rural society, they were the people that he had spoken for most of his life. In general, Texans' response to his stand on the fundamentals and to his position in the Scopes trial was favorable. Protestant leaders usually spoke laudably of him and welcomed his aid in support of religion. Norris sent a reporter to Dayton and gave a full, if somewhat biased, account of the proceedings in The Searchlight. Just before his death Bryan wrote to Norris thanking him for his support and sending a copy of his last anti-evolution speech, prepared but not delivered for the trial.[9] Bryan also received support from less radical Texas Protestants. The Texas Christian Advocate published an article by him and editorialized in favor of the Tennessee law. The Baptist Standard also gave its support. The Firm Foundation furthered Bryan's cause by editorializing against evolution, calling it the devils device to turn people from God, and arguing that it would destroy the principles of humanity.[10]

---

[9] Dallas Morning News, 2 August 1925, p. 10.

[10] Texas Christian Advocate, 30 July 1925, p. 1; 23 July 1925, p. 8; Baptist Standard, 9 July 1925, p. 6; 16 July 1925, p. 6; Firm Foundation, 7 July 1925, p. 4; 6 October 1925, p. 2.

When the Christian Courier printed an article critical of both Bryan and Darrow at the Dayton trial and further argued that evolution was not a serious threat to religion, a strong protest arose from the readers. One irate reader demanded that the "infidel" paper be sent to him no longer because "I am having fellowship with the devil in permitting your paper to come to me." Another asserted that most Christian clergymen rejected evolution.[11] When Bryan died a few days after the end of the Scopes trial, the newspaper eulogized him calling his soul "as white as snow," and declaring that he had gone home to the Lord.[12] Apparently opinion among Texas Disciples of Christ was divided concerning Bryan, evolution, fundamentalism and modernism, but since their conventions were informal and unofficial they had no united stand. Nationwide, the fundamentalist-modernist controversy was almost splitting the denomination, but on the state level the Courier called for peace, reconciliation, and open-mindedness.[13] Unlike Baylor, Southern Methodist University, and other church schools, Texas Christian University seemed little disturbed by the controversy, with students hearing lectures both by fundamentalists like Bryan and by well known liberals like Julian Huxley.[14]

---

[11] Christian Courier, 23 July 1925, p. 4; 13 August 1925, p. 2.

[12] Ibid., 30 July 1925, p. 1.

[13] Ibid., 24 September 1925, p. 4; 20 August 1925, p. 1.

[14] The Skiff, 5 November 1924, p. 2; 22 January 1924, p. 1; 1 October, 1924, p. 1. This was the Texas Christian University school newspaper.

Other denominations that had not made their stand on the issues clear took the agitation over the Tennessee law as the occasion to declare their position. Seventh Day Adventists, who were holding an encampment in San Antonio during the trial, adopted a declaration of their faith in the Bible and announced that their church had no place for evolutionists and modernists. Later in the summer a conference of North Texas Seventh Day Adventists also denounced evolution, and at a Dallas Conference a Seventh Day Adventists speaker labeled the conflict over evolution as the contest between the Christ and anti-Christ, calling it a sign of the end of the world.[15] The Texas Missionary Baptist Association declared that their association contained not one modernist, with local associations also condemning evolution and modernism. The Missionary Baptists accused the Southern Baptists of selling out to modernism.[16] The Church of the Nazarene Assembly also denounced modernism in 1925.[17]

Three branches of the Presbyterian Church were active in Texas--the Cumberland Presbyterian, the Presbyterian Church in the United States, which represented the southern

---

[15] Dallas Morning News, 25 July 1925, p. 3; 3 August 1925, sec. 2, p. 1; 30 July 1925, sec. 2, p. 1.

[16] Dallas Morning News, 14 November 1925, sec. 2, p. 13; 16 October 1925, p. 6; L. A. Hammett to Brooks, 20 June 1925, Brooks Paers; Baptist Progress, 17 November 1921, in Scarborough Papers.

[17] Austin Statesman, 4 November 1925, p. 1.

branch, and the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, which was the northern branch. Bryan himself being a Presbyterian, most Texas Presbyterians wholeheartedly supported him. Although the fundamentalist versus modernist issues disturbed Presbyterians on a national level, ultimately splitting the northern church, Texas Presbyterians seemed little concerned, in part because there seemed to be little disagreement over the fundamentals and in part because the denomination was plagued by money problems that any disuniting force could only serve to worsen.[18] The Cumberland Presbyterians meeting in San Antonio in 1925 did clarify their position by requiring teachers in denominational schools to pledge their belief in the Genesis account of creation, the Virgin Birth, and the inspiration of the Scriptures.[19]

The publicity given the Tennessee Law and the Scopes trial led to heated discussions in Texas pulpits, with most ministers taking Bryan's side and defending the law. Texas Presbyterian ministers seemed especially anxious to defend Bryan's position. One Presbyterian minister referred to evolution as "the gospel of dirt;" another asserted that the Bible was a perfect revelation from God; while still

---

[18]Paschal and Benner, One Hundred Years of Challenge and Change, pp. 149-150.

[19]Dallas Morning News, 11 December 1925, p. 3.

another claimed that the Bible contained the only accurate record of man's history.[20] One Baptist minister in Dallas contended that if Scopes were acquitted the country would have a generation of infidels within twenty years and declared, "Evolution is the tool of the devil spewed up from out of the bottomless pit to destroy the Bible and drag God's people down to destruction."[21] Since evolution served as the topic for numerous other sermons throughout the year, the issue was at least being widely discussed.[22]

A few ministers opposed the Tennessee law and defended Scopes as they tried to reconcile science and religion. One of the most outspoken opponents of Bryan and apologist for evolution was Frank Powell, a Dallas Unitarian minister. He argued that belief in evolution would strengthen rather than destroy religion because it would purge Christianity of superstition and fear, thus broaden its application.[23] Other Unitarians along with some scientists, educators, and

---

[20]Ibid., 16 November 1925, sec. 2, p. 12; 20 July 1925, sec. 2, p. 1; 20 July 1925, sec. 2, p. 1; 30 November 1925, sec. 2, p. 12.

[21]Ibid., 20 July 1925, sec. 2, p. 1.

[22]Ibid., 13 November 1925, sec. 2, p. 13; 15 July 1925, p. 7; 3 August 1925, sec. 2, p. 1; 14 July 1925, p. 6; El Paso Times, 1 June 1925, p. 4.

[23]Dallas Morning News, 30 November 1925, sec. 2, p. 12; 9 November 1925, p. 2.

visiting northern ministers,spoke in behalf of evolution, but their voices were few and scattered.[24]

Bryan received widespread secular as well as religious support in Texas. A Houston lawyer wrote a series of letters for the Dallas Morning News explaining his reasons for believing in the constitutionality of the law under which Scopes had been tried. He reasoned that regulation of morals is one of the rightful powers of government and that by outlawing evolutionary teachings the state government was merely protecting public morality.[25] Senator E. B. Mayfield of Texas praised Bryan, calling him Christianity's "greatest friend since the Apostle Paul."[26] G. B. Terrell, state Commissioner of Agriculture,called Bryan the world's greatest moral leader,who had died fighting for Christianity.[27] Judge Felix D. Robertson also favored Bryan's position, accusing the scientists of trying to drive the Bible and Christianity from the public schools.[28]

Editorial comment from the state's secular press also indicated the strength of fundamentalist support across the

---

[24]El Paso Times, 23 February 1925, p. 10; Dallas Morning News 7 December 1925, sec. 2, p. 9; 21 July 1925, p. 1; 10 July 1925, p. 5; 28 November 1925, p. 13; Austin Statesman, 9 July 1925, p. 1.

[25]Dallas Morning News, 26 July 1925, sec. 5, p. 7.

[26]Ibid., 19 August 1925, sec. 2, p. 15.

[27]Ibid., 9 August 1925, p. 13.

[28]Ibid., 22 August 1925, p. 2.

state. For the most part Texas newspapers openly opposed teaching evolution in public schools, while those editors who refused to support anti-evolution legislation usually made only vague statements expressing their beliefs. The Tyler Daily Courier Times noted that with few exceptions Texas editors still accepted the old time religion and opposed evolution. In support of this observation the Times quoted a Brownwood Bulletin editorial declaring that of the dozens of Texas newspapers passing through their office each day, none supported the "scientific views" of evolution while almost every one expressed complete acceptance of the Biblical account of creation.[29]

Although Bryan's cause attracted support from all areas of the state his strongest newspaper support came from Northeast Texas. The Gilmer Daily Mirror, for example,declared that the American denial of the Bible at Dayton, Tennessee, would cause the Soviets to declare a holiday, while "the flag in the valhalla of the immortals will be at half mast." When Bryan died after the trial the Mirror eulogized him, saying, "He stood among men, the peer of them all in his kingly splendor."[30] The Tyler Daily Courier Times editor declared his belief in the Bible from "kiver to kiver," and opposed Darrow's motion against prayer in court, contending

---

[29]Tyler Daily Courier-Times, 4 July 1925, p. 2;

[30]Gilmer Daily Mirror, 2 July 1925, p. 3; 27 July 1925, p. 2.

that the majority of the people in the nation believed that court should be opened with prayer.[31] During the Scopes trial the Tyler paper printed several editorials opposing evolution. Upon Bryan's death the paper not only praised him highly but also printed stories about his life and called him one of the world's greatest men.[32] Other east Texas presses also condemned the theory of evolution. The editor of the Marshall newspaper feared that immature minds would be corrupted by the theory, while the Honey Grove Signal admitted, "We don't know anything about evolution, and cherish no hope of ever learning anything about it. . . . We have known several monkeys in our day and not one ever gave evidence of losing its tail and joining the pants wearing tribe known as the genus homo."[33]

Support for Bryan and opposition to evolution also came from Central Texas. The Austin Statesman, while condemning Darrow, praising Bryan, contended that by trying to explain creation and development science was interfering the realm of religion.[34] The Dallas Morning News believed that while

---

[31]Tyler Daily Courier-Times, 4 July 1925, p. 2; 15 July 1925, p. 2.

[32]Ibid., 24 March 1925, p. 2; 26 July 1925, p. 1; 29 July 1925, p. 2; 27 July 1925, p. 2.

[33]Cited in Tyler Daily Courier-Times, 4 July 1925, p. 2; Quoted in Ibid., 10 July 1925, p. 2.

[34]Austin Statesman, 20 June 1925, p. 4; 29 July 1925, p. 4; 6 March 1925, p. 4.

other species might have developed from lower forms, man had not. The Waco Times Herald declared that scientiests would never prove man's relation to other animals, and the Brownwood Bulletin expressed "unfailing belief in the Holy Bible."[35]

Although apparently most Texans supported Bryan's cause, some newspapers criticized him. Strongest opposition to his position came from west and south Texas. The El Paso Times probably expressed stronger opposition to fundamentalism than any other Texas newspaper. The Times declared that the anti-evolution laws denied young people the privilege of participating in scientific discoveries and violated the constitutional principle of separation of church and state.[36] When the Scopes trial started the Times bitterly opposed Bryan. A daily column satirized his activities at the trial describing his face as a "panorama of curdled egotism" and saying that he had been eulogized and pampered so long that he expected a "steamer basket full of fruits and flowers every time he jumps into the bath tub."[37] Anti-Bryan editorials appeared almost daily during the trial and continued even after his death, but the newspaper

---

[35]Cited in Tyler Daily Courier-Times, 4 July 1925, p. 2; 18 September 1925, p. 2.

[36]El Paso Times, 25 March 1925, p. 4.

[37]Ibid., 15 July 1925, p. 1.

certainly did not represent a united front against Bryan in El Paso as several local ministers expressed fundamentalist beliefs.

Other western newspapers were not as ardent in their opposition to Bryan as the El Paso Times, but the Lubbock Morning Avalanche also occasionally expressed similar sentiments, calling the jury that convicted Scopes "illiterate backwoodsmen;" however,when Bryan died the paper praised him highly.[38] Other West Texas newspapers, such as the Abilene Reporter supported Bryan from the first.[39]

South Texas newspapers also voiced some opposition to Bryan. The Corpus Christi Caller editorialized that any law prohibiting the explanation of a theory in the classroom was a violation of free speech and free thought. Also criticizing the anti-evolution laws, the San Antonio Express stated that excluding the teaching of evolution would cause Texas young people to grow up in ignorance of one of the greatest discoveries of all times. Referring to the Scopes trial as an anachronism belonging to the seventeenth rather than the twentieth century, the Express predicted that the Supreme Court would overturn the law involved.[40]

---

[38]Lubbock Morning Avalance, 23 July 1925, p. 4; 31 July 1925, p.4.

[39]Ibid., 9 July 1925, p. 4; 20 July 1925, p. 4; 21 July 1925, p. 4; 22 July 1925, p. 4; 25 July 1925, p. 4; 27 July 1925, p. 4; 21 August 1925, p. 4; 1 June 1925, p. 4; Abilene Reporter, 5 July 1925, p. 4; 12 July 1925, p. 6; 27 July 1925, p. 6.

[40]Corpus Christi Caller, 6 July 1925, p. 6; San Antonio Express, 23 July 1925, p. 12; 19 January 1923, p. 6.

Several possible reasons may explain why south and west Texas voiced opposition to Bryan. Those areas were more removed from the theologically conservative South than East Texas and were perhaps less traditional in outlook. In addition, these areas were further from Fort Worth and the ministry of J. Frank Norris. Since fundamentalism was primarily a Protestant movement the large Catholic population in south and west Texas remained essentially uninvolved.

Texas fundamentalists were not content merely to root for Bryan in the distant Tennessee proceedings in 1925; they were busy with agitation in their own state as well. At about the same time that Tennessee was passing its famous law, Texas legislators were considering a similar measure. On February 5, Representative James W. Harper, from Mount Pleasant, introduced House Bill Number 378, which forbade any public school, college, or university to teach any phase of evolution, either Darwinian or theistic. Unlike the 1923 bill this one contained provisions for punishment of violators. Any instructor who taught the theory was to lose his position immediately. Rather interesting provisions were made for identifying evolutionists. Any two people in a community who had evidence of the crime could make a written complaint to the school board, which had to investigate the charge within five days. If an individual

were found guilty and discharged officials could fine him from fifty to five hundred dollars.[41]

The bill was referred to the Committee on Education, which reported it favorably on February 16. On March 17 a motion to take the bill up lost, and the measure never passed the House.[42] While the legislature was considering the 1925 bill, scattered opposition to it arose. The El Paso Times editorialized that the controversy had set groups to spying on Texas teachers, making them "more opinionless automatons than they already are." The El Paso paper contended that Texas teachers already had less freedom than any other group and had to work in constant fear. Believing that the bill hurt the state's reputation in the nation, the Times editorialized that the law was unneccessary because public opinion opposed the study of evolution so strongly that the schools did not teach it anyway.[43]

Agitation for other fundamentalist measures also developed in 1925 as bills to put Bibles in the schools and take atheists out were again considered. Compulsory Bible reading received considerable support as newspapers like the Austin Statesman, and the Dallas Morning News

---

[41]Texas, Legislature, House, H. B. 378, "A Bill to be Entitled an act prohibiting the teaching of evolution in any of its phases . . .," typed copy, Legislative Library, Austin, Texas.

[42]Texas Legislature, House Journal, 39 Leg. reg sess., 1925, p. 386, 682, 1726, 1787.

[43]El Paso Times, 8 February 1925, p. 4.

editorialized for it. The Statesman wanted the Bible used in teaching such subjects as history, literature, civics, mathematics, and psychology. Various government officials such as Judge F. F. Looney, an associate justice of the Court of Civil Appeals, also supported reading and studying the Bible in public schools.[44] A bill was introduced in the House to require Bible reading, but the Education Committee postponed consideration of the question.[45] The Legislature never passed an act making Bible study mandatory, although it was a fairly common practice in Texas. A survey of five hundred and forty-seven schools taken in 1927 indicated that two hundred and fifty-nine had formal Bible reading; however, three hundred and seventy felt that the state legislature should not require it. Local school boards frequently adopted a policy of requiring Bible reading exercises, and sometimes individual teachers followed this practice voluntarily.[46]

Another fundamentalist-inspired piece of legislation was a bill to force teachers, professors, instructors, superintendents, and other school officials to take an oath

---

[44]Austin Statesman, 17 September 1925, p. 4; Dallas Morning News, 11 July 1925, p. 4; 9 July 1925, p. 4.

[45]Dallas Morning News, 21 June 1925, p. 4.

[46]Texas Outlook, April 1927, p. 46; Minutes of the Austin Bible Society, 15 March 1925.

asserting their belief in a supreme being. Representatives Harper and Robinson introduced the bill in February 1925, but it too failed to pass, although it had considerable support.[47] The Austin Statesman argued that the bill was constitutional since the Bill of Rights was worded in a way that excluded atheists from public office. The Statesman contended that the main objective of the bill would be to place on record "an official condemnation of an opinion few persons hold," its major purposes being to prove the religious nature of the Texas government and Texas schools, since few atheists taught in these institutions anyway.[48] Local pressures undoubtedly guarded well against atheists and agnostics training young minds so that state action was not really necessary.

Although Texans might be fairly certain of the orthodoxy of their teachers in public schools, they knew that the text books used were not always sound. Since Texas teachers failed to oppose the anti-evolution laws apparently few of them accepted or taught evolution anyway, thus textbooks provided almost the only means for Texas young people to become acquainted with the doctrine. Censorship of these books seemed essential to fundamentalists; in fact probably more necessary than anti-evolution laws. In 1925 fundamentalists

---

[47] House Journal, 39th Leg., reg. sess. p. 704.

[48] Austin Statesman, 21 February 1925, p. 4.

won their most important secular victory when the Texas text book committee agreed to expunge from the public school textbooks discussions of the theory of evolution.

The action concerning textbooks was tied directly to the religious controversy that had been raging in the state throughout the decade. For several years various individuals, organizations, and church groups had criticized the books in use by the public schools and had brought pressure for adoption of books that supported the Genesis account of creation. One of the largest and most influential groups expressing such concern was the Baptist state convention. In 1922 the convention formed a committee to investigate texts used in public schools. Governor Pat Neff, a good fundamentalist Baptist, assured the committee that the state would select sound books. Although the committee warned that since the majority of the state's taxpayers were Christians the state was obligated to insure that books did not contradict their faith, it concluded that the state textbook committee chose the best books available.[49] By 1924, however, the Baptists had become greatly alarmed as a result of their investigation of textbooks, having found all science books to be based on the theory of evolution.[50] The Norris faction of the Baptist denomination had

---

[49] Texas Baptist Annual, 1922, pp. 85-86.

[50] Ibid., 1924, p. 164.

also been concerned about the nature of textbooks used, and when the textbook committee acted in 1925 Norris took credit for having influenced them. Concern of Methodist spokesmen and other church leaders also undoubtedly helped prompt the action of the state committee.[51]

The committee that responded to fundamentalists agitation consisted largely of Texas educators. It was chaired by the governor, Miriam Ferguson, while the state superintendent of schools, S. M. N. Marrs, served as secretary. Members of the committee were Ida Mae Murray, a University of Texas graduate and a San Antonio public school teacher; F. M. Black, supervisor of Houston public schools; A. W. Bridwell, president of Nacogdoches State Teachers College; T. J. Yoe, Brownsville school superintendent; R. L. Paschall, a Fort Worth high school principal, and F. W. Chudej, who had five years teaching experience in grades below the high school level. The law establishing the committee required that one member be from outside the field of education. Appointment of H. S. Wroe, a businessman, fulfilled that requirement.[52]

Having decided on the ban of evolution, the committee proceeded to a thorough cleansing of the state's books.

---

[51]The Fundamentalist, 16 July 1926, p. 11; The Texas Christian Advocate, 8 June 1922, p. 11; Christian Courier, 18 February 1925, p. 1-2.

[52]Graham Leader, 9 July 1925, p. 10.

The committee rejected as completely unsuitable the book New Essentials of Biology,which had figured in the Scopes trial. In other books the committee ordered extensive changes and refused to make contracts until publishers made the desired changes. The committee required the most extensive changes in Truman J. Moon's Biology for Beginners, published by Henry Holt and Company. Three chapters, titled "Development of Man," "The Method of Evolution," and "The Development of Civilized Man," all dealing with some phase of evolution, had to be omitted in the Texas edition. The committee objected to such statements in the book as "with an egotism which is entirely unwarranted, we are accustomed to speak of 'man and animals' whereas we ought to say 'man and other animals,' for certainly man is an animal."[53] The same book made the heretical claim that man was related to all living organism and that man, plants and animals "acutally descended from common ancestors." Deleted also was the statement that man's ancestors once walked on all fours.[54]

The committee even excised the statements that attempted to reconcile science and religion. In the text, Moon pointed out that evolution did not teach that man descended from

---

[53]Dallas Morning News, 16 October 1925, p. 10.

[54]"No Evolution for Texas," The Literary Digest 90 (14 August 1926): 30-31.

monkey nor did it teach that "God can be left out of the scheme of creation," Instead he concluded that God was still at work improving the world and all living things in it through evolution and informed his readers: "Rest assured that in the minds of the greatest scientists there is no confusion between science and religion;" however, the committee, unconvinced that evolution and religion could harmonize, omitted these statements also.[55]

The extent of the committee's determination to uphold the literal Biblical account of creation is indicated by their omission of the chapter on the development of civilized man. That chapter described man's development from stone age hunter to herdsman to farmer and told how man gradually settled down to establish permanent homes and communities. Fundamentalists would not concede that man had ever lived in an uncivilized state, insisting that Adam was the first civilized man, and hence, they could not tolerate Moon's interpretation.[56]

Although Moon's book received the greatest revision, similar changes were made in other books. For example, Macmillian Company was ordered to change the wording of Jesse Feiren Williams' Healthful Living; the sentence: "Evolution is a slow and gradual process and the skeleton

---

[55]Ibid., p. 31.

[56]Dallas Morning News, 16 October 1925, p. 10.

of man is the result of centuries of development," was altered to read, "The skeleton of the higher forms of animals represents many centuries of development." Benjamin Charles Gruneberg's Biology and Human Life, published by Ginn and Company, also contained objectionable statements. In the phrase, "some curious but useless relics" the word "relics" was changed to "structures." the committee omitted the words "at last" before "four-chambered heart," which they felt implied evolution of the heart. They also deleted the sentence, "Mutations give rise to new species." In all books the word "evolution" was changed to "development."[57] The suggestion was made to strike the word evolution from dictionaries, but the group concluded that dictionaries were not actually text books.[58] Authors and publishers faced a serious challenge from the textbook committee; if they refused to make the alterations they would lose the Texas market; therefore, they adjusted to the situation and prepared special editions for Texas school children.

Across the state little opposition to the committee's action arose. As one Dallas magazine editor observed,

> Not one teacher, not one politician, not one office holder in Texas raised his voice against this infamous act of a set of common politicians. Lacking organization, we remained quietly in our offices or in our homes and allowed the fanatics to capture the public schools. We are a helpless disorganized

---

[57]"No Evolution for Texas," p. 31.

[58]Shipley, War on Science, p. 172.

> army, and as long as we continue to drag along, as we have, we shall be defeated in every contest.[59]

A fundamentalist stand was, as it turned out, a popular position in Texas. Governor Miriam Ferguson said of the committee's action, "I am a Christian mother who believes Jesus Christ died to save humanity, and I am not going to let that kind of rot go into Texas textbooks." Her successor, Dan Moody,was equally as adamant concerning the fundamentals. He contended, "I believe in the Bible from cover to cover. I believe that God created man in His own image and likeness, that the whale swallowed Jonah, and that the children of Isarael passed through the Red Sea on dry land."[60]

Educators and teachers showed no more disposition to oppose the committee's action than the politicians. The superintendent of San Antonio schools supported the action, declaring, "The old-time religion is good enough for me."[61] The Texas Outlook, the official publication of the state teachers' association, printed a few vague editorials supporting academic freedom in the classroom, but failed to take a forceful stand.[62] Certainly the lack of opposition

---

[59]Quoted ibid., p. 174.

[60]Maynard Shipley, "The Forward March of the Anti-Evolution Movement," Current History 29(January 1929): 578; "No Evolution for Texas," p. 30.

[61]Shipley, War on Science, p. 174.

[62]E. C. Barker, "Plea for Intellectual Independence in Texas," Texas Outlook, July 1925, p. 7; Charles McKenny, "Education--Human Progress," Ibid., January 1925, p. 9.

was one of the major reasons for fundamentalism's success in controlling the state's text books.

In addition to the secular agitation of 1925, fundamentalists continued their efforts to control the Protestant denominations. Conflict among the Methodists reached its peak during that year, as conservatives in the denomination sought to rid it of any whose ideas were too liberal. In the spring of 1925, Mims Thornburgh Workman, an instructor of Bible at Southern Methodist University, who had been criticized in the widely publicized "trial" of modernists held in Norris' church in 1923, again came under attack. The basis of the criticism in 1925 was a speech in which Workman criticized the strong-arm revivalist tactics of the church. Conservatives promptly accused him of being a modernist, denying regeneration of the soul, and doubting the Virgin Birth. He was threatened with dismissal, but instead the President of Southern Methodist University, Charles Selecman, asked Workman to take a leave of absence.[63]

When Workman told his students about his problems with the administration,they issued a statement in his behalf, testifying that he had been a great Christian influence on their lives. In addition students appointed a committee to appear before the board of trustees, and some

---

[63]Dallas Morning News, 7 May 1925, p. 1; George M. Gibson, Jr., "An Inquisition in the South, The Churchman 132(11 July 1925): 13.

seniors even threatened to refuse their diplomas if Workman was dismissed.[64] In spite of this enthusiastic defense, perhaps in part because of it, the Board of Trustees promptly dismissed Workman, issuing a statement that cited the professor's criticism of the administration in the classroom as the reason for dismissal. The board defended freedom of thought and academic freedom, but concluded that it was improper and unfair for a teacher to arouse students against an administration; thus, the board concluded, his friends had "followed a course in his defense which closes the door of usefulness to him in this institution."[65] In the version of the controversy made public, care was taken to deny its connection with the fundamentalist controversy, but apparently tension had existed between Selecman and Workman for several years and Selecman seemed to fear that Workman's liberal teachings would reflect badly upon him and the university. Workman's dismissal angered both faculty and students. One faculty member resigned in protest while two others asked for leaves of absence hoping for a change in administration.[66]

The Workman controversy did not end fundamentalist agitation among Texas Methodists. By the fall of 1925, the

---

[64]Gibson, "Inquisition in the South," p. 13.

[65]Texas Christian Advocate, 11 July 1925, p. 8.

[66]Gibson, "Inquisition in the South," p. 13; Vernon, Methodism Moves Across North Texas, p. 284.

Scopes trial had brought about such widespread discussion of evolution and modernism in general that tensions ran high when the Methodist conferences began meeting. In the West Texas Conference, the Austin district recommended a young man named Thomas Gibbs for ordination as a minister, but his case led to extensive discussion and argument because of his apparently unorthodox beliefs, especially when he was unable to answer to the committee's satisfaction questions about the Apostles' creed. Most unsettling to the conference delegates was the discovery that Gibbs had apparently acquired his heretical beliefs at Southern Methodist and Southwestern universities.[67] In response to Gibbs' revelations and to the persistent rumors of unorthodox teachings in Methodist schools, the conference passed a resolution asking Bishop James Dickey to appoint a committee of five members "to thoroughly investigate these institutions, examining the teachers as to their personal belief, methods of teaching and text books used, and to make full report back to this Conference at its session in 1926." The resolution empowered the committee to demand action from the boards of trustees of the schools in question.[68] In the

---

[67] Journal of the Sixty-Seventh Annual Session of the West Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at San Antonio, Texas, October 28-November 1, 1925 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 86-67; Dallas Morning News, 2 November 1925, p. 8; 1 November 1925, p. 1.

[68] Journal of the West Texas Conference, 1925, p. 87.

discussion of Gibbs' appointment and of possible modernism in the schools one delegate said that he would rather his son be dead than in doubt about the fundamentals of the faith. Bishop Dickey made it clear where his sympathies lay by preaching to the conference an orthodox sermon upholding the divinity of Christ and the Virgin Birth.[69]

Other Methodist conferences were also disturbed by the situation in their schools and anxious to enforce orthodoxy. The Northwest Texas Conference took definite steps to control teachers by passing a resolution requiring teachers to sign a statement that

> There is no teacher in our school within my knowledge who believes or teaches that man had his origin in a lower form of animal life. All the teachers of our institution . . . believe without mental reservation, equivocation or without interpretation other than that of the accepted standard of the Methodist Church in the inspiration of both Old and New Testaments and in every statement in the Apostle's Creed.

This resolution, designated Rule 9, became a standing rule, and the conference required that the president of an institution, the dean of each department, all science, sociology, and Bible teachers sign the statement before appropriations to the school would be made.[70] The Central Conference

---

[69] Dallas Morning News, 1 November 1925, p. 16; 2 November 1925, p. 8.

[70] Journal of the Sixteenth Annual Session of the Northwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Canyon, Texas, November 11-15, 1925 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 35-36; Texas Christian Advocate, 18 March 1926, p. 6.

also discussed the situation in the schools, but under the direction of Moore the conference merely confirmed its faith in Methodist schools.[71] 1925 was the year in which fundamentalists enjoyed their greatest success among Texas Methodists.

While the Methodists argued and investigated, Norris kept controversy raging among Texas Baptists. The Fort Worth minister continued to send messengers to both the Tarrant County Association and the Texas Baptist Convention only to have them turned down. In 1925 his church sent a messenger to the Tarrant County Baptist meeting whose appointment was calculated to embarrass the association. The messenger, J. T. Pemberton,was a well respected citizen, president of a Fort Worth Bank, and a trustee of the Seminary and the Baptist hospital. In spite of his influence and position, the association refused to seat him by a vote of 212 to 45 and the state convention also rejected him.[72]

When the Baptist associations refused him fellowship, Norris' attacks, far from being abated, became more bitter and more personal. For example, in 1925 he accused F. S.

---

[71] Journal of the Sixtieth Annual Session of the Central Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Waxahachie, Texas, November 18-22, 1925 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 30.

[72] Fort Worth Press, 9 September 1925, p. 1; 11 September 1925, p. 12, in Scarborough Papers; Scarborough to W. R. Hornburg, 12 September 1925, Scarborough Papers; The Fundamentalist, 11 December 1925, pp. 1-4.

Groner, Secretary of Texas Baptist State Mission Board, of granting Baptist printing contracts to a company he owned, of buying a car with state mission funds, and of employing members of his family in his office. According to Norris, Scarborough had used his position in the Seminary to make a handsome profit on a real estate deal.[73] He also began a tormenting practice, which he would follow for many years to come, of conducting a tent meeting in the same town while the state convention was in progress. In 1925, he announced that he would speak at the same time that George Truett was scheduled to deliver an address to the convention, causing Truett to cancel his speech.[74] For some reason, Norris was especially bitter toward Truett, probably because he was one of the most respected and best loved ministers of the South. Norris seemed to delight in making Truett look ridiculous, calling him the "Holy Father." Norris resorted to such cruel tactics as sending disturbing telegrams which would arrive just minutes before Truett was scheduled to speak. Truett tried to ignore Norris, refusing even to speak his name, and the letters and telegrams that tormented the Dallas pastor have been removed from the Truett Papers.[75]

---

[73]The Fundamentalist, 9 October 1925, p. 1; 13 November 1925, p. 1; W. h. Horton to Scarborough, 18 November 1925, Scarborough Papers.

[74]The Fundamentalist, 11 December 1925, p. 1, 5.

[75]Leon McBeth, The First Baptist Church of Dallas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1968), p. 190.

Outside the Baptist Association, Norris strengthened his ties with fundamentalist organizations. He encouraged the efforts of the Baptist Bible Union to disrupt the Southern Baptist Convention and invited leaders of the national movement to speak in Fort Worth and to write for his newspaper.[76] In addition he constantly acquired more allies within the state. Dale Crowley,by 1925 firmly aligned with the Norris faction, sought readmittance to Baylor. Although the Board of Trustees granted him a hearing, they refused to reinstate him, and Crowley, with Norris' aid, announced that he would bring the case up at the next Baptist convention.[77] A. Reilly Copeland also claimed to be fighting the machine with Norris. When his fight in Waco had resulted in his conviction for libel, he blamed a conspiracy of gamblers, bootleggers, and evolutionists for his persecution.[78] In 1925 Norris installed his own radio station, enabling him to reach an even larger audience,[79] thus paving the way for a permanent breach in Baptist ranks.

Although Norris was officially excluded from the Texas Baptist Association, many of his supporters remained in it,

---

[76]The Fundamentalist, 26 June 1925, p. 1; 30 January 1925; 1 May 1925, p. 1.

[77]Ibid., 1 May 1925, p. 1; 4 December 1925, p. 1.

[78]Copeland, "The Inside Story," The Fundamentalist, 9 January 1925, p. 1; 16 January 1925, p. 1.

[79]The Fundamentalist, 19 June 1925, p. 1; 26 June 1925, p. 1; 11 December 1925, p. 1.

and hence were able to keep the denomination in a constant state of turmoil. Scarborough reported difficulty with some of the seminary students, while Norris accused him of exerting pressure on students to keep them from attending the First Baptist church. Although Scarborough denied pressuring students, he did admit that he warned those who sympathized with Norris that they would "go into the ditch" if they followed him.[80] A number of churches reported divisions in their congregations over the Norris issue. Some pastors, reportedly influenced by the Searchlight, held late night meetings and even refused to resign when asked to do so.[81] Some indicated that they would give nothing to Baptist causes as long as evolution was being taught, and the financial situation continued to worsen, with Scarborough claiming that he had to borrow money monthly to run the Seminary.[82] Baptist leaders continued to attack Norris openly in the pages of the Standard and in specially printed tracts, but even this policy caused

---

[80]Scarborough to W. A. Hobson, 13 October 1925, Scarborough Papers.

[81]J. D. Hughes to Scarborough, 8 June 1925; Amy Glenn to Scarborough, 30 July 1925, Scarborough Papers; The Fundamentalist, 1 January 1926, p. 1.

[82]James Holliday to Scarborough, 4 November 1925; J. W. Billon to Scarborough, 20 October 1925; Scarborough to E. Godbold, 8 October 1925, Scarborough Papers; John T. Boland to Truett, 27 March 1926, Truett Papers; The Fundamentalist, 22 May 1925, p. 1.

divisions within the denomination as some wanted to ignore him, others to condemn him, while still others agreed with him.[83]

By 1925 the Southern Baptist denomination as a whole could no longer conceal the division caused by the fundamentalist antagonists. Efforts to oust Norris from the Southern Baptist Convention failed; while he had considerable support in that body, it also contained some fairly liberal spokesmen. The Southern Baptist Education Association set the stage for controversy when it met in February 1925 and took the stand that teachers in Baptist schools should be free to explore, research, and teach without restrictions, and that they sould not be disturbed by either fundamentalism or modernism. This statement infuriated Norris and other fundamentalists, notably C. P. Stealey, editor of the Oklahoma Baptist Messenger, who argued that it left the way open for Baptist students to study evolution and other heresies.[84]

By May 1925, when the Southern Baptist Convention met in Memphis, fundamentalists were demanding a definite stand against evolution and on other issues from the convention.[85]

---

[83]Groner to Brooks, 7 October 1925, Brooks Papers; Godbold to Scarborough, 13 October 1925, Edgar Hurst to Scarborough, 14 November 1925; Carl Stephen to W. A. Hobson, 13 October 1925, Scarborough Papers.

[84]Bailey, Southern White Protestantism, pp. 65-66; The Fundamentalist, 1 May 1925, pp. 1-4.

[85]The Fundamentalist, 6 March 1925, p. 1; 20 March 1925, p. 1; 1 May 1925, p. 1-4; 8 May 1925, p. 1; 15 May 1925, p. 1-4.

Tell the world exactly where Southern Baptists stand on the fundamentals of the faith by adopting a creedal statement, was their cry. Moderates in the denomination, like Edgar Mullins, and liberals, like William Poteat, opposed the adoption of a definite creedal stand, but clearly the convention had to take some action; hopefully a statement would be drawn up that would satisfy all Southern Baptists. The confession of faith ultimately proposed by a special committee stated that man was the direct creation of God. Fundamentalists in the convention led by C. P. Stealey tried to amend the statement by adding "and not by evolution," but the moderates and liberals blocked their attempt. Instead, liberals and moderates appended a statement to the confession declaring that evolution was "a working hypothesis of science" but urging that science and theology should not conflict.[86]

Satisfying all Baptists at this juncture was not possible. Norris and other fundamentalists were disappointed that the convention hedged the issue of evolution instead of calling it by name and condemning it outright. They interpreted the convention's actions as a deception of the Baptist faith and immediately began attacking the statement of faith and demanding its revision. The fundamentalist would apparently

---

[86]El Paso Times, 17 May 1925, p. 6; The Fundamentalist, 29 May 1925, pp. 1, 3, 4.

be satisfied with nothing less than complete victory in the Southern Baptist Convention.[87]

---

[87]Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controvery, p. 123; The Fundamentalist, 29 May 1925, p. 1, 3, 4; 19 June 1925; 3 July 1925, p. 1; 10 July 1925, p. 5.

CHAPTER VI

TEXAS FUNDAMENTALISM AS A SEPARATIST MOVEMENT

During the last half of the decade fundamentalists continued to exercise important controls in Texas. Although the controversy seemed to subside nationwide modernists had won few strongholds in the Lone Star State. In the late 1920's and early 1930's fundamentalists began to take a new course by withdrawing into factions and creating organizations of their own. During that time Norris made his most significant attempts to actually split the Southern Baptist denomination. Until then he ostensibly tried to win the lost Baptists back to the fundamentals, but after 1925 he apparently realized that reconciliation was impossible and looked instead toward an open break which would create a group he could control.

First he had to complete the task he had worked on so hard throughout the decade--discrediting the Baptist leadership in Texas. By compromising with liberals and moderates in the 1925 Southern Baptist Convention, Texas leaders had opened the way for a new attack, and they realized the need to prove their orthodoxy on the homefront. Delegates to the state convention in the fall of 1925 again witnessed declarations of orthodoxy. J. B. Tidwell, professor of Bible at Baylor University, delivered one of the

most convincing orthodox statements, demanding acceptance of the Genesis account of creation. Since no one could deny the orthodoxy of Tidwell's position, Scarborough contacted Brooks suggesting that he might improve his and Baylor's reputation by writing an introduction to Tidwell's paper and issuing it in pamphlet form.[1] Brooks complied, but as in so many other incidents, his efforts backfired. In an effort to endorse the paper, he used some unfortunate terminology, saying, "I am in hearty agreement with the principles set forth and defined in this production, notwithstanding I would have reached the same conclusions expressed in different language."[2]

Norris again accused Brooks of evading and dodging the issue by casting reflections on Tidwell's language. He and many other Baptists insisted that Brooks should have endorsed the paper just as it stood; Texas Baptists apparently liked Tidwell's language without qualification.[3] Instead of helping the situation the controversy over the Tidwell paper actually did harm. Norris reported one Baptist as saying

> Brooks' straddling 'endorsement' of Tidwell's paper has put us in a worse fix than if he had said nothing. To reject the language of Tidwell's paper as Brooks did has only clouded the issue and given Norris another cudgel to whale the life out of us with. Why

---

[1]Scarborough to Brooks, 23 December 1925, Brooks Papers.

[2]The Fundamentalist, 5 February 1926, p. 8.

[3]Ibid., 12 February 1926, p. 1; 22 January 1926, p. 1.

> on earth Brooks cannot come out and express himself clearly is a question on the vast majority of the lips of our people.[4]

Brooks was pressured to demand that his entire faculty sign the Tidwell paper as a creedal statement, but the president refused, claiming that such was never the purpose of the paper.[5]

A controversy more serious and divisive than that surrounding the Tidwell paper concerned the Southern Baptist statement of faith adopted in 1925. As the 1926 convention approached, Norris and other fundamentalists demanded that Southern Baptists rectify their previous year's mistake and denounce evolution outright. Many Baptist leaders, on the other hand, felt that this issue needed to be discussed no further and that the previous statement was clear enough.[6] Scarborough argued that the convention should be concerned with kingdom building rather than creed making, but Norris answered that the Baptists could not successfully build the kingdom without a satisfactory creed.[7] Fundamentalists objected especially to the statement which identified evolution as a working hypothesis while rejecting it as fact. The fundamentalists did not want it presented as either fact or theory, and they wanted Southern Baptists to declare that

---

[4]Ibid., 12 March 1926, p. 1.

[5]Brooks to J. C. Newman, 11 January 1926, Brooks Papers.

[6]The Fundamentalist, 9 April 1926, pp. 1-3, 7, 14, 18, 19; 7 May 1926, p. 2.

[7]Ibid., 16 April 1926, p. 1.

it could never be proved true. As it stood, the Southern Baptist creed might allow fellowship with evolutionists, while fundamentalists wanted all evolutionists excluded from the denomination.[8]

In April, 1926, fundamentalists announced their specific plans for the Southern Baptist convention which was to meet in May. Selsus E. Tull planned to propose an extremely fundamentalist resolution vowing Southern Baptist support of the literal Biblical account of creation and repudiating as "un-scriptural and scientifically false" all claims of evolution.[9] Norris was jubilant. He hoped that Tull's resolution would open the way for discussion of similar issues, such as modernism in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and heresy in the foreign mission field, and that it would be the beginning of a tremendous clean-up campaign of all southern denominational schools. He hoped for a similar resolution from every state convention and every church. The proposed resolution, Norris seemed to feel, had the Baptist leadership cornered. He took great pleasure in pointing out that nothing they could do would save them. If they accepted the resolution they would be admitting last year's error, while if they rejected it, they would infuriate the common people all over again and get themselves in even

---

[8]Ibid., 9 April 1926, p. 10.

[9]Ibid., 23 April 1926, p. 1.

deeper economic trouble.[10] Under Norris' leadership the Blue Grass Baptist Ministers' Association of Texas formally condemned Mullins and the Southern Baptist Seminary, which they claimed had failed to uphold true Baptist beliefs.[11]

Since the 1926 convention was scheduled to meet in Houston, Texas, Norris made amibtious plans to put on a sensational show and to help the fundamentalists capture the convention. He promised to erect a great tent just three blocks from the convention site and to perform "a major operation" on ten of the leading Baptists the night before the convention opened, giving names and presenting papers, records, and documents. Again he asserted that machine politics ran the denomination. In the previous year's convention the leaders had ignored the wishes of the people and railroaded through a statement that most Southern Baptists did not approve, he declared, but in 1926 the people would rise and make their wishes well known. He warned that it would be no easy task because the "machine" leaders planned to apply the "gag rule" and refuse to discuss evolution. Norris assured his followers that adoption of Tull's resolution would be a repudiation of leaders like Mullins, Scarborough, and Truett and an endorsement of The

---

[10]Ibid., 23 April 1926, p. 1, 2, 6; 7 May 1926, p. 1.

[11]Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, p. 123.

Searchlight's policies. He promised that if the resolution passed it would be applied to many specific situations in Texas.[12]

When the convention met in Houston, Norris erected his tent and scathing attacks issued from it.[13] Southern Baptist leaders realized that they had to react but still hoped to avoid lengthy discussion of the evolution issue to keep it from dividing the convention. In his opening address, the president of the convention, George McDaniel, made the statement, "I am happy to believe that this convention accepts Genesis as teaching that man was the special creation by God and rejects every theory, evolution or otherwise, which teaches that man originated . . of lower animal ancestry."[14] In a move that gave credence to Norris' accusations of machine control, M. E. Dodd made the motion that this statement become the official stand of the convention and that the issue receive no further discussion. It seemed as though fundamentalists' efforts had been thwarted and the issue neatly taken care of early in the convention; however, the forces of fundamentalism were not to be handled so easily. Tull moved that in order to insure the orthodoxy of the entire denomination all employees of all Baptist boards and institutions

---

[12]The Fundamentalist, 7 May 1926, p. 1; 30 April 1926, p. 1; 9 April 1926, p. 3.

[13]Ibid., 21 May 1926, pp. 3, 7-9, 13-16.

[14]Ibid., p. 1.

be required to endorse the McDaniel statement. Apparently these two resolutions, adopted by the convention, were strong enough statements of doctrine to satisfy most Southern Baptists. Norris immediately announced a great victory for fundamentalism, calling the McDaniel statement a great repudiation of Baptist leadership and declaring "open season for gunning individual evolutionists."[15]

Norris apparently intended greatly to enjoy applying these resolutions in Texas, and instead of alleviating the state Baptists' problems these two unequivocal statements only intensified them. Immediately Norris and other fundamentalists demanded that Brooks and his faculty sign the McDaniel pledge, contending that failure to do so would prove Brooks' sympathy with evolution.[16] Brooks was by now more than a little disgusted with the constant demands that he prove his orthodoxy and sign creedal statements; it seemed to him that almost every Baptist in Texas knew exactly what he ought to say as well as how he should say it, and they did not hesitate to tell him. Brooks voted against the Tull resolution "in a loud voice," although he

---

[15]Ibid.; Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, p. 124; The Fundamentalist, 14 May 1926, p. 1.

[16]W. A. Bowen to Brooks, 31 January 1927; Scarborough to Brooks, 9 September 1927, Scarborough Papers; A. Reilly Copeland , "How Satan Seeks to Confuse an Issue," tract in Copeland Papers; W. C. Hamilton to Brooks, 17 September 1927, Brooks Papers; The Fundamentalist, 4 March 1927, p. 1; 11 June 1926, p. 5; 25 June 1926, p. 1.

knew he would be attacked for his vote.[17] He refused to make still another avowal of his faith, saying he should be trusted or fired outright. He contended that since the Texas Baptists had adopted a creedal statement in 1924, and every new member of his faculty had been required to sign it, there was no need for still another statement. He argued that Baylor was owned by the Texas Baptist Association and not by the Southern Baptists, while Tull's resolution applied only to Southern Baptist institutions.[18] Although Brooks denied it, Norris accused the Baylor president of saying that he would die and rot in his grave before he would sign the McDaniel statement.[19]

The Texas Baptist Convention of 1926, after again refusing to seat Norris' messengers, agreed that Brooks was not required to sign the McDaniel statement and asserted its faith in his orthodoxy.[20] Fundamentalists pressure on Brooks continued through 1927, and when the state convention met at Wichita Falls in 1927 Norris held his own meeting during the convention. The 1927 convention passed "A

---

[17]Brooks to W. L. Poteat, 17 February 1927, Brooks Papers.

[18]Brooks to J. C. Lee, 21 February 1927; Brooks to J. L. Ward, 20 June 1927, Brooks Papers.

[19]Brooks to H. F. Aulick 27 July 1926, Brooks Papers.

[20]Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, Held at San Antonio, Texas, November 17-21, 1926, Containing the Proceedings of the 78th Session (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 153-154.

Statement and A Resolution" written by Scarborough and R. E. Bell, reaffirming faith in the orthodoxy of Brooks and his faculty. The statement pointed out that every year, sometimes twice a year, Brooks had either voted for or signed anti-evolution statements or avowals of his orthodoxy. His faculty had signed a declaration of their faith in 1924, and every new faculty member had been required to sign this declaration. The Waco Baptist Association,which was close enough to the institution to know conditions there, had recently given Brooks and Baylor a vote of complete confidence, contending that no one connected with Baylor believed in evolution. Thus the convention concluded that Brooks need not again be required to prove his orthodoxy by endorsing the McDaniel statement.[21]

In addition the state convention ruled that the Tull resolution only required institutions owned and controlled by the Southern Baptist convention to endorse the McDaniel statement. Their statement did, however, assert that every one at the state convention accepted the statement. Texas Baptists gave a vote of appreciation and loyalty to all Baptists schools and

---

[21]The Fundamentalist, 11 November 1927, p. 1; Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, Held at Wichita Falls, Texas, November 16-20, 1927, Containing the Proceedings of the 79th Annual Session (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 22-29.

> put the stamp of our disapproval upon this baseless, malicious and conscienceless warfare against our leaders in missions, in education, in hospitals, and those in other lines of work, and against the causes dearer than our lives; and that we hereby pledge ourselves to defend these leaders and causes against misrepresentation, false accusation and sensational persecution until this propaganda of conscienceless accusation and false misrepresentations had been swept out of the hearts of our people.[22]

After this convention Norris claimed that Brooks had again admitted his error and that he had endorsed the McDaniel resolution, and of course, Norris took credit for having forced him to "get right."[23]

Brooks was not the only Texas Baptist leader to suffer embarrassment over the McDaniel and Tull resolutions; Scarborough, president of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, also had problems. Soon after the 1926 convention which required endorsement of the McDaniel statement, the faculty of Southwestern illustrated their support of the resolution, by a standing vote of approval in a faculty meeting, but this was not enough to satisfy fundamentalists who insisted upon endorsement by signature. In the fall of 1927, under pressure from the Oklahoma fundamentalist editor, C. P. Stealey, the Oklahoma Baptist Association passed a resolution proposed by C. C. Morris, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Ada, Oklahoma, requiring all faculty members of Baptist institutions to sign a statement endorsing the

---

[22]Texas Baptist Annual, 1927, pp. 22-29.

[23]The Fundamentalist, 25 November 1927, p. 1.

McDaniel resolution in order to receive funds from the Oklahoma Association. Scarborough and the seminary faculty refused to sign, indicating that they too were becoming tired of repeatedly swearing to their orthodoxy. In fact, the faculty signed a statement rejecting funds granted under the Morris Resolution and Scarborough returned money to the Oklahoma Baptists.[24]

Explaining that his faculty was thoroughly orthodox, Scarborough declared he would not tolerate evolution or modernism for one minute in the Seminary. He noted that the faculty had unanimously endorsed the McDaniel statement by standing vote, which was all that the Tull Resolution required. Offering as a conciliatory gesture to have the faculty sign and send the minutes of that faculty meeting to the Oklahoma Association, he warned that he would not insist on further endorsement in order to receive money. Using threat of economic penalty to enforce orthodoxy was, according to Scarborough, a violation of important Baptist principles, his faculty would not even sign the ten commandments under such conditions, he averred. Agreeing that Oklahoma Baptists had a right to demand orthodoxy from the schools, Scarborough insisted that before they withheld

---

[24]Ibid., 11 November 1927, p. 1; The Baptist Messenger, 21 September 1927, p. 2, in Scarborough Papers; Scarborough to J. B. Rounds, 3 April 1928; Scarborough to C. C. Morris, 3 April 1928; Scarborough to J. D. Brunner, 3 April 1928, Scarborough Papers.

support and funds, they should investigate the schools to determine their soundness. Scarborough urged Morris to revise the restrictions, pointing out that his tactics were similar to Roman Catholicism's enforcement of creeds by penalty. Although the Seminary was in serious economic trouble when Scarborough returned the money, ultimately a compromise was worked out and Oklahoma began contributing again.[25]

During the later 1920's Norris and the fundamentalist faction also continued attacking the colleges by singling out individual professors for abuse, seemingly with less justification since there were apparently few evolutionists left among Texas faculty members. Norris launched one of the most unfair attacks of the decade, which began in 1926 and reached its peak in 1927, against William P. Meroney, a Baptist minister who was orthodox and who actually opposed the evolutionary theory. In 1923 Meroney had written that Baylor teachers taught about evolution in much the same way that they taught about small pox and venereal disease.[26] In 1924, he announced his intention to write a textbook

---

[25]Scarborough to W. T. Conner, 3 April 1928; C. C. Morris to Scarborough, 5 April 1928, Scarborough to C. C. Morris, 6 April 1928, Scarborough to Former Students, 30 April 1928, Scarborough Papers.

[26]William P. Meroney to C. R. Wilson, 20 October 1923, William Penn Meroney Papers, Texas Collection, Baylor University Waco Texas.

although he predicted that it would not please Norris, and some of his friends thought he would be wiser not to publish.[27]

When Meroney finally published his book in 1926, it was not an original work but a collection of readings expressing a variety of viewpoints. Meroney, who had replaced Dow in the sociology department at Baylor, was careful to point out that he did not accept everything in the book. Norris, apparently determined that evolution and other heretical views were not even to be mentioned at Baylor, informed the Board of Trustees in August, 1927, that he found Meroney's book even more objectionable than Dow's.[28] In his newspaper, recently renamed The Fundamentalist, Norris published isolated statements from the readings, ascribing them to Meroney and pretending not to know any better. He objected primarily to a statement concerning man's bestial ancestry made by William Graham Sumner, but Norris printed the statement in a way that it appeared to be Meroney's. Other essays discussed the development of family life which meant, according to Norris, that Meroney doubted that Adam and Eve originated the family.[29] In

---

[27]Meroney to Jeff D. Ray, 25 September 1924, Meroney Papers.

[28]Norris to the Trustees of Baylor University, 16 August 1927, Norris Papers.

[29]The Fundamentalist, 29 July 1927, p. 1; 26 August 1927, pp. 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9; 9 September 1927, p. 6; 2 September 1927, p. 1; Meroney to R. E. Bell, 23 August 1927, Meroney Papers.

this controversy Norris' tactics appeared unfair if not actually dishonest, as he seemed more interested in discrediting Baylor than in saving it from evolution.

Meroney attempted to defend himself by pointing out that parts of the book under attack were not his work, claiming that in fact he explained to his classes the fallacies of many statements in the book. Meroney, however, could not obtain a fair hearing for his side of the story. The Texas denominational publication, the Baptist Standard, still edited by E. C. Routh, again seemed sympathetic at least with Norris' motives. When Meroney wrote an article explaining his position, Routh ommitted key parts of it and then followed with an editorial stating that Baylor should be cleansed of all traces of evolution. Meroney retaliated by preparing a paper bitterly attacking Routh for his misrepresentations and mailing it to influential Baptists.[30] Both Scarborough and Brooks defended Meroney, writing letters and delivering addresses in his behalf and criticizing Routh's editorial policy harshly. When Routh ultimately lost his position Norris charged that it was because he had dared to criticize evolution in Baylor.[31]

---

[30]Baptist Standard, 1 September 1927, p. 6. The Fundamentalist 9 September 1927, p. 1; W. P. Meroney, 'The Garbled Editor" typescript in Meroney Papers; Waco Times Herald, 13 October 1924, p. 1, in Caopeland Papers; Meroney to O. L. Smith, 20 October 1927, Meroney Papers.

[31]Brooks to E. C. Routh, 19 September 1927;Scarborough to Brooks, 13 September 1927; E. C. Routh to Brooks, 9 September 1927; Brooks to E. F. Lyon, 8 September 1927; Brooks to E. C. Routh, 5 September 1927; R. C. Bell to Routh, 7 September 1927; Brooks to C. F. Edwards, 30 August 1927, Brooks Papers: Norris, Inside History, p. 203.

Norris finally admitted that the essays in Meroney's book were not his work, but he still argued that by printing them Meroney had given his approval. Meroney should have used quotation marks more clearly, Norris argued, and he should have made his disagreement clearer. Norris contended that evolution should not be taught as either a fact or theory; claiming that it was taught only as theory was convenient subterfuge for evolutionists like Meroney.[32]

Norris found reasons other than lack of religious orthodoxy to condemn Baylor professors. Another attack from the Fort Worth Minister came in 1927 against J. W. Gormley, who taught medical jurisprudence part-time in Baylor's medical and dental schools. Norris wrote the Board of Trustees of Baylor that Gormley was a Roman Catholic, that he had been arrested in a gambling raid, that he drank heavily, and that he danced in road houses.[33] Brooks and other Baptist leaders attempted to defend Gormley, offering evidence that he was not presently a Catholic and had not been for twelve or fifteen years. Although in their defense of him the Baptist leaders revealed that Gormley

---

[32]The Fundamentalist, 23 September 1927, p. 1.

[33]Norris to the Board of Trustees, Baylor University, 12 October 1927, J. Frank Norris Papers, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

was not a member of any church, they testified to his personal character and integrity.[34]

Gormley resigned on September 19, 1927, interestingly enough not because of the attacks by Norris but because of the defenses the Baptist leaders were making in his behalf. While he felt he could ignore Norris, he refused to tolerate it when the Baptists stooped to Norris' level and dragged every phase of his life into the limelight. He wrote:

> I am under no obligation to remain the subject or object of a controversy which I have ever disapproved. . . . My resignation will remind [the trustees] that in this day and age a teacher does not sell his time and intellect to the trustees of a school for $20 per month and throw his soul and the privacy of his home into such petty bargain to hold it fast.

He further objected to religous tests for a professor, which he believed "immolates, not only his personal academic ambitions and asperations but also the code of academic freedom upon the altars of fanaticism."[35]

He also deeply resented the haste with which Brooks and others had denied that he was a Catholic, feeling that these denials could not help but cast a bad light on the Catholic church, the church of his fathers and of many of his friends. "Whatever my religious fortunes,--and it seems to be generously conceded by churchmen of all denominations

---

[34]Brooks to J. W. L. Hall, 30 August 1927, Brooks Papers; Lon R. Scarborough, "The Fruits of Norrisism," tract in Scarborough papers.

[35]J. W. Gormley to Brooks, 19 September 1927, Brooks Papers.

that I am as a wandering star to whom the storms of darkness are reserved forever--I would not and could not approve of public controversy tainted with suggestions and imputations reflecting on the ideals of any particular church." In resigning Gormley said in effect, "a plague o' both your houses!" He could not, he wrote, understand how such bitter controversy could relate to a religion that claimed to be one of peace.[36]

By the end of the 1920's Baptist institutions had responded to fundamentalist agitation by becoming less open to free discussion. When fundamentalists attacked Meroney and Gormley, Baptist officials responded by denying the charges against them. Likewise when widespread public dissatisfaction centered on a biology book used at Baylor, officials quickly explained that those parts which contradicted Genesis were either omitted or their fallacies explained by the teacher.[37] Apparently fundamentalists had succeeded in part in preventing the discussion of controversial doctrines.

In the latter part of the 1920's. however, Norris and the fundamentalist faction shifted the focus of their attacks, more frequently challenging Baptist preachers and leaders

---

[36]Ibid.

[37]W. H. McClelland to Brooks, 12 December 1927; Brooks to Rev. James C. Vandiver, 8 December 1927, Brooks Papers.

rather than professors. After abandoning any possibility of reconciling with Texas Baptists, Norris seemed to consider any method of embarrassing them as fair. Continuing his accusations that leaders were mishandling denominational funds, he published, under the headline, "Inside Secrets of the Broken Down Texas Machine," some private letters to Scarborough expressing dissatisfaction with F. S. Groner, secretary of the state association. The letters protested Groner's handling of Baptist moneys and requested his resignation. Apparently there were spies in the denomination who agreed with Norris. Furious, Scarborough wrote several letters in an effort to discover who turned the correspondence over to Norris. Groner was ultimately forced to resign.[38]

In addition to his implications that Baptist leaders were committing fraud, Norris also tried to prove that Texas Baptists were leaning toward modernism, especially trying to establish guilt by association. Truett and Scarborough, for example, were both active in the World Baptist Alliance, which Norris identified as a modernistic association. He condemned Truett for appearing on the same program with a

---

[38]The Fundamentalist, 9 April 1926, p. 3; James McNew to Scarborough, 23 April 1926; A. B. Mayhew to Scarborough, 23 April 1926; I. E. Gates to Scarborough, 27 April 1926; Wallace Bassett to Scarborough, 27 April 1926; M. T. Andrews to Scarborough, 19 April 1926; The Fundamentalist, 6 April 1928, p. 1.

modernist, while he accused Scarborough of having nominated a modernist for office.[39]

Norris' favorite target undoubtedly was Joseph M. Dawson, a man of whom he had long disapproved. Although Dawson was somewhat more liberal than the average Texas Baptist, he could by no means be classified as a modernist. Apparently to Norris he seemed the weakest spot in the Texas Baptist machine, since Norris carefully studied everything that Dawson said or wrote, ready to expose the slightest deviation from orthodoxy. In 1929, for example, Dawson delivered an address in which he claimed that the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah might have been by natural causes, perhaps volcanic explosions; slime from such explosions, he noted, might explain the Biblical description of Lot's wife being turned into a pillar of salt. Norris replied that the Bible stated fire and brimstone or supernatural causes had destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah and that to doubt this literal explanation was to doubt the Scriptures. Statements such as this one, as well as others, proved, Norris contended, that Dawson doubted the verbal inspiration of the Bible; and indeed Dawson did reject the mechanical dictation theory of inspiration.[40] Norris enlisted the aid

---

[39]The Fundamentalist, 4 October 1929, p. 6; 3 August 1928, p. 2; 6 April 1928, p. 1.

[40]Ibid., 22 March 1929, p. 1; 14 June 1929, p. 1; 22 November 1929, p. 1; Baptist Standard, 24 April 1930, p. 3; 1 May 1930, p. 2; 14 April 1930, p. 2; W. N. Webb to Scarborough, 5 May 1930, Scarborough Papers.

of Charles T. Alexander of the Western Recorder in his attack on Dawson. Opposing especially Dawson's statement that "The primary end of our religion is to create Christian character and service," Alexander pointed out that such a belief was the modernistic "deception of 'Salvation by character and service,' " which denied regeneration of the soul.[41]

In 1928 Dawson wrote an article for Plain Talk magazine entitled "Baptist Illiteracy in the South," which harshly criticized Southern Baptists in general and the fundamentalists in particular for failing to educate the southern populace. He noted that the national illiteracy rate was highest in the South and within that region greater in the predominantly Baptist counties. He believed that Southern Baptists' lack of commitment to education, along with fundamentalist attacks, especially those of J. Frank Norris, had greatly retarded educational development in the South. Fundamentalists, he contended, had for several years insisted upon orthodox statement after orthodox statement, forcing many good scholars out of Southern Baptist schools. In addition, Baptists had been told not to contribute to schools because of the heresies taught there, and judging from the lack of support many had complied. Dawson urged Baptists

---

[41]Norris to Charles T. Alexander, 20 December 1929; Alexander to Norris, 21 December 1929, Norris Papers.

to make a renewed commitment to education, and thus help solve the problems of the South's illiteracy and poverty.[42]

In spite of Norris' criticism. Dawson continued to write and speak in opposition to fundamentalism, publishing in 1930 an article in the Christian Century describing "Religion Down South." An even more open attack on fundamentalists, his article refered to "the paranoid escapades of a diminishing drove of Big 'F' fundamentalists who with cunning espionage, unabashed blackmail, and terrifying fury have pursued independent thinking individuals," but he concluded that religion in the South was changing and becoming more progressive. He wrote that southerners still believed the Bible was inspired as no other book, but that they no longer considered it an infallible guide in all matters.[43] Norris attacked Dawson's position repeatedly, calling him a modernist and an evolutionist. In the following years, Norris labeled any trends toward more progressive religion as "Dawsonism" and condemned anyone who seemed to approve of his ministry. The enmity between the two men continued until Norris' death in 1952.[44]

---

[42]Joseph Martin Dawson, "Baptist Illiteracy in the South," Plain Talk (October 1927): 440-441.

[43]Joseph Martin Dawson, "Religion Down South," Christian Century 47(25 June 1930): 811-813.

[44]The Fundamentalist, 16 November 1928, p. 1-4; 30 November 1928, p. 6; 22 March 1929, p. 1; 6 December 1929, p. 1; Norris to Victor I. Masters, 5 March 1932; Scarborough Papers.

In the late 1920's Baptist leaders began to fight back using some of Norris' own tactics. Since for some time Norris had been attacking them over the radio, in 1927 Brooks, Scarborough, Groner, Truett, and others acquired radio time for seven nights, not only to answer Norris' accusations but also to issue specific charges against him. Scarborough pointed out that Norris had accused him of stealing cows, of defrauding the Seminary out of land, of misappropriating Seminary funds, and of mishandling denominational funds. Denying all of these charges, Scarborough then accused Norris of misappropriating his church's funds, of lying about his church's membership, and of being a crook.[45] For several hours the "hate-fest," as Norris labeled it, went on. Securing the radio time immediately following their broadcast, Norris again managed to turn the situation to his advantage. He opened by praying for the misguided denominational leaders and then preached an evangelistic sermon about one of his favorite topics, the second coming. Later he thanked the leaders for the publicity but accused them of turning the controversy into a bitter personal attack.[46] Many cooperating Baptists as well as Norris

---

[45] Austin Statesman, 19 November 1927, p. 1; untitled typescript of Scarborough's address, in Scarborough Papers.

[46] The Fundamentalist, 4 November 1927, p. 1; 25 November 1927, p. 1; 2 December 1927, p. 1; Norris, Inside History, p. 198; unidentified newspaper clipping, 23 November 1927, Brooks papers; Norris to F. S. Groner, 15 December 1927, Brooks Papers.

sympathizers criticized the radio "hate-fest." Brooks was accused of "descending into the gutter with Norris" and Scarborough was called "pitiful."[47]

Announcing that the radio attack had destroyed any hope for peace, Norris feigned disappointment, saying that he had hoped Brooks would appreciate his help in getting rid of the evolutionists at Baylor. For many years Norris used the radio rampage to insult the leaders and to illustrate his charge of machine domination.[48] With the final split Norris' attacks on the Baptists developed a pattern. Each fall, just before the state convention, he opened a new offensive and held his own meetings in the same town during the convention. Seeming to take perverse pleasure from the sufferings he caused Texas Baptists, he reported having a "delightful time" over the bankruptcy of the machine and continued, as he said, "feeding it to them for dinner, breakfast and supper."[49]

As the split in the denomination deepened, Norris stressed differences in doctrine as well as theology. He attacked Baptist leaders for what he saw as trends toward

---

[47]J. H. Johnson to Brooks, 22 November 1927; Copeland to E. C. Routh, 22 November 1927; A Listener-in to Norris, 30 November 1927, Brooks Papers.

[48]The Fundamentalist, 13 January 1928, p. 1; 3 February 1928, p. 5; Norris, Inside History, pp. 198-200.

[49]The Fundamentalist, 23 September 1927, p. 8; 10 May 1929, p. 1; Norris to Entzminger, 15 April 1931; Norris to Entzminger, 4 November 1932, Scarborough Papers.

the social gospel. Winning souls was the only significant duty of the church, he asserted, and he was fond of pointing out how much more effectively he accomplished this goal than did other Baptist leaders, who, he believed, were concentrating too much on establishing God's kingdom and too little on saving individual souls. Norris reported Brooks as stating that Baylor's aim was to help humanity, requiring only that his faculty be of high character. Norris claimed Brooks' attitude explained how medernists, agnostics and Catholics could teach there.[50] Actual conditions at Baylor did not substantiate Norris' charges. In 1926 a Baylor student reported to the convention a new system in Baylor whereby Christian students prayed for the unsaved by name; apparently the individual soul was still of importance in Baylor.[51] Another Baptist College, Howard Payne, boasted that it had never graduated a single student who was not a Christian.[52]

Repeatedly, as he had through the decade, Norris stressed his emphasis on the local church versus the leaders' emphasis on the denomination as a whole, accusing the Baptist leaders of "cutting off the heads" of ministers who opposed the

---

[50]The Fundamentalist, 12 July 1927, p. 5; 13 September 1929, p. 5; 11 January 1929, p. 1; 18 October 1929, p. 1.

[51]Unidentified newspaper clipping, 10 November 1926, Baptist Scrapbook, University of Texas Archives, Austin, Texas.

[52]Texas Baptist Annual, 1927, p. 58.

machine. He claimed that "denominational machines are making desperate efforts to mold every man's ministry after a stereotyped, cut-and-dried program."[53] By the late 1920's a number of ministers apparently agreed with Norris that they had not been treated fairly by Texas Baptist leaders. For example, Scarborough suggested that one young man whom he suspected of Norrisism try Albuquerque, New Mexico, rather than come to Texas, while several other ministers already in the state reported that Baptist leaders demanded conformity.[54]

Norris also stressed his belief in the premillennial second coming and accused the convention of being post-millennialist. Because he believed that premillennialism was "sweeping the country like a prairie fire," he turned frequently to the imminent second coming of Christ for his sermon topics.[55] Connecting postmillennialism with institutionalism, he argued that the leaders had been premillennialists until they became involved with the institutions. He contended:

---

[53]The Fundamentalist, 1 January 1926, p. 4; 2 August 1929, p. 1.

[54]Charles T. Alexander to Norris, 25 September 1929; W. A. Brown to Norris, 24 November 1928, Norris Papers; Ernest Baldwin to Scarborough, 16 April 1931; Scarborough to J. W. Gillon, 1 October 1925, Scarborough Papers; The Fundamentalist, 2 October 1931, p. 1.

[55]Norris to I. E. Gates, 13 October 1931, F. L. Lyon Papers, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas. Norris, The Gospel of Dynamite, p. 4, 7; Norris to Entzminger, 6 January 1931, Scarborough Papers.

> Present-day institutionalism and post-millennialism are Siamese twins, so also modernism and post-millennialism are fed by the same hand. Not every post-millennialist is an evolutionist, but you will never find a pre-millennialist who is an evolutionist. Not only so, in all the history of evangelism there hasn't been one single solitary great evangelist who was a post-millennialist.[56]

By the late 1920's and early 1930's Norris' following had become better organized as he began to report the formation of independent Baptist churches not tied to the Texas machine. Although he was still sending delegates to the Texas Baptist Convention to embarass the leaders, he had given up all hope of reuniting with that body,and instead he was creating his own fellowship, which he labeled a premillennial conference. The churches that became a part of Norris' fellowship consisted of dissident groups that had withdrawn from other Southern Baptist churches or churches that the local associations had refused to seat. Those churches whose pastors sympathized with Norris refused to cooperate in Baptist causes, criticized Baylor, and accused Baptist leaders of machine domination. Under Copeland's leadership, for example, the Temple Baptist Church of Waco passed a resolution in support of the McDaniel statement and declared that "Any individual Association or Convention that endorses and supports men who are unwilling to sign the McDaniel Resolution do not represent the spirit,

---

[56]The Fundamentalist, 8 January 1926, p. 1; 26 March 1926, p. 1.

purpose and policy of Tabernacle Baptist Congregation." When the Waco Association endorsed Baylor and Brooks, Copeland's messengers were not seated and his church became a non-cooperating, independent Baptist church.[57]

Soon Norris was encouraging the formation of more such churches, with enterprising young men like Sam Morris, Scott Hickey, and John R.Rice aiding him. A stronghold for the developing organization was Decatur, home of Decatur Baptist College, and the birth of the independent church there offered a good example of how the group operated. In the fall of 1929, John R. Rice held a revival in Decatur, over the protests of the local Baptist ministers. The revival was a tremendous success, with a number of souls reportedly being saved. Because Rice was associated with Norris, the local ministers refused to receive members from the meeting, undoubtedly fearing that they would create the same kind of division that his supporters all over the state were causing. Using as a basis the rural Bethesda Baptist Church, which moved into town during the revival, a new church with three hundred and thirty members was created to accomodate the newly saved souls. With Scott Hickey as pastor, almost constant revivalism marked the church's

---

[57] Tabernacle Voice, February 1933, newspaper in Scarborough Papers; Copeland, "The Inside Story"; Copeland, "Some Facts the Public Should Know," October 1927, tract in Copeland Papers.

early history. Of course, the local Baptist association refused to seat the new church's messengers, and they too became "victims" of machine politics.[58]

Hickey's Decatur church, like the parent church in Fort Worth, was constantly torn by controversy, as Hickey and Rice, with the aid of Norris, worked to create serious trouble in the Baptist college there. First they encouraged division among the trustees of the college, especially when the president of the college, J. L. Ward, criticized J. E. Boyd, a pro-Norris trustee, for appearing in public with Norris.[59] The most serious problem, however, arose when Hickey attacked the college for using a biology book that utilized the theory of evolution. Two young girls who attended Hickey's church, Fern Bond and Vera Nemo, testified at one of Hickey's meetings that they had learned about evolution at the college. President Ward's reaction to this accusation again demonstrated the impact of the fundamentalist movement on the denomination. Acting quickly and decisively to prove the college's innocence, he had thirty-two of the thirty-four members of the class that Bond

---

[58]The Fundamentalist, 25 October 1927, p. 1; J. E. Boyd, "The Fundamentalist Baptist Church, Decatur, Texas, Fifty Year History," typescript in Norris Papers.

[59]J. E. Boyd to Norris, 10 December 1927, Norris Papers.

and Nemo attended sign a statement to the effect that the teacher had not even covered the objectionable chapters; in fact, they claimed the teacher had told them in class that he did not believe in the material about evolution included in the text. When the two girls who had testified against the college refused to sign the statement, they were expelled from school.[60]

This action naturally appeared to fundamentalists as further proof of machine denomination. Sam Morris, who had emerged as an effective radio spokesman for the Norris group, had the girls as guests on his radio program. Both of them said that the professor and President Ward tried to pressure them into denying that evolution was taught at Decatur Baptist College. Vera Nemo claimed also that Dr. Ward had earlier tried to prevent her from attending the fundamentalist church because he believed it was trying to destroy the college.[61] Norris ran pictures of the girls with the caption, "We Will Not Sign--We Will Not Serve Thy Gods."[62]

---

[60]"A Statement from the Trustees of Decatur Baptist College," typescript in Bell Papers.

[61]Sam Morris, "Address Over KTAT," Fort Worth, Texas, 1931, typescript on file Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

[62]The Fundamentalist, 19 June 1931, p. 3.

By the early 1930's Norris openly advocated a split in the Baptist ranks and explained the method to use in establishing fundamentalist churches. He told his followers that breaking with the Baptist machine was inevitable, but urged them to remain in the established church, working to convince as many members as possible of the denomination's drift toward modernism. After gaining as many followers within the existing church as feasible, his supporters should, he instructed, take limited action to damage the denomination, such as discontinuing the Sunday school literature. Even after the fundamentalists had gained control of the existing church, Norris encouraged them to refuse to leave the denomination voluntarily.[63] He probably intended this tactic to make it appear that the fundamentalists were persecuted and to insure their maintaining control of the property. Even when the local association had denied a fundamentalist-controlled church fellowship, Norris suggested that some of his supporters leave the excluded church and join cooperating churches so that they could attend the state convention as delegates and"machine gun the life out of them [the denomination]."[64]

Apparently Norris' tactics worked reasonably well. In the early 1930's he reported the formation of fundamentalist

---

[63]Ibid., 2 March 1932, p. 5.

[64]Norris to Louis Entzminger, 17 September 1932, Norris Papers.

churches in San Antonio, Amarillo, Denton, Abilene, Waxahachie, Dallas, Houston, San Angelo, Sherman, Cleburne, and Big Spring; outside the state churches were founded in Oklahoma City, Jacksonville, Florida, Jonesboro, Arkansas, and a number of other places.[65] The new churches built large tabernacles, cheaply and simply constructed, which traditional Baptists denounced as mule barns. By 1934 Norris claimed two thousand premillennial Baptist Tabernacles in Texas, including one in every major Texas city.[66] In the late 1920's he announced plans for a premillennial Bible school in Fort Worth. Norris dedicated the new seminary, which opened in the fall of 1932, to teaching the Bible only.[67]

Meanwhile conservatives organized still another institution, the Dallas Theological Seminary, which illustrated their tendency to withdraw from established institutions and denominations to establish their own. Although Dallas Theological Seminary developed from the movement to protect conservative theology from liberal encroachments, its founders eschewed any connections with the organized fundamentalist

---

[65] The Fundamentalist, 17 April 1931, p. 1; 1 May 1931, p. 8; 7 August 1931, p. 1; 9 October 1931, p. 3; 20 November 1931, p. 1; 12 August 1932, p. 1; 17 June 1932, p. 1; 3 February 1933, p. 1; 27 October 1933, p. 1; 16 November 1934, p. 1.

[66] Ibid., 20 November 1931, p. 1; 16 November 1934, p. 1; Norris to Masters, 8 January 1933, Scarborough Papers.

[67] Norris to L. S. Ballard, 25 February 1932, Scarborough Papers.

movement because of its angry polemics. Founded as the Evangelical Theological College in September of 1924, it enrolled ninety-one students. In the beginning, and for its first ten years, Presbyterians controlled and dominated the seminary, although its founders, led by Louis Chafer its first president, intended from the beginning that it be non-denominational. Its avowed purpose was to combat liberal tendencies in theological seminaries, maintain conservative theology, and emphasize the premillennial second coming of Christ.[68]

As many ardent fundamentalists withdrew from established denominations, the seminary drew from denominations other than Presbyterian, achieving its non-denominational goal. By 1958 only four percent of the student body was Presbyterian. The largest number of students, 46 percent, listed their religious affiliations as independent, while two-thirds of the faculty also identified themselves as members of independent groups. Several of the students pastored non-denominational churches; however, a significant number of students, 32 percent, identified with Baptist groups. In order to enter the school, a student had to be "born again" and had to sign a statement of faith agreeing with the school's doctrine. The curriculum of the school

---

[68]Rudolf Renfer, "A History of Dallas Theological Seminary, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, Texas, 1959, pp. 136-138, 145, 153, 160, 186, 189.

emphasized the whole Bible and each student's personal religious experience. By 1958, its enrollment had grown to over three hundred, and it had become an important mainstay of conservative theology in Texas. One historian described it as "the largest theologically conservative, denominationally unrelated, graduate-level seminary in North America."[69]

After 1925 Texas denominations other than the Baptists were not as disturbed by fundamentalism, and the movement showed signs of subsiding in importance. The Methodists continued for some time to discuss the issues, but the fundamentalists no longer seemed to exercise as much control over the denomination as earlier. In 1926 the investigating committee of the West Texas Conference reported that teaching in the various schools was basically sound and that it reinforced rather than destroyed students' faith. To determine the personal beliefs of teachers the committee asked faculty members to sign the most recent statement of faith passed by the General Conference. Stressing the divinity and the reality of God, this document took an orthodox approach to the Virgin Birth, the resurrection, and the nature of Christ, but it made no mention of evolution.[70]

---

[69]Ibid., p. 2, 7, 192, 246, 264.

[70]Journal of the 68th Annual Session of the West Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at San Angelo, Texas, October 27-31, 1926 (n.p.: n.d., n.p.), pp. 70-73.

Many modernists or evolutionists could have signed it without disturbing their consciences.

Only one faculty member, Harold Gray of Southwestern University, refused to endorse it, and his case was discussed at length in the West Texas Conference, with Bishop John Moore presiding. The university president, Dr. J. Sam Barcus, defended Gray, and Gray spoke in his own behalf, contending that he refused to sign the document because of principle since he believed that the conference had no right to force professors to sign statements of faith. The conference passed a resolution confirming his Christian character, while a resolution calling for his resignation lost by 121 to 59.[71] Apparently the conference was not as determined to enforce orthodox beliefs as it had been the year before.

Fundamentalist control of the Northwest Texas Conference also diminished in the latter part of the decade. In 1926 the conference changed Rule 9, dropping the anti-evolution statement and requiring instead that faculty members sign the Methodist statement of faith; the following year the rule was dropped entirely and trustees of the schools were simply

---

[71] Texas Christian Advocate, 4 November 1926, pp. 1, 4.

warned to insure the soundness of faculty members' faith and character.[72]

Meanwhile the Central Conference took steps to control the most militant Methodist fundamentalist, William E. Hawkins. In 1926 the Committee on Evangelism refused to recommend Hawkins as an evangelist, and the conference voted unanimously to locate him; that is remove him from the ministry. Since Hawkins was not present at the 1926 meeting, Methodist leaders gave him an opportunity to defend himself in the 1927 conference. Moore, who also presided at this meeting, began the hearing by pointing out that Hawkins had been located on the grounds of "unacceptability," and that it was not a question of morality, heresy, or doctrinal differences. When Hawkins gained the floor, he called Moore a heretic and charged Methodist schools with teaching heresy. Other delegates protested that these charges were not true and did not relate to the case. The delegates allowed Hawkins to continue speaking for some time. When the discussion that followed brought out that he had refused to use Methodist Sunday school literature and had circulated a paper attacking Moore, he denied neither accusation. The convention concluded that none of the presiding elders were able to use him in any

---

[72] Journal of the 17th Annual Session of the Northwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Childress, Texas, November 10-14, 1926 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 26-27; Journal of the 18th Annual Session of the Northwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Big Spring, Texas, November 9-13, 1927, (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 39.

of the districts, and since the Committee on Evangelism refused to recommend Hawkins, Moore could not appoint him. The motion to locate him carried with only two or three delegates voting in opposition.[73]

After his location, Hawkins moved into a dormitory at the Dallas Theological Seminary, where he developed a radio broadcast entitled "Radio Revival." At the seminary he instructed the theology students in radio work and helped them with rural and suburban evangelism. For his work with students, Dallas Theological Seminary in 1948 rewarded him with an honorary doctorate, but apparently he drew little support from the Methodists.[74]

Moore, on the other hand, became increasingly outspoken in opposition to fundamentalism. In 1925, he said,

> When a man ceases to think he becomes intolerant toward thinking men. Some think modern knowledge will destroy the Bible. This cannot be done without destroying God. The fundamentalist is a fixed man. To him everything is foreordained. This is not Methodism but Calvinism. Against Calvinism is the theory of the progressive order of life. Life answers all theories. Preachers are cautioned not to preach evolution. How can they help themselves? What is meant by evolution? Is it orderly development of life? The world needs clarification of ideas and less dealings in abstract words that can mean everything or nothing.[75]

---

[73]Journal of the 62nd Annual Session of the Central Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Fort Worth, Texas, November 16-20, 1927 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 34-35; John Moore, Life and I or Sketches and Comments, (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1948), p. 150.

[74]Renfer, "History of Dallas Theological Seminary," pp.193-194.

[75]Dallas Morning News, 12 November 1925, p. 1.

In 1929 he wrote an article for the Texas Christian Advocate, again defending tolerance and understanding and opposing the fixed approach of fundamentalists.[76] Moore met severe criticism within his own denomination as some of his fellow Methodists accused him of selling out to the modernists and of taking underhanded actions to control fundamentalism, such as interfering with the committee appointed to investigate school affairs in 1925.[77] In spite of the opposition, Moore's influence and outspoken stand undoubtedly helped to minimize the impact of fundamentalism among Texas Methodists.

After 1925, articles continued to appear in the Texas Christian Advocate opposing modernism, but they tended to be general statements rather than specific attacks, while several articles were also printed attempting to reconcile science with religion.[78] In general, the periodical's policy seemed one of avoiding controversy over the issue of modernism, thus leaving scientific investigation to the scientists. The question did not again disrupt Methodist conference meetings, but the controversy had already done considerable

---

[76]Texas Christian Advocate, 15 March 1929, pp. 326-328.

[77]R. P. Shuler to Moore, 21 May 1925; B. H. Hutchins to R. A. Meek, 17 July 1925, Bishop John Moore Papers, Bridwell Library, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

[78]Texas Christian Advocate, 14 February 1932, p. 1; 19 January 1928, p. 1; 27 January 1927, p. 3; 13 May 1926, p. 6; 23 December 1936, p. 10; 2 December 1926, p. 9; 18 November 1926, p. 3.

damage to Methodist schools. In 1927, Ellis Shuler, Dean of the Graduate School at Southern Methodist University, blamed the controversy for having rendered the teaching of science woefully ineffective in church schools. "The tragic fact," he reflected, "is that church schools fail to give adequate training at the very point where she is most often attacked. . . . It is small wonder that men of science have been callous and indifferent to the moral effect of scientific speculation." He concluded that the integrity of science teachers in church schools was not respected by the world of science because of the controversy caused by the fundamentalists.[79]

During the latter half of the 1920's fundamentalism continued as a significant issue in secular as well as religious affairs. The controversy entered into politics in the summer of 1926 during the gubernatorial campaign, when Dan Moody challenged Miriam A. Ferguson's attempt for re-election. During her governorship, "Ma" Ferguson had demonstrated the soundness of her position on the Bible through censorship of the state's textbooks. Since the Baptists were supporting Moody, her husband, former governor James Ferguson, tried to capitalize on the controversy. At a campaign meeting held at Lake Park, Angelina County, Jim

---

[79] Ellis Shuler to Bishop Edwin Mouzon, 5 March 1927, Bishop Edwin Mouzon Papers, Bridwell Library, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

Ferguson called Moody and his friends "monkey-faced Baptists," accusing President Brooks of Baylor of having said that man at one time had a tail but had worn it off squatting down. To his four thousand listeners Ferguson illustrated his points with a cageful of monkeys, declaring, "You monkey-faced Baptists are more dangerous than any group of anarchists. You fellows are worse than the Ku Klux Klan and we're going to wipe you out." He indicated clearly that he was not talking about the Baptist common people but only about those who had sold out to modernism and evolution.[80] Moody responded by declaring his own orthodoxy and his belief in the literal Scriptures. Brooks not only denied Ferguson's charges but affirmed his belief in the McDaniel statement.[81]

Legislative efforts to control the spread of modernism continued during the latter half of the decade also. In 1929 two more anti-evolution bills, one of which narrowly failed to pass, as well as an anti-evolution resolution were introduced in the Texas House. On January 10 in the Regular Session of the Forty-First Legislature Representative James W. Harper, of Mount Pleasant, introduced House Bill Number 90, an even more stringent restriction on the teaching of evolution than earlier proposals had been. It not only prohibited

---

[80]Unidentified newspaper clipping, 9 July 1926, Brooks papers.

[81]"No Evolution for Texas," pp. 30-31; Statement of S. P. Brooks, 21 July 1926, Brooks Papers.

teaching that "mankind evolved from a lower order of animals" but made it illegal for a textbook committee to select books that included the theory of evolution for use in the classroom. Declaring evolutionary teaching a misdemeanor, the bill provided that teachers or other officials proven guilty under the act be discharged and fined not more than five hundred dollars. Declaring that the teaching of evolution had created an emergency, the bill claimed the measure to be of such importance to the public welfare that it was necessary to suspend the constitutional rule requiring the reading of a bill on three separate days in each house. The Committee on Criminal Jurisprudence, to which the bill was referred, returned an adverse report on January 24, but in spite of the committee's action the House voted sixty-four to forty to have the bill printed.[82]

On February 16 a vote of fifty to thirty-five favored engrossment but the bill failed to pass for lack of a quorum. Lengthy and heated debate ensued nevertheless, with Harper emotionally supporting his bill, connecting evolution with moral degeneracy. Identifying it as a religious doctrine, he suggested that modernists maintain their own schools as other denominations did. During the debate a group that had gathered to hear the discussion asked Edward R. Sinks, a spokesman favoring the bill to define evolution. He answered: "Define the mischief." When questioned further

---

[82]Texas, House Bill, No. 90, typed copy legislative library, Austin, Texas; Texas Legislature House Journal 41st Leg., Reg. Sess., 1929, pp. 67, 248, 252.

he retorted, "I'm not going to answer all you smart alecks." Joining Harper and Sinks in support of the bill was W. R. Wigg, of Paris, who contended that if his forefathers had hung, it was by the neck, not the tail. Several representatives spoke in opposition to the bill. Roland Bradly, of Houston, argued that the bill would restrict teachers unnecessarily, while another representative referred to the failure of the Tennessee act under which Scopes had been tried. When on March 1 the bill was brought up again, it failed to pass to engrossment by the narrow vote of fifty to fifty-nine.[83]

Still hoping for success, the anti-evolutionists made further efforts when the Second Called Session of the Forty-first Legislature met. A bill similar to the earlier bill was introduced on June 5, which made it illegal to teach evolution or to teach that the Genesis account of creation was untrue, and ordered the textbook committee not to adopt books that contradicted Genesis. The bill was referred to the committee on Education, which reported it unfavorably on June 10, 1929. Although it was ordered printed by a vote of sixty-nine to thirty-nine, a motion to vote on it as a special order lost by thirty-eight to sixty-nine.[84] The

---

[83]Fort Worth Star Telegram, February 16, 1929, p. 7; House Journal, 41st Leg. reg. sess., 1929, p. 1259.

[84]Texas, Legislature, House Journal, 41st Leg., 2nd Called Sess., 1929, pp. 31, 112, 115, 217.

fundamentalists made their final effort on June 28,when Harper offered an anti-evolution resolution for consideration. The resolution, which asked the boards or regents of colleges and universities to prevent the teaching of evolution and requested the textbook committee not to adopt books that taught the doctrine, was referred to the Committee on Education, but it never emerged from that committee.[85]

The proposals in the legislature of still more anti-evolution measures in 1929 brought about considerable discussion of the issue from both religious and secular quarters, at which time there seemed to be more opposition to prohibitive legislation than earlier. Texas Episcopalians passed a resolution condemning anti-evolution laws as "contrary to the interests of true religion."[86] Methodist Bishop John Moore contended that all biologists used the evolutionary hypothesis and urged the churches to leave scientific investigation to the scientists,[87] Even the editor of the Baptist Standard, F. M. McConnell, editorialized, without fully explaining his position, that the legislation was unwise. His statements brought an outcry of criticism from his fellow Baptists as well as from Norris, who accused him of being a theistic evolutionist. Forced to explain and clarify his position, McConnell answered that he did

---

[85]Ibid., pp. 262-263.

[86]Fort Worth Record Telegram, 16 January 1929, p. 13.

[87]Texas Christian Advocate, 5 March 1929, pp. 326-329.

not believe in evolution and in fact strongly disapproved of its being taught in the schools; he intended only to point out the difficulties involved in attempting to control it through legislation.[88]

Although after 1929, fundamentalists no longer attempted anti-evolution legislation, they continued as a vocal, active minority. Significantly, however, by the end of the 1920's fundamentalists had withdrawn into their own organizations and institutions or joined existing groups that believed as they did. While they continued to have important influence in the state, issues that had concerned them during the decade of the 1920's no longer seemed so controversial, in part because fundamentalists groups were discussing the issues among themselves but no longer contending openly with their opponents. No satisfactory grounds for communication had been worked out during this period of controversy, and both sides seemed to give up hope of changing the other's opinion.

---

[88]Baptist Standard, 13 January 1929, p. 4; 4 April 1929, p. 4; The Fundamentalist, 22 February 1929, p. 8; 8 November 1929, p. 1; 15 March 1929, p. 1.

CHAPTER VII

WHAT HAPPENED TO TEXAS FUNDAMENTALISM?

What happened to the fundamentalists in Texas after the heated debates of the 1920's? Were they, as their opponents claimed, so completely defeated at the Dayton trial that the movement ceased to have significant influence, or did they accomplish any part of their goals? If fundamentalists sought to preserve the past by maintaining the old values and stopping progress, they obviously failed; but since time can never be made to stand still, it is unfair to judge the movement a failure because it did not accomplish the immpossible. In Texas after the controversy-filled decade of the 1920's fundamentalists continued to exercise important controls and to influence both the secular and the religious world. Liberalism did not triumph in the Lone Star State. Conflict seemed less heated after the 1920's, but largely because by the end of the decade fundamentalists had established their own institutions and were no longer attempting to converse with their opponents.

Since the 1930's the conservative religious sects have been experiencing constant growth nationwide, and a significant revival of the fundamentalist impulse has been noted in recent years. In the 1930's the Church of God grew from

23,000 to 80,000, the Assemblies of God increased from 48,000 to 175,000 and the Church of the Nazarene experienced a 100 percent increase.[1] During the 1940's two councils developed to give fundamentalists national organization. The American Council of Christian Churches and the National Association of Evangelicals enabled fundamentalist groups to identify with each other and to speak with a degree of unity on important issues. Throughout the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's fundamentalists spread their message through radio evangelism, Bible institutes and colleges, and evangelistic crusades. Organizations such as the Youth for Christ, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship and numerous other groups gave the fundamentalists organizations to work through and laid the foundations for another period of religious revivalism.[2] In the 1970's the churches experiencing the most rapid growth were the small independent sects with strict codes. Still offering simple answers, they did not concern themselves with society's problems, being content to await the second coming. Obviously by the mid-1970's fundamentalism was not a dead issue.[3]

---

[1]Sweet, The Story of Religion, p. 422.

[2]Louis Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement (Paris: Mouton and Company, 1963), pp. 23-25, 76-77, 85-86, 133-134.

[3]Joan S. Gimlin, "Fundamentalist Revival," Editorial Reports 2:275, in file on Fundamentalism, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

The most significant post-fundamentalist development in American Protestantism has been the neo-orthodox school of theology. Developing in the 1930's and having its basis in the teachings of the Swiss theologian Karl Barth, neo-orthodoxy rejected the liberalism of the pre-World War I era and reasserted faith in a supernatural, omnipotent God. The impact of fundamentalism was evident in the teachings of the American proponents of the movement. Rejecting the liberal concepts of man's basic goodness, they emphasized the doctrine of original sin and man's inability to fully understand God since he was separated from his Creator by an insurmountably gulf of sin and evil. Although neo-orthodox theologians were more tolerant of modern science than earlier fundamentalists, they too believed in the divine inspiration and inerrance of the Scriptures. In addition they believed that the only solution to man's problems lay in saving individual souls and rejected the social gospel. The 1930's and the coming of the depression, followed by the holocaust of World War II and the uncertainty of the Cold War years, undoubtedly strengthened the support of this school of theology, with its emphasis on man's weakness and God's power. A stronger religion than the vague uncertainty of liberalism seemed necessary as man proved his capacity for evil over and over again. This demise of liberalism probably contributed to the decreased intensity

of the fundamentalist movement, since the opposing forces no longer seemed so threatening.[4]

The man most responsible for popularizing the new conservative religion in America was Billy Graham. Beginning his evangelical crusade in 1949, Graham won the praise of Norris and other fundamentalists as he carried the neo-orthodoxy movement in even more conservative directions. Although Graham is a member of the First Baptist Church of Dallas, his appeal crosses denominational lines, and he assures the success of his crusades by acquiring the support of the leading churches in each area he evangelizes. His sermons and writings emphasize personal evangelism and regeneration of the individual soul as the only hope of mankind. Appearing on nationwide television and appealing to millions, he has elevated the premillennial doctrine to a new respectability. Liberal churchmen criticize Graham's movement as a revival of fundamentalism, pointing out that he preaches all the origianl five tenets of fundamentalism--the literal scriptures, the virgin birth, the blood atonement of Christ's death, the resurrection, and the imminent second coming. They warn that his followers might again divide the denominations with the bitterness and passion

---

[4]Sweet, The Story of Religion, pp. 420-421; Walter M. Horton, "The New Orthodoxy," American Scholar 7(Winter, 1938): 3-11; Arnold W. Hearn, "Fundamentalist Renaisance," Christian Century 75(30 April 1958): 528-530; Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement, p. 19.

of the 1920's but Graham won a large following in Texas, and his teachings showed little tendency to divide Texas Protestants.[5]

In general, Texas theologians accepted the new conservative view readily, although some denominations, especially the Methodists, seemed to be continuing the liberal trend begun in the late 1920's. During the depression, the Methodists became more interested in social issues, adopting in the early 1930's the social creed of the Federal Council of Churches, which called for alleviation of poverty, abolition of child labor, equal rights, and education.[6] In spite of their social interests, however, Texas Methodists remained theologically conservative. The Texas Methodist leader Umphrey Lee warned in 1936 that liberal religion had failed and urged a return to more orthodox teachings.[7] Many individual pastors continued preaching the "old time religion" and some protested the liberalizing trends. Much of the social concerns of Texas Methodists continued to center on public morality, concerning themselves with issues such as prohibition, movies and gambling.[8]

---

[5]Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement, pp. 128-143; "Fundamentalist Revival," Christian Century 74(19 June 1957): 749-751; Reinhold Niebuhr, "Literalism, Individualism and Billy Graham," Christian Century 73(23 May 1956): 640-642.

[6]Texas Christian Advocate, 25 September 1930, p. 1.

[7]Vernon, Methodism Moves Across North Texas, pp. 286-287.

[8]The Fundamentalist, 21 December 1945, p. 1; Texas Christian Advocate, 24 July 1930, p.1; 6 March 1930, p. 1; 1May 1930, p. 8.

Texans still expected religion to deal primarily with spiritual matters. In 1934, a young couple who had moved to Ohio from Truett's church wrote to their former pastor distressed and heart-broken because their new Sunday school dealt with such topics as drama and archeology rather than the gospel.[9] Texas Baptists had never strayed from the conservative viewpoint, and the neo-orthodox school expressed their position well. After the 1920's Southern Baptists continued to affirm their conservatism and in 1955 the Baptist Standard estimated that 98 percent of the Southern Baptists still accepted the Bible literally and many, though not all, accepted the premillennial position.[10] In 1962 a controversy reminiscent of the 1920's arose which gave Texas Baptists a chance to prove their continued devotion to orthodoxy. A seminary professor in Kansas wrote a book contending that Genesis could not be accepted literally. The pasor of the First Baptist Church of Houston, Owen White, led a movement in the Southern Baptist Convention to discredit the book and its author. Under his leadership the Convention adopted a resolution reaffirming "faith in the entire Bible as the authoritative, authentic, infallible word of God," and requested officials of Baptist

---

[9]Marian and Ernest Landes to Truett, 30 October 1933, Truett Papers.

[10]Baptist Standard, 16 July 1955, p. 2.

institutions to take steps to insure against false teachings that might undermine the historic Baptist position.[11]

Although the neo-orthodox movement shared many of the theological tenets of the fundamentalists, it lacked fundamentalist aggressiveness and militancy. The movement had its greatest impact in the traditional Protestant sects while the most militant separatist fundamentalists denounced it as being too prone to compromise with liberalism.[12]

After the 1920's Norris praised some Southern Baptists, such as Graham and W. A. Criswell, who became pastor of the First Baptist Church of Dallas after Truett's death and who ardently opposed modernism and communism while supporting a staunch moral code.[13] For a time Norris even stopped his attacks on Baylor. After Brooks' death in 1931, former governor Pat Neff, a fundamentalist, became president of the college, and, according to Norris, he cleaned out any remaining evolutionists. Neff pleased Norris by combating drinking, smoking, and Communists, as well as "monkey business" in Baylor.[14] However, in 1948, after Dr. E. B.

---

[11] Texas Observor, 15 June 1962, p. 2.

[12] A. Reilly Copeland, An Angel of Light (n.p.: Old Puritan Press [1950's]) in Copeland Papers.

[13] The Fundamentalist, 24 September 1948, p. 1; 29 July 1949, p. 1.

[14] Ibid., 26 January 1934, p. 1; 28 November 1947, p. 1, 3; 5 December 1941, p. 1.

White replaced Neff as university president, Norris resumed his opposition to the Baptist school. He accused White of employing communists and evolutionists and of trying to unite the northern and southern Baptists.[15]

Norris also continued his attacks on Dawson, accusing him of saying that the thoughts but not the words of the Bible were inspired and of rejecting the literal hell.[16] In the 1940's Dawson reviewed a book by John Erskine titled The Human Life of Jesus, a modernist interpretation of Jesus' life and works that denied the virgin birth. Although Dawson did not defend Erskin's position, he did indicate that he believed Erskin's interpretation of Jesus' life might come to be widely accepted in the future. Norris reprinted parts of the review and parts of the book, attempting to attribute Erskin's words to Dawson. In a further effort to expose Dawson's heresy Norris printed a tract titled Infidelity Among Southern Baptists and distributed copies to delegates at the Southern Baptist Convention meeting in Miami in 1946.[17] Norris accused Dawson of being an agnostic, an evolutionist and ultimately even

---

[15]Ibid., 13 August 1948, p. 3.

[16]Ibid., 6 February 1931, p. 1; 3 January 1930, p. 1; 7 February 1931, p. 1.

[17]Ibid., 14 December 1945, p. 1; 11 January 1946, p. 1; 31 May 1946, p. 1; 7 February 1946, p. 1; J. Frank Norris, Infidelity Among Southern Baptists Endorsed by Highest Officials (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), passim.

claimed that he was connected with the Communist party, identifying him as "Joe Stalin's Fith [sic] Columnist in America."[18] Dawson tried to ignore Norris' attacks and remained an influential figure among Southern Baptists, although he ultimately left Texas for Washington, D.C., where he directed the Joint Committee on Public Affairs for the Baptists of the United States.[19]

In addition to attacking the Baptists, Norris was also involved with expanding his work and influence in the 1930's and 1940's. The Depression and then World War II made his second-coming philosophy appealing, and his Premillennial Bible Institute in Fort Worth influenced many young preachers. One former student gave the following description of the teachings he acquired in the seminary:

> We believe our Lord will come in a visible body to translate the saints out from among the wicked and we will ever be with the Lord. At the end of a short period of time Christ will come back to the earth to establish a thousand year reign at the end of which Satan will be loosed for a short span of time. He will go out to deceive the nations again and will try to dethrone the king of kings but Christ will destroy the wicked with the breath of his lips. Then the wicked dead will be gathered before the great white throne to have judgements meted out to them according to their works.[20]

---

[18]The Fundamentalist, 12 December 1941, p. 1; 18 March 1938, p. 1.

[19]Joseph M. Dawson, "Darwinism and Dawsonism: A Memoir," in Glick, editor, Darwinism in Texas, p. 33.

[20]Rev. John Rawlins, "What I Got from Bible Institute, Testimonial Written in 1941," Norris Papers.

Norris carried his preoccupation with premillennialism further than this moving description of the end, however, as he linked it with the many other issues that concerned him. He accused the Baptist leaders of postmillennialism, which he claimed destroyed belief in the supernatural, repudiated the verbal inspiration of the Bible, and was "rooted and gounded in the false doctrine of evolution." In addition, according to Norris, postmillennialism meant worship of the denominational hospitals and institutions, "leavened with a little gospel." On the other hand, premillennialism stressed the supernatural, the spirit of the Lord, the verbal inspiration of the Bible, while it rejected evolution and materialism. Whereas postmillennialists put their faith in the system, premillennialists emphasized the regeneration of the individual soul, according to Norris.[21]

The depression, the World War, and the Cold War all provided Norris with excellent material for his premillennial preaching. In 1934, he announced "The End of All Things Is at Hand," and warned that the rise of Hitler, the anti-Christ, would lead to another world war which would destroy civilization.[22] As the world situation seemed hopeless he claimed that premillennialism, rather than being a pessimistic philosophy, offered the only basis for optimism.

---

[21]The Fundamentalist, 17 January 1930, p. 1, 2.

[22]Ibid., 16 February 1934, p. 1; 23 September 1938, p. 1.

Since secular economic and political systems had failed, man's only hope was the return of Christ to establish the kingdom[23] When World War II ended without Christ appearing Norris shifted his predictions for the end of the world to emphasize the role of Russia in that event. In 1944, he gave reasons why Russia would take all of Europe and pointed to this as a sure sign of the second coming. By 1950 he was predicting a war with Russia as well as the end of the world. To Norris an individual's views on the millennium were the major test for orthodoxy, and this reamined the major theological question dividing Texas Baptists.[24]

Meanwhile Norris increased his activities and worked to strengthen his organization. In 1937 he agreed to pastor simultaneously with his Fort Worth Church the Temple Baptist Church of Detroit. Immediately he led the church out of the Northern Baptist Association and began much the same kind of attack and abuse against that organization that he had levied against the Southern Baptists.[25] This move broadened

---

[23]J. Frank Norris, Norris-Wallace Debates, (Fort Worth: Fundamentalist Publishing Company, 1935), pp. 9-11.

[24]The Fundamentalist, 4 August 1944, p. 1; 29 September 1950, p. 1; 24 October 1952, pp. 4,5; 24 February 1950, p. 2; 4 March 1949, p. 1; Norris to Entzminger, 4 November 1932, Scarborough Papers.

[25]The Fundamentalist, 28 September 1934, p. 1; 7 December 1934, p. 1; 22 March 1935, p. 1; 7 January 1938, p. 2.

Norris' power considerably, enabling him to spread the influence of the fellowship which he had begun.

Norris' movement was characterized in the 1930's and 1940's by increasing bitterness and sometimes even violence. In Jonesboro, Arkansas, a factional fight over who controlled the First Baptist Church brought out the national guard. When fundamentalists led by evangelist Joe Jeffers, a cohart of Norris', were taken to City Hall, Jeffers asked for and was given permission to pray. Instead of exhibiting a kindly Christian spirit, he called for lightning to strike the mayor and a fist fight broke out. Factionalism continued in Jonesboro and a couple of years later Dale Crowley killed a man in a dispute over control of the church.[26] Other incidents of violence were reported. One of Norris' supporters wrote to him in the 1940's. (spelling and grammar are unchanged)

> On the nigt of the 15 of may these moderist burnt my grat Church just as thay did yous severarl years a go; so you can tell from that wother i am giving thim the works are not;"

Still he assured Norris

> i am for you i00% and i am fundmentliest all over. . . . the Church is going to build back as soo as we can rase the money. . . . so just wate for the hold story it is coming. . . . for i am in the fight aginst, Modernist and Communist all over this State;[27]

---

[26] Sling and Stone, 19 September 1931, p. 1, in Scarborough Papers; The Fundamentalist, 27 October 1933, p. 1.

[27] W. O. Alvis to Norris (no date, filed in 1947), Norris Papers.

Whether or not actual violence broke out, the rhetoric of the movement was certainly violent. As Norris said in condemning his opponents, "I am going to burn what is left of the spot they stand on if they don't stay in there and pitch."[28]

Norris also began trying to spread his influence overseas with the creation of the Fundamentalist Baptist Missionary Fellowship, Inc., which was organized in 1937, with a central office being established in Chicago in 1938.[29] Throughout the movement repeated accusations had been made that missionaries had sold out to the modernists, and Norris hoped to correct this situation. In the 1940's his fellowship financed the mission of John Birch, among others, to China, their major area of concern. When Birch was killed by the Communists he became a martyr to the Christian cause and Norris used his name repeatedly to buttress his crusades.[30]

In spite of increased activity and concern, Norris' group was plagued by serious internal divisions by the 1950's. Norris, always fond of power, controlled his churches and his fellowship with an iron hand. As early as 1936, John R. Rice broke his ties with Norris because of his

---

[28]Norris to Sam Morris, 6 March 1933, Scarborough Papers.

[29]The Fundamentalist, 9 April 1937, p. 1; 28 January 1938, p. 1.

[30]Ibid., 5 July 1940, p. 1; 21 January 1938, p. 1; 14 December 1945, p. 3; 21 September 1945, p.

dictatorial policies.[31] The major split in the fellowship came in 1950 between Norris and G. B. Vick, the man being groomed to take over the organization. Norris had promised repeatedly to step down but each time failed to follow through. Vick and the rebels accused their former leader of being too authoritarian, ironically attacking him on the same grounds he had used against the Southern Baptists--centralization of power. This fight, Norris' last, was one of the most bitter of his career, degenerating into a nasty personal feud. Norris, for example, accused Vick's daughter of committing adultery, exposed another adulterous affair between one of Vick's men and a cab driver's wife, and offered evidence that another of Vick's supporters had committed sodomy with a thirteen-year-old Negro boy.[32] This and similar testimony which Norris gave against his former co-workers made them appear to be a group of moral perverts rather than church leaders. Undoubtedly accusations from both sides hurt the movement, as neither side exhibited a very Christ-like spirit.

At least one important fundamentalist, Luther Peak, who had been president of the Fort Worth seminary, led his

---

[31] Ibid., 20 March 1936, p. 4.

[32] G. B. Vick to Norris, 20 December 1946; Norris to Vick, 27 May 1950; Vick to Norris, 27 May 1950; Norris to Vick, 12 June 1950 and 24 June 1950; R. O. Woodworth to Norris, 2 July 1952; Norris to Vick, 6 July 1950, Norris Papers; The American Baptist, 15 July 1950, clipping in Norris Papers.

church, the Central Church of Dallas, back into the Southern Baptist fold because of the bitterness of this feud. In explaining his return to the Southern Baptists he said, "In the Fundamentalist Movement we were usually in a fight of some kind. If we were not fighting Southern Baptists, Northern Baptists, the National Council of Churches, the Catholics, Communism or Modernism, we fought each other."[33] He asserted, "Fundamentalism made much of the machine but it would be impossible to find a more dictatorial machine than Fundamentalism itself had throughout its course."[34] Anyone or any group that criticized the leadership was maligned and misrepresented. Peak made it clear, however, that in rejoining the Southern Baptists he had rejected none of his fundamentalist theological beliefs.[35]

Since the anti-evolution crusade was the most publicized aspect of the fundamentalist movement during the 1920's, a discussion of what happened to the movement must consider its later concern with evolution. Opposition to evolutionary teaching in Texas actually never ceased. Norris, of course, never accepted the theory, and continued to oppose its being taught in public schools and colleges. Although he later concentrated on opposing Communism, he frequently

---

[33] Baptist Standard, 7 April 1956, p. 1.

[34] Ibid., 14 April 1945, p. 7.

[35] Ibid., 21 April 1956, p. 7; 28 April 1956, p. 6-7; 7 April 1965, p. 6-7

connected evolutionary teaching to communist activity.[36] Other conservative churchmen like B. A. Copass and J. B. Gambrell also continued to write and speak in opposition to the theory.[37] Nevertheless students of the movement insisted that Darrow had won a sweeping victory at Dayton and that the world had learned what evolution was all about. Fundamentalists were regarded as "a colorful fragment of an old, vanishing way of life."[38] As William Leuchenburg wrote in Perils of Prosperity, "The anti-evolutionists won the Scopes trial; yet, in a more important sense, they were defeated, overwhelmed by the tide of cosmopolitanism."[39]

Those who had reached such conclusions were undoubtedly surprised when anti-evolution again became a significant issue in the 1950's and 1960's. Since the decade of the 1920's the anti-evolution movement has taken a different course. Acquiring the support of scientists and educated men, the new movement challenged the theory on different grounds, referring more and more frequently to scientific proofs that evolution had not occurred. Although the

---

[36]Mr. and Mrs. Boyd to Norris, 20 February 1932, Norris Papers; The Fundamentalist, 3 February 1950, p. 3.

[37]Baptist Standard, 30 July 1930, p. 3; 23 January 1930, p. 3; The Baptist Message, 9 October 1952, p. 5; Copass to Mrs. O. E. Waldrip, 4 October 1938, Copass Papers.

[38]David Danzig, "The Radical Right and the Rise of the Fundamentalist Minority," Commentary 33(April 1962): 292.

[39]Leuchtenburg, Perils of Prosperity, p. 223.

majority of scientists continued to accept evolution as a working hypothesis, this vocal minority who rejected it, had attracted a significant following by the 1960's. Working to develop scientific proof that creation occurred instantaneously and disputing other scientists' calculations of the age of the earth, they identified themselves as creationists, avoiding the negative term anti-evolutionists. The new movements, like the recent developments on the political right seemed potentially more powerful than the old by the mid-1970's.[40]

During the 1930's and 1940's opponents of the anti-evolutionists had good reason to believe they had won, because opposition to evolution became less vocal and less emotional. Several factors help explain the superficial demise of the movement. By the mid-1930's the fundamentalist Baptists had formed their own groups, and in 1930 the Presbyterians divided over similar issues. In addition the already existing fundamentalist or conservative sects experienced a period of growth, undoubtedly attracting opponents of modernism from other denominations; thus, opposition to evolution subsided in part because those who believed in it had fewer opportunities to communicate with those who did not. The academic and scientific

---

[40]James R. Moore, "Evolutionary Theory and Christian Faith: A Bibliographical Guide to the Post-Darwinian Controversies," Christian Scholar's Review 4(1975): 211.

communities were happy in their comforting belief that the fundamentalists had been annihilated in the Scopes trial, and fundamentalists were satisfied to train young minds in their own institutions and explain their reasons for rejecting evolution mainly to those who agreed with them.[41]

Another reason fundamentalists became less vocal about the evolution issue was that they probably felt that they had won at least a partial victory. In 1930 Maynard Shipley contended that the majority of the nation's schools could teaching nothing that the fundamentlists disapproved.[42] Certainly local pressures continued to inhibit teachers long after the issue had ceased to cause national concern. Even more significant, however, was the trend in the writing of science textbooks for public schools after the Scopes trial. In a 1974 study of textbooks published after 1925, Judith Grabiner and Peter Miller revealed that the scientists and the press had been far too hasty in their judgement that the fundamentalists lost ground at Dayton. They discovered that in fact biology books used after the Scopes trial actually gave far less coverage to the study of evolution than books in use at the time of the trial. After 1925, they noted that the word evolution rarely appeared in the index of the public school texts and when discussed at all it was usually called simple "development." George William

---

[41]Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement, pp. 21-23.

[42]Maynard Shipley, "Growth of the Anti-Evolution Movement," Current History 32 (May 1930): 330-332.

Hunter's Civic Biology, from which Scopes taught, was revised in 1926 leaving out the most obvious references to evolution, and a sentence was inserted proclaiming that "man is the only creature that has moral and religious instinct."[43]

In 1925, Truman Moon's book Biology for Beginners, had been altered for Texas schools, but in 1926, apparently Moon and his publishers, Holt, under pressures from fundamentalists decided to change the format of the book for all regions. The portrait of Charles Darwin that had appeared in the earlier book was replaced and the word development inserted instead of evolution. In addition more religious statements reconciling science and religion were added. Moon's book was further revised in 1933, with evolution receiving even scantier treatment.[44]

The most widely used textbook in the late 1920's and one that was popular in Texas was W. M. Smallwood, I. L. Reveley, and G. A. Bailey, New Biology, later New General Biology. Since the book gave no indication that man had evolved, a Texas official remarked that it was suitable for use in Texas since it was "tactfully written" and required no revisions. In the early 1940's this book was still appearing on the adoption lists in Texas.[45]

---

[43]Judith V. Grabiner and Peter D. Miller, "Effects of the Scopes Trial: Was it a Victory for Evolutionists?" Science 185(6 September 1974): 833.

[44]Ibid., p. 834.

[45]Ibid., For Texas adoptions see Texas Education Agency, Current Adoption Textbook, 1941-1942, Bulletin 410, Austin, Texas, p. 17.

In the 1930's the text having the largest market was Arthur O. Baker and Lewis H. Mills, Dynamic Biology. Still used in Texas in the late 1940's, this book discussed evolution to some extent but concluded that the theory of Darwin "is no longer generally accepted." The authors also maintained a religious orientation to the origin and development of life. After World War II, Modern Biology, a revision of Moon's earlier work, with the aid of two additional authors, dominated the field of high school biology texts and was widely used in Texas in the 1950's and early 1960's. The word evolution did not appear in the index although it was superficially treated near the end of the volume.[46]

Grabiner and Miller attribute the scanty treatment afforded evolution in these textbooks to the fact that most of the authors were not professional biologists; in fact the scientific community expressed little concern about public school education during those years. In addition, economic pressures on publishers played an important role as the southern market was a lucrative one that publishers could not afford to lose, since states making statewide adoptions were primarily southern and west.[47] In Texas, after 1925, the textbook committee no longer needed to

---

[46]Gradiner and Miller, "Effects of the Scopes Trial," p. 835; Current Adoption Textbooks, 1959-1960, Bulletin 602, p. 33; 1960-1961, Bulletin 606, p. 33.

[47]Grabiner and Miller, "Effects of the Scopes Trial," pp. 836-837.

censor textbooks used in the public schools; the publishers were doing it for them. Fundamentalists had good reason for assuming that they had prevented the spread of evolutionary doctrine to Texas.

In addition to the limited coverage given evolution in the textbooks, three states, Tennessee, Mississippi,and Arkansas kept the anti-evolution laws on the books until the 1960's. Although no one else came to trial under them until 1966, they were not completely ignored in the intervening years. In 1946, a Mississippi college student reported learning nothing of evolution in Mississippi schools and having pages torn from a history book purchased for a college class. In 1960 an article in the Science News Letter claimed that no teacher who wanted his job taught about evolution in Tennessee.[48]

In 1966 another monkey trial was staged, this time in Arkansas. As a test of the constitutionality of the law, Susan Epperson, a young science teacher,was charged with teaching evolution. Although the United States Supreme Court eventually overturned the law and the issue no longer aroused the furor it did in 1925, the case did attract considerable attention in Arkansas. Reportedly Governor

---

[48]Vera Joset Jacobs, "Expurgation of Evolution from Textbooks in Mississippi," School and Society 63(2 February 1946): 82-83' Watson Davis, "Anti-evolution Not Dead," Science News Letter 78(13 August 1960): 103.

Orval Faubus' mail ran eight to one against overturning the law. Addressing a Baptist Sunday school class, Faubus himself expressed his belief that if evolution occurred, then the Resurrection was a myth, and he urged the judges not to repeal the Bible.[49]

In the 1950's and 1960's evolutionary teachings began to make significant inroads, and as a result opposition to them became more outspoken. In Texas it was apparent that some religious leaders had not accepted evolution. W. A. Criswell, who, as pastor of the Dallas First Baptist Church, was one of the most significant religious spokesmen in the state, delivered in 1957 a series of anti-evolution sermons. His speeches illustrated the new tendency among anti-evolutionists, as he frequently used scientific terms and endeavored to prove that science, not religion, rejected evolution. From January 13 through March 31, 1957, his sermon titles were "The Creation of Man--God or Gorilla," "The Facts of Biology Scorn Evolution," "The Facts of Embryology Repudiate the Theories of Evolution," "The Creation of Man and the Facts of Paleontology," "The Dubious Defense of Darwinism."[50]

---

[49]Sara Murphy, "Men Out of Monkeys or Monkeys Out of Men?" The New Republic 154(7 May 1966): 9-10; "Monkey Trial: 1968," Newsweek 72(25 November 1968): 36-37.

[50]W. A. Crisswell, "Text of Addresses on Evolution," typescripts on file in Texas Collection, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

In 1966 several Churches of Christ in Arlington, Texas, sponsored a series of lectures and discussions of the theory of evolution. Their speaker was Dr. H. Douglas Dean, associate professor of biology of Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, California. A man whose training was in the field of science and who was working with the California-based Creation Research Society, Dean attracted large crowds and attempted to prove the literal truth of Genesis. Although his background was impressive his arguments sounded much like those of the 1920's, and he strongly implied that the scientific community deliberatly conspired to suppress evidence that contradicted evolution.[51]

Still another conference dominated by the Creationists was held in Houston, Texas in 1968. At the annual conference of the Association for Christian Schools held at St. Thomas Episcopal School in Houston some of the leading exponents of Creationism from across the country delivered a series of papers on such topics as the flood, the origin of civilization, and the age of the world.[52] Although the evidence used in these various conferences and discussions tended to be more sophisticated than in the previous controversy,

---

[51]H. Douglas Dean, The Bible, Science and Evolution, A Series of Four Lectures (Arlington, Texas: n.p., 1966), passim. See especially pages 12-13, 15, 31, 43, 53, 74.

[52]Henry M. Morris and Others, A Symposium on Creation, (Grank Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968), passim.

the basic differences between the Creationists and evolutionists remained philosophical, as the literal interpretation of the Scriptures and the supernatural aspects of religion continued to concern conservatives deeply.[53]

By the early 1960's textbooks in use in Texas public schools, now reflecting evolutionary teachings and other doctrines that displeased the conservatives, came under bitter attack. In 1962 the state legislature agreed to investigate the books as well as the system used in adopting them. A committee held hearings in several cities. The hearings, as it turned out, only served as a sounding board for the state's conservative forces. They lambasted the books for such failings as teaching evolution, undermining the American way of life, and political system, sympathizing with Communism, favoring the United Nations, and advocating world peace. These hearings illustrated the sympathy that had developed between the radical right and fundamentalism.[54] Although little was accomplished by the hearings, they paved the way for a real storm when time for selecting textbooks came in 1964.

In that year, the American Institute of Biological Science had finally become interested in public education and developed a series of books known as the Biological

---

[53]Moore, "Evolutionary Theory and Christian Faith," p. 212.

[54]Texas Observer, 6 April 1962, p. 1; 8 June 1962, pp. 1, 3.

Sciences Curriculum Study, or BSCS tests, which gave the most advanced coverage of evolution to appear to date.[55] When the Texas textbook commission considered these books for adoption, they met with a concerted, emotional campaign in opposition to evolution. The opposition came from the pulpit, the religious press, and concerned lay men and women. The Firm Foundation, a Church of Christ publication, printed a series of articles by Rita Rose Ward, a high school biology teacher, exposing the dangers involved in adopting the new books.[56] The Texas Education Agency received a large number of letters and bills of particulars and conducted lengthy hearings on the book protests. Objections were based largely on the books' implication that man was an animal and that he had evolved, with the

---

[55]Grabiner and Miller, "Effects of the Scopes Trial," p. 836.

[56]Firm Foundation, 30 June 1964, pp. 14-15; 7 July 1964, p. 431; 14 July 1964, p. 444. The Churches of Christ present something of a problem in studying Texas fundamentalism, as they conform with some but not all of the criteria for classification as fundamentalists. For example, the basis of their belief is the literal interpretation of the Scriptures and they ardently oppose institutionalization of religion, yet they reject premillennialism. The denomination figured little in the controversy of the 1920's being small and in relative agreement concerning the issues. By the 1960's the denomination had grown to approximately 400,000 members in the state, and some of its members became involved in the anti-evolution and anti-communist struggles. Lacking central organization, the church states no official policy; thus evaluating its role is difficult.

Bible being frequently cited to disprove evolution.[57] Obviously many Texans who were educated in the public schools after the Scopes trial had received little evolutionary indoctrination. The BSCS books were adopted at that time, but public pressure opposing them continued.

In 1974, the anti-evolutionists' crusade experienced some success when the Texas State Board of Education adopted a resolution requiring that evolution be taught only as a theory. It reads:

> (5) Textbooks that treat the theory of evolution should identify it as only one of several explanations of the origins of humankind and avoid limiting young people in their search for meanings of their human existence.
>
> (5-1) Textbooks presented for adoption which treat the subject of evolution substantively in explaining the historical origins of man shall be edited, if necessary, to clarify that the treatment is theoretical rather than factually verifiable. Furthermore, each textbook must carry a statement on an introductory page that any material on evolution included in the book is clearly presented as a theory rather than verified.
>
> (5-2) Textbooks presented for adoption which do not treat evolution substantively as an instructional topic, but made reference to evolution indirectly or by implication, must be modified, if necessary, to insure that the reference is clearly to a theory

---

[57] Texas Education Agency, Textbook Division, Protests and Statements on Certain Textbooks Being Considered for Adoption in 1964 (Austin: TSTA, 1964), passim. An Example of the nature of protests in Joe Betsy Allred to the State Textbook Committee, 4 September 1964, pp. 1-5, but the volume is filled with similar protests.

> and not a verified fact. These books will not need to carry a statement on the introductory page.[58]

Apparently in the 1970's the Texas Board of Education was about to become involved again in editing textbooks.

Other states have also experienced recent controversy over textbook adoption. The most obvious and serious example is the storm raging in West Virginia, where parents have rebelled, sometimes violently, over teachings that challenge their beliefs.[59] In California, opponents of evolution experienced some success in 1970, when the state board of education amended their policies to require that the Bible and other accounts that differ with science be included in the science curriculum. Since California is an important market for textbook publishers, the ruling will undoubtedly affect the writing of many textbooks.[60] In 1973 the Tennessee state legislature passed a law specifically requiring that the Genesis account of creation be given equal consideration with scientific accounts. Although a United States court of Appeals declared the law unconstitutional in the spring of 1974, observing that the

---

[58]Texas Education Agency, Policies of the Texas State Board of Education, 1974, Policy 3331.3.

[59]John Egerton, "The Battle of the Books," The Progressive 39(June 1975): 13-17.

[60]Rebecca Larsen, "California's Evolution War, Should Genesis Get Equal Time?" Time 87(25 February 1970): 251-252.

purpose of the law was the same as that of the 1925 law, its passage illustrated the strength of the Creationist movement.[61]

The most significant and enduring preoccupation of Texas fundamentalists since the 1920's has been the growth of Communism, socialism, and collectivism in general. Their concern with Communism was in part an outgrowth of their preoccupation with modernism of the earlier period and in some ways a logical continuation of the earlier crusade. In fact, many fundamentalists saw communism as the ultimate development of modernism, which they had already identified as materialist and agnostic. Even in the 1920's some fundamentalists, such as W. B. Reilly, had identified evolution and modernism as being part of the Communist conspiracy to take over the United States.[62] Norris identified Communism and evolution as two sides of the same coin, since both believed that men came from beasts and died like beasts. He contended, "These modernists [are] just like Communists--and that's where modernism leads, toward the camp of Communism, like Lot toward Sodom."[63] Edgar Bundy, organizer of the Christian Crusade and one of

---

[61]"Fundamental Setback for Fundamentalists," Science 188(2 May 1975): 428.

[62]Riley, Inspiration or Evolution, pp. 57, 91, 91-110.

[63]J. Frank Norris, Americanism, An Address to the Texas Legislature (Fort Worth, Texas: Seminary Bible and Book House, n.d.), p. 25; The Fundamentalist, 3 February 1950, p. 3.

the most vocal leaders of the radical right, claimed, "Communism and Theological Modernism are as One!"[64]

In part the fundamentalists' fear of communism and collectivism can be traced to their distrust of institutionalism in general. Being intensely individualistic, they feared being dictated to by forces outside their control. The same frame of mind that caused them to resist central control of the denominations led them to fear centralized government control. At times their hatred of Washington and distrust of the United States government seemed almost to equal their hatred and fear of foreign foes.[65] Thus the anti-Communist development within the fundamentalist movement, beginning in the 1930's and 1940's and reaching fever pitch in the 1950's, was related to the fundamentalist-modernist controversy of the 1920's and motivated by the same kind of fear. Fundamentalists felt that they were losing their grip on the country and on their own lives--in the 1920's to the modernists and scientists, after that decade to the Communists.

Much of the fundamentalist crusade against communism can be explained as a manifestation of the fundamentalist

---

[64]Quoted in Thomas John Ferris, "The Religious Right: A Study in American Religious Fundamentalism," M. A. Thesis, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1963, p. 69.

[65]"Love, Hatred, and Politics," Christian Century 80 (20 November 1963): 1423-1424.

mind-set. Fundamentalism is primarily a manner of looking at life and the world; it is a state of mind which interprets the world in terms of absolutes. Fundamentalist leaders tended to conceive of themselves as God's prophets and defenders of the one and only absolute truth. Once they had set themselves up as prophets, anything or anyone who opposed them or their point of view was attacking God's truth. This attitude made them susceptible to the conspiracy interpretation of history. The mind of a prophet is almost of necessity paranoid,because prophets are obviously the most likely targets of the forces of evil and the first that Satan seeks to destroy.

No matter what evil the fundamentalists were fighting, whether it was liquor, Sunday movies, Biblical criticism, denominationalism, machine politics, evolution, or Communism, their opponents were labeled conspirators. The mortal prophets never believed that they would win the struggle against Satan themselves; final victory would come only with the second coming, but they had to continue the fight, maintaining a constant vigil until the end, taking care never to compromise with evil. Since they interpreted the world in terms of a constant struggle between good and evil, they had no choice but to oppose with a vengeance all that they considered to be connected with the forces of evil.[66]

---

[66]The Fundamentalist, 22 June 1934, p. 1; James E. Conant, The Church, the Schools, and Evolution, p. 79; Danzig, "The Radical Right," p. 292.

As Carol McIntire, founder of the Twentieth Century Reformation, explained,

> Whereever issues are drawn between opposing sides, there are always those who desire compromise and a middle course. . . . But where one of the sides in the conflict has the eternal truth as is the case of those of us who embrace the great doctrines of the historic Christian faith, to compromise in the slightest is to dishonor and destroy the faith.[67]

When he left fundamentalism, Luther Peak described the fundamentalist view in this way, "Fundamentalism supposes itself to be right doctrinally. Therefore people who are not aligned under its banner are wrong. Therefore any steps that Fundamentalism may take to gather disciples out from under the banner of others and assemble them under its own banner are right." They believed, he claimed, that "It is right to do wrong to do right."[68] Fundamentalists accepted the Bible and historic Christianity as permanent and unchanging; applying this fixed attitude to the political and economic principles of the United States as the ultimate Zion was an easy process and any efforts to alter those principles were compared to Satan's efforts to destroy the Bible. Thus in the minds of many fundamentalists, politics

---

[67]H. A. and Bonaro Overstreet, The Strange Tactics of Extremism (New York: Norton, 1964), p. 98.

[68]Baptist Standard, 21 April 1956, p. 6-7.

and religion became inextricably mixed, as they gave significant support to the rise of the political right.[69]

The anti-communist movement did not reach its peak until the 1950's and 1960's, but Norris and his followers were among the first religionists to discern a massive communist conspiracy. As early as 1935, Norris' Detroit church held anti-Communist rallies and his newspaper announced a nationwide campaign against Communism.[70] In this new campaign Norris aroused his followers by connecting the crusade to some of his earlier causes. Especially effective was his tactic of relating communism to the final struggle and the second coming, using sermons with titles such as, "The World-Wide Sweep of Russian Communism and its Relation to the Second Coming."[71]

Norris, also among the first of the Protestant leaders to express the belief that Communism was infiltrating American churches, directed much of his anti-Communist activity toward "saving" the Protestant denominations from Soviet domination. Early in the 1930's he began to warn that the two great centers of Communist activity were the

---

[69]Erling Jorstad, The Politics of Doomsday: Fundamentalists of the Far Right (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), pp. 23-24; Ferris, "The Religious Right," p. 10; Danzig, "The Radical Right," p. 292.

[70]The Fundamentalist, 12 July 1935, p. 1; 19 July 1935, p. 1.

[71]Ibid., 24 April 1931, p. 1; 18 December 1953, pp. 4-5.

denominational headquarters and the universities, contending that the Communists were "honeycombing" the churches.[72] His early fears sprang from his observations during the depression years of the denominations' increased concern with social issues. Always having opposed social gospelism, he now became convinced that tendencies in that direction were inspired by Communism. When the Southern Baptists established a social service board, for example, he identified it as a Communist organization.[73]

One of the Texas fundamentalists' earliest specific charges of Communist infiltration came in 1932,when Kirby Page, editor of The World Tomorrow, delivered the commencement address at Baylor. A. Reilly Copeland, with the support of Norris, led the exposure of Page's beliefs and activites. According to Copeland, Page was guilty of "evolution, infidelity, modernism, atheism, bolshevism, communism."[74] Norris branded him an "International Red Communist and atheist." Page had, it was revealed, defended Russia and advocated world peace, a Red tactic to enable the Communists to take over the world. Admitting that Page had given his address in Christian terms, the fundamentalists believed that it was poisoned nevertheless.[75]

---

[72]Norris, Inside History, p. 217.

[73]The Fundamentalist, 24 May 1935, p. 3.

[74]Tabernacle Voice, February 1933, p. 1, in Scarborough Papers.

[75]The Fundamentalist, 8 April 1932, p. 1; 3 June 1932, p.1.

Probably Page's most serious offense was his advocacy of racial equality. The Fundamentalist printed a huge picture of a Negro, Ethelred Brown, identifying him as Kirby Page's "right hand man." A former Baylor student testified that Page had endorsed interracial marriage, and indeed a miscegenous marriage had reportedly occurred on his staff.[76]

The subject of racial equality and especially of interracial marriage was an explosive issue with Texans, and one about which fundamentalists continued to express concern. The fundamentalist mind supported the status quo and tended to identify forces for change of any kind with that half of the world that was evil. With their tendency to lump all evil forces together, they identified the civil rights movement and all demands for racial equality as a part of the Communist conspiracy. Norris warned that under Soviet rule white girls would marry Negroes.[77] Copeland charged in 1956 that the Communists, who were behind the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, were trying to mix the blood of Americans so that "there will be no superior race."[78] When several prominent Southern Baptists, including Dr. Thomas Maston of Southwestern

---

[76]Ibid., 30 September 1932, p. 1; 27 May 1932, p. 1.

[77]Ibid., 24 September 1948, p. 1; Norris to Sandifer, 9 April 1932, Scarborough Papers.

[78]A. Reilly Copeland, "Black Heart or Red Signal," typescript in Capeland Papers.

Baptist Theological Seminary, supported integration and social equality for the Negro, they became targets of bitter abuse from the fundamentalists and were accused of being Communists.[79] This intense opposition to racial integration stemmed from the fundamentalist attitude that they alone were defending the true faith, and thus any doctrine or any individual opposing them must be working for Satan, who was currently trying to destroy truth through Communism.

Norris and other fundamentalists were especially concerned with the development of interdenominational organizations through which the churches cooperated with each other in dealing with social issues and problems. Norris interpreted such cooperation as a trend toward collectivism. The World Baptist Alliance, an attempt to unite Baptist effort, concerned Norris with its modernist tendencies, especially since George Truett served as president of the organization. Through it, Norris warned, modernism and socialism would capture the Southern Baptist Convention.[80] Of even greater concern to fundamentalists was the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Formed in 1908 as an attempt to unite Christian efforts, the FCC had expressed an abiding concern with social issues,

---

[79]Interview with Dr. Thomas Maston, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, July 11, 1974.

[80]Norris, Inside History, p. 3; "Voice of Frank Norris, Extra," 11 May 1934, p. 1.

especially during the Depression years. This concern led fundamentalists to identify the council as a Communist organization.[81]

In 1936, an effort was made to join the Southern Baptist with the Federal Council of Churches. Norris immediately launched a campaign against it so bitter that the FCC threatened him with a libel suit.[82] Contending that the FCC was connected with Moscow and a part of the conspiracy to overthrow the gospel and ultimately the United States government, he preached sermons with titles like, "Sovietizing America through the Churches," while calling the FCC the most "sinister and sensational conspiracy of all time."[83] When the Southern Baptist rejected the FCC, Norris lauded the move as a return to New Testament Evangelism.[84]

When the Federal Council of Churches expanded into the National Council of Churches in 1950, it attracted more Protestant denominations, and the fundamentalists, even more concerned about the growth of collectivism, also labeled it as a Communist organization. Over thirty

---

[81]Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement, p. 10; Ralph Lord Roy, Communism and the Churches (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1960), p. 231.

[82]The Fundamentalist, 29 November 1936, p. 1; 4 December 1936, p. 3; 1 May 1936, p. 1; 20 March 1936, p. 1; 27 March 1936, p. 1.

[83]Ibid., 22 May 1936, p. 3; 17 April 1936, p. 1.

[84]Norris, Inside History, p. 131; The Fundamentalist, 2 June 1939, p. 1; 22 May 1936, p. 1.

denominations affiliated with the National Council, but the Southern Baptist and the Missouri Synod Lutherans, along with numerous fundamentalists and separatist groups, refused to affiliate. One liberal churchman contended, "The radical right is trying to harass, intimidate and silence the social gospel. . . . It hopes to frighten the clergy into turning their backs on controversial public issues." One means of accomplishing this was by attacking the National Council of Churches.[85]

In the fundamentalist mind still another example of Communist intrusions into religion came in 1952 with the publication of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. Thirty-two scholars worked about twenty years on various manuscripts to correct errors and revise the Bible by using modern English. Since the National Council of Churches published the Revised Version, fundamentalists were likely to reject it no matter how accurate it was. When the revised text failed to substantiate some of their doctrinal assumptions, they launched a bitter campaign against it. Most of their objections centered around the substitution of the words "young girl" for "virgin" in Isaiah's description of Mary. Fundamentalists argued that this change was part of the conspiracy to destroy belief

---

[85]Louis Cassels, "The Rightist Crisis in Our Churches," Look 24(24 April 1962)L 40.

in the virgin birth and ultimately to deny the divinity of Jesus. In typical fundamentalist fashion they were not content merely to call the translation inaccurate or to attack it on logical or scholarly grounds; instead they insisted that it too was a part of the communist conspiracy, a direct attack upon the Scriptures intended to shake the people's faith. Copeland was active in the opposition to the new translation, using radio broadcasts, as well as his pulpit and newspaper,to present his case. When his broadcasts were canceled he claimed that the communists had put him off the air because of his campaign against the Revised Standard Version.[86]

The fundamentalists also continued their attacks on individuals sympathetic to the social gospel or who expressed sympathy with the Russians. In the worried mind of the fundamentalists it was easy to find Communism almost everywhere, and a minor error or careless statement could result in one's being labeled a Communist. One of the most emotional and colorful fundamentalist attacks was the opposition to Louie Newton, president of the Southern Baptist Association. In the 1940's Newton travelled in Russian and made some kind comments about the Soviets. He supported aid to Russia

---

[86]Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement, pp. 71-74; Baptist Bible Tribune, 10 September 1954, p. 1, in Copeland Papers.

and commented favorable on the progress of religious liberty there. As a result he was accused of being "soft" on communism, while Norris insisted that he was "stewed in Communism."[87] In 1947 Norris disrupted the Southern Baptist Convention meeting in St. Louis when he tried to get the floor to expose Newton's heresy. Although the chair refused to recognize him, he insisted on telling his story anyway until delegates began singing hymns to drown him out.[88] Other fundamentalists joined in the attacks on Newton, and he announced that he would not seek another term as convention president. Still the fundamentalists were not satisfied but insisted unsuccessfully that the convention officially repudiate their president.[89]

Just as in the 1920's Norris felt compelled to fight modernism and evolution in the secular as well as the religious realm, he also participated in the secular anti-communist campaigns. He identified three important groups that were rapidly coming under control of the Communists--clergymen, labor unions, and professors.[90] He attacked state-supported as well as religious colleges, with the

---

[87]The Fundamentalist, 23 August 1946, p. 1; 4 April 1947, p. 1; 13 September 1946, p. 1.

[88]St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 7 May 1947; in file on J. Frank Norris, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

[89]The Fundamentalist, 12 March 1948, p. 1.

[90]Norris, Americanism, p. 16.

University of Texas being one of his favorite targets. Assuming that college teachers, whom he described as "pink," were Communists unless they proved otherwise, he attacked acedemic freedom as being a disguise for Communist infiltration.[91]

In 1949 he addressed the state legislature, suggesting that all state funds be withheld from colleges and universities until they were purged of Communists, while accusing the United State government of surrendering to the Communists at Yalta and Teheran and of selling out China to the Communists. A sociology graduate student from the University of Texas interrupted Norris' speech with accusations that he was attacking all liberal groups, and the Daily Texan, student newspaper at the University of Texas, insulted him. Norris, however, forced the newspaper to retract its statements and took credit when the state legislature responded to his scare tactics and pressure from other sources by passing a resolution denouncing Russia, calling for a European federation, and asking for the dismissal of all federal employees who condoned Communism.[92]

Norris identified secular as well as religious organizations as Communist, contending that the American Civil

---

[91]The Fundamentalist, 5 January 1940, p. 1; 10 June 1932, p. 1; Norris, Infidelity Among Southern Baptists, p. 64; Norris, Americanism, p. 17.

[92]The Fundamentalist, 6 May 1949, p. 12; 20 May 1949, p. 1; 13 May 1949, p. 3. Norris, Americanism is the published form of this address.

Liberties Union was the leading Communist organization in the country. Even more disturbing to Norris was the increasing strength of the labor movement in the United States. He condemned radical labor leaders, claimed that the CIO was directed by Communists, and accused John L. Lewis of conspiring to take over the government.[93] Norris' and other fundamentalists' concern with labor organizations undoubtedly stemmed from their emphasis on individualism and fear of centralized control. Thus any movement or organization directed toward united rather than individual action was labeled Communistic or socialistic. Since such groups threatened the status quo,they must be evil.

The anti-Communist and radical right movements of the post-World War II era were caused by a variety of forces and supported by people who had never been fundamentalist. It would certainly be unfair and overly simplistic to attribute such a varied and complicated movement as the rise of the radical right entirely to the fundamentalists, but in Texas at least many fundamentalists have given important support and impetus to the movement. They have helped supply it with a philosophical basis, and their portrayal of the world in terms of absolute good versus absolute evil helped set the frame of mind for the political

---

[93]Norris, Inside History, p. 217; The Fundamentalist, 22 January 1937, p. 1; 10 January 1947, p. 1; 7 May 1937, p. 1.

right even when the religious motivation was missing. Frequently the political activists behind the radical right emphasized religious issues. John Stormer in his polemical book, None Dare Call it Treason, for example, identified the social gospellers as the originators of the collectivist movement, contending, "This disintegration of the basic tenets of Christianity is the outgrowth of modernists theologicans who deny the divine inspiration of the Bible." He argued, "God could not be replaced by Government as the source of all blessings until moral concepts were first blurred."[94] Martin Dies, the Texas who headed the House Committee on Un-American Activities, warned: "The irreconcilable conflict between the teaching of Christ and Marx is the issue upon which the future of western civilization is staked."[95]

In the 1950's and 1960's religious fundamentalism seemd to be merging with political fundamentalism to become once again an organized and aggressive movement. Emotional national leaders like Billy James Hargis, Edgar Bundy, and Fred Schwarz bridged the gap between secular and religious right and organized Christian crusading groups to oppose Communism and support the political right.[96]

---

[94]John Stormer, None Dare Call it Treason (Florissant, Missouri: Liberty Bell Press, 1964), pp. 131, 124.

[95]Quoted in William Gellerman, Martin Dies, (New York: The John Day Company, 1944), p. 5.

[96]Jorstad, Politics of Doomsday, pp. 69-76.

In the early 1960's these organizations became a significant force in Texas. In 1960 Houston was one of the four organizational centers of Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communism Crusade. W. P. Strube Jr., president of Mid-American Life Insurance Company, was the state's most active organizer and speaker in behalf of the movement. Strube, who was an officer on the Board of Directors of the Crusade, boasted that his Houston office had one of the largest libraries in the country of pro-American and anti-communist material. With "all the vigor of the sunrise evangelical revival" the crusade presented "Freedom Forums" in Dallas, Austin, Abilene, and San Antonio, attracting considerable attention and support across the state. The tactic of this organization was to fuse Christian goals and rhetoric with anti-communism.[97] A similar organization called Christian Citizens organized a chapter in Dallas in 1962. The avowed purpose of this group was to forge the people who "have had a personal experience with Christ" and who accepted the Bible as infallible into voting blocks in local precincts. Their goal was to infuse religion into politics and acquire power by working at the local level.[98]

The new fundamentalist movement shifted from the middle- or lower-class "forks of the creek" boys that followed

---

[97] Texas Observer, 30 December 1960, pp. 1, 3.

[98] Danzig, "The Radical Right," p. 291.

Norris to the upper middle class and wealthy industrialists. It was no longer a rural movement and consequently had more sophistication, thus becoming potentially more powerful, in appealing to religious conservatives and in reflecting their biases against economic and political change.[99]

Far from being a dead issue, the fundamentalist movement with its long and powerful history in Texas, continues to exert influence within the state. The movement's foundations rest on the state's revivalistic heritage and on the nature of Texas Protestantism with its emphasis on individual regeneration. Although in the 1970's the Texas fundamentalist was more likely to live in a city or small town than on a farm, he was heir to the fundamentalist tradition. He was not defending precisely the same values as his 1925 antecedent, but his approach remained similar, nevertheless. Continuing to resist and fear change, he frequently discerned an evil conspiracy at work to destroy the values that he held dear. The tendency to view the world in terms of good versus evil remained a significant aspect of the fundamentalist point of view, whether he was battling evolution or communism.

The controversy of the 1920's had a significant impact on later developments in both fundamentalist and modernist

---

[99]Ibid., pp. 293-294.

camps. The bitterness of the discussions and accusations from both sides during that decade contributed to the failure of science and religion to develop a meaningful dialogue. Both factions retreated into themselves and not only failed to work out a compromise but practically ceased communicating with each other. Certainly all the virtues were not on one side and all the vices on the other; both science and religion had much to offer the modern world but the bitterness of the dispute convinced many on both sides that all hope was lost for their opponents. While some scientists decided that religion was hopelessly tied to the past and hampered by ignorance and superstition, fundamentalists decided that most scientists were doomed to hell anyway. The controversy of the 1920's contributed to the mind-set in both camps, and by the 1970's the distance between the two groups had widened.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Manuscript Collections

Address by President L. R. Scarborough to Student Body, April 24, 1942. Unfiled typescript. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

Austin Bible Society Records. Correspondence, 1924-1935. University of Texas Archives. Austin, Texas.

Baptist Scrapbook. University of Texas Archives. Austin, Texas.

Barker, Eugene C. Papers. University of Texas Archives. Austin, Texas.

Bell, R. E. Papers. Texas Historical Collection of Baylor University. Waco, Texas.

Brooks, Samuel Palmer. Papers. Texas Historical Collection of Baylor University. Waco, Texas.

Burleson, Rufus. Papers. Texas Historical Collection of Baylor University. Waco, Texas.

Carroll, B. H. Papers. Texas Historical Collection of Baylor University. Waco, Texas.

Copas, B. A. Papers. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

Copeland, A. Reilly. Papers. Texas Historical Collection of Baylor University. Waco, Texas.

Crisswell, W. A. "Text of Addresses on Evolution," Typescript on file in Texas Historical Collection of Baylor University. Waco, Texas.

Cummings, Williams F. Papers. University of Texas Archives. Austin, Texas.

File on Evolution Controversy. Texas Historical Collection of Baylor University. Waco, Texas.

File on Fundamentalism. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

File on J. Frank Norris. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

Lyon, E. F. Papers. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

McAllister, Frederick. Papers. University of Texas Archives. Austin, Texas.

Meroney, William Penn. Papers. Texas Historical Collection of Baylor University. Waco, Texas.

Minutes of the Austin Bible Society, 1904-1935. University of Texas Archives. Austin, Texas.

Moore, John. Papers. Bridwell Library. Southern Methodist University. Dallas, Texas.

Morris, Sam. "Address Over KTAT." Fort Worth, Texas, 1931. Unfiled typescript on file Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

Mouzon, Edwin. Papers. Bridwell Library. Southern Methodist University. Dallas, Texas.

Norris, J. Frank. Papers. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

Reminiscences of D. T. A. Warton. Sherman, Texas. Typescript. University of Texas Archives. Austin, Texas.

Scarborough, Lon R. Papers. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

Tarrant County Baptist Executive Board Refuses Membership to Board Members of Berry Street Fundamentalist Baptist Church. Unfiled typescript. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

Texas Academy of Science Record Book. University of Texas Archives. Austin, Texas.

Truett, George W. Papers. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fort Worth, Texas.

Public Documents and Official Records

Texas Almanac. 1910-1973.

Texas. Education Agency. Current Adoption Textbooks.

Texas. Education Agency. Policies of the Texas State Board of Education, 1974, Policy 3 331. 3.

Texas. Education Agency. Textbook Division. Protests and Statements on Certain Textbooks Being Considered for Adoption in 1964. Austin: TSTA, 1964.

Texas. Legislature. H. B. No. 90. "A Bill to be Entitled an act making it unlawful for any teacher . . . to teach as a fact that mankind evolved from a lower order of animals . . . ." Typed copy, Legislative Library, Austin, Texas.

Texas. Legislature. H. B. No. 97. "A Bill to be Entitled an act prohibiting the teaching of evolution . . . ." Typed copy, Legislative Library, Austin, Texas.

Texas. Legislature. H. B. No. 378. "A Bill to be Entitled an act prohibiting the teaching of evolution in any of its phases . . . ." Typed copy. Legislative Library, Austin, Texas.

Texas. Legislature. House. Journal. 38th-41st Legislatures. 1923-1929.

Texas. Legialature. Senate. Journal. 38th-41st Legislatures. 1923-1929.

Church Documents and Records

Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas (meeting place varies), 1920-1929. n.p.: n.p., n.d.

"The Case Against the Reverand Lee W. Heaton." Prepared by John D. Covert, Senior Warden, and Austin F. Anderson, Junior Warden, of Fort Worth Trinity Church. Pamphlet. Episcopalian Archives, Austin, Texas.

Journal of (the 55th-64th annual sessions) of the Central Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (meeting place varies), 1920-1929. n. p.: n. p., n. d.

Journal of (the 54th-63rd annual sessions) of the North Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (meeting place varies), 1920-1929. n. p.: n. p., n.d.

Journal of (the 11th-20th annual sessions) of the Northwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (meeting place varies), 1920-1929. N. p.: n. p., n. d.

Journal of (the 81st-90th annual sessions) of the Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (meeting place varies), 1920-1929. N. p.: n. p., n. d.

Journal of (the 65th-75th Annual Sessions) of the Presbyterian Church of the U. S., 1920-1930. N. p.: n. p., n. d.

Journal of (the 62nd-70th annual sessions) of the West Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (meeting place varies), 1920-1929. N. p.: n. p., n. d.

Luthern Church Papers. University of Texas Archives. Austin, Texas.

Minutes of the Synod of Texas Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (meeting place varies), 1920-1930.

Minutes of the Presbyterian Educational Association of the South, 1920-1930. N. p.: n. p., n. d.

Memoirs and Interviews

Bryan, William Jennings. The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan. Chicago: John C. Winston Company. 1925.

Boaz, Hiram A. Eighty-Four Golden Years. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1951.

Dawson, Joseph Martin. Oral Memoirs. Religion and Culture Project. Baylor University Program for Oral History, 1972.

_____. A Thousand Months to Remember: An Autobiography. Waco: Baylor University Press, 1964.

Maston, Thomas. Interview, July 11, 1974. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

Moore, John. Life and I or Sketches and Comments. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1948.

Books and Pamphlets

Brann, William Cowper. Brann: The Iconoclast, A Collection of the Writings of W. C. Brann. Comp. J. D. Shaw. 2 vols. Waco, Texas: Knight Printing Co., 1898-1903.

Bryan, William Jennings. In His Image. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1922.

Carnell, Edward J. The Case for Orthodox Theology. Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1959.

Cobb, George T. Modernism vs. Bible Christianity. N. p.: n. p., 1955.

Conant, James E. The Church, the Schools, and Evolution. Chicago: the Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1922.

Dean, H. Douglass. The Bible, Science and Evolution, A Series of Four Lectures. Arlington, Texas: n. p., 1966.

Entzminger, Louis. The J. Frank Norris I have Known for 34 Years. N. p.: n. p., n. d.

Fosdick, Harry Emerson. Christianity and Progress. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1922.

The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth. Compliments of Two Christian Gentlemen [Lyman and Milton Stewart]. 12 vols. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company, 1909-1915.

Gambrell, J. B. Ten Years in Texas. Dallas: Baptist Standard, 1909.

Gatewood, Willard B. Jr., ed. Controversy in the Twenties, Fundamentalism, Modernism, and Evolution. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969.

Glick, Thomas R., ed. and comp. Darwinism in Texas: An Exhibition in the Texas Historical Center, April 1972. Austin: Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, 1972.

Hayden, S. A. The Complete Conspiracy Trial Book, Being an Historical, Philosophical, Ethical and Judicial Analysis of Eleven Baptist Lawsuits in Texas. Dallas: Texas Baptist Publishing House, 1907.

Lane, Henry Higgins. Evolution and the Christian Faith. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1923.

McCann, Alfred. God or Gorilla? New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1922.

Machen, John Gresham. Christianity and Liberalism. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1923.

Martin, Thomas Theodore. The Dawson Norris Issue, J. M. Dawson and Modernism: The Inside of the Cup Turned Out. Jackson, Tennessee: McCowat-Mercer Ptg. Company, 1932.

Mathews, Shailer. The Faith of Modernism. New York: MacMillan, 1924.

Morris, Henry M. and Others. A Symposium on Creation. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968.

Norris, J. Frank. Americanism, An Address to the Texas Legislature. Fort Worth, Texas: Seminary Bible and Book House, n. d.

_____. The Gospel of Dynamite. N. p.: n. p., n. d.

_____. Infidelity Among Southern Baptists, Endorsed by Highest Officials. N. p.: n. p., n. d.

_____. The Inside History of the First Baptist Church. Fort Worth: N. p.: n. p., n. d.

_____. Inside the Cup or My 21 Years in Fort Worth, Norris-Martin Debates. N. p.: n. p., 1932.

_____. Norris-Wallace Debate. Fort Worth: The Fundamentalist Publishing Company, 1935.

Rice, John. The Old Testament in the Life of Today. New York: MacMillan Company, 1920.

Riley, William Bell. Inspiration or Evolution. Cleveland: Union Gospel Press, 1926.

Scarborough, Lon R. A Modern School of the Prophets. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1939.

Shipley, Maynard. The War on Modern Science, A Short History of the Fundamentalist Attacks on Evolution and Modernism. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1927.

Smith, Hilnie Shelton, Robert Handy, Lefferts Loetsher, eds. American Christianity, An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents, 1820-1960. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.

Stormer, John. None Dare Call It Treason. Florissant, Missouri: Liberty Bell Press, 1964.

Newspapers and Periodicals

Abilene Reporter. 1925.

The American Mercury. 1924-1929.

Austin Statesman. 1920-1929.

Baptist Standard, (Dallas). 1890-1970.

Christian Courier, (Fort Worth). 1890-1935.

Corpus Christi Caller. 1925.

Dallas Morning News. 1920-1929; 1964.

El Paso Times. 1923, 1925.

Firm Foundation, (Austin). 1890-1900; 1920-1930; 1960-1970.

Fort Worth Record Telegram. 1925, 1929.

The Fundamentalist, (Fort Worth). 1917-1952.

Gilmer Daily Mirror. 1923, 1925, 1929.

Graham Leader. 1925.

The Houston Post Dispatch. 1924, 1925.

Iconoclast, (Waco). 1896-1898.

Lubbock Morning Avalanche. 1925.

New York Times. 1920-1929.

San Antonio Express. 1923, 1925.

The Skiff, (Fort Worth). 1923-1930.

Texas Christian Advocate, 1890-1960.

The Texas Observer. 1950-1970.

Texas Outlook. 1920-1929.

Tyler Daily Courier-Times. 1920-1929.

Waco News-Tribune. 1923, 1925.

Articles

Allen, Harbour. "The Anti-Evolution Campaign in America." Current History, 24(September 1926): 893-897.

"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Appalling Conditions Revealed by Churchman Survey." The Churchman 129 (3 May 1924): 10-11, 26, 28.

"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Bishop Moore and Mr. Heaton." The Churchman 129(24 May 1924): 16-18, 25.

"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Fundamentalism in the Diocese of Dallas," The Churchman 129(7 June 1924): 15-16.

"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: The Ku Klux Kaln and Mr. Heaton." The Churchman 129 (31 May 1924): 12-13.

"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: Mr Heaton's Work and Character." The Churchman 129(14 June 1924): 15-20.

"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: The Rev. J. Frank Norris and Mr. Heaton," The Churchman 129(17 May 1924): 13-15.

"Along the Battlefront in Dallas: St. John's Mission Opposes Trinity Parish." The Churchman 129(10 May 1924): 10-12.

Anderson, Nels. "The Shooting Parson of Texas." The New Republic 48(September 1926): 35-37.

"Banishing Evolution in the South." The Literary Digest 89(3 April 1926): 30.

"Bishop Moore Forces Trial for Heresy in Dallas Diocese." The Churchman 129(22 December 1923): 24-25.

"Bishop Moore Writes to Correct Press," The Churchman 129(19 January 1924): 27.

Brooks, Samuel P. "Concerning Evolution in Baylor University." The Baylor Bulletin 26(December, 1923): 1-10.

Bryan, William Jennings. "The Fundamentals." The Forum, 70(July 1923): 1665-1680.

"The Case of Evolution," Christian Advocate 86(31 July 1925): 1060.

Canales, J. T. "Science Versus Christian Education," The Presbyterian of the South 98(30 April 1924): 2-3.

Cassels, Louis. "The Rightist Crisis in Our Churches," Look 24(24 April 1962): 40.

"Christianity and our Soldiers," Southwestern Journal of Theology 2(April 1918): 3-7.

Conklin, Edwin Grant and Henry Fairfield Osborn. "The Proposed Suppression of the Teaching of Evolution," Science 60(10 March 1922): 264-266.

Copass, B. A. "The Evangelistic Call of the Army." Southwestern Journal of Theology. 2(July 1918): 36-42.

"Creationism," Scientific American 224(January 1971): 46-47.

David, Watson. "Antievolution Not Dead," Science News Letter 78(13 August 1960): 103.

Dawson, Joseph Martin. "Religion Down South," Christian Century 47(25 June 1930): 811-813.

DeFord, Miriam Allen. "The War Against Evolution." The Nation 120(20 May 1925): 564-565.

Denham, "The Fall of Man," Southwestern Journal of Theology 6(January 1922): 23-27.

Editorial, Southwestern Journal of Theology 3(April 1919): 3-6.

Egerton, John. "The Battle of the Books," The Progressive 39(June 1975): 13-17.

"End of the Monkey War," Scientific American 220(February 1969): 15-21.

Evans, Hiram Wesley. "The Klan's Fight for Americanism." The North American Review 223(March, April, May, 1926): 3-63.

Frick, Philip L. "Why the Methodist Church is so Little Disturbed by the Fundamentalist Controversy," Methodist Review 107(May, 1924):422-426.

"Fundamentalist Revival." Christian Century 74(19 June 1957):749-751.

"Fundamental Setback for Fundamentalists." Science 188 (2 May 1975):428.

Gibson, George M. Jr. "An Inquisition in the South." The Churchman 132(11 July 1925):13.

Hartt, Rollin Lynde. "The War in the Churches, The Great Split in the Protestant Denominations." World's Work 46(September 1923):469-477.

Hearn, Arnold W. "Fundamentalist Renaiscance." Christian Century 75(30 April 1958):528-530.

Horton, Walter M. "The New Orthodoxy," American Scholar 7(Winter 1938):3-11.

"In Darkest Dallas." The Churchman 129(3 May 1924):8.

Jacobs, Vera Joset. "Expurgation of Evolution from Text-books in Mississippi." School and Society 63(2 February 1946):82-83.

"The Ku Klux Klan and Mr. Heaton." The Churchman 129(31 May 1924):12-13.

Larson, Rebecca. "California's Evolution War; Should Genesis Get Equal Time?" Time 87(25 February 1970):251-252.

"Lee Heaton Resigns: The Correspondence." The Churchman 130(26 December 1925):10-13.

"Legislation to Suppress Truth." Science, 60(17 March 1922): 292.

"Love, Hatred and Politics." Christian Century 80(20 November 1963):1423-1424.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. "Anti-Evolution Laws and the Principle of Religious Neutrality," School and Society 50(2 February 1929): 132-138.

Mabie, Henry C. "Current Unvelied: Its Root and Remedy," Southwestern Journal of Theology 2(January 1918): 11-18.

Martin, Joseph Martin. "Baptist Illiteracy in the South." Plain Talk (October 1927): 440-441.

Mathews, Shailer. "Ten Years of American Protestantism." North American Review 217(May 1923): 577-593.

Methodist Quarterly Review 70(January 1921): 170.

Mims, Edwin. "Why the South is Anti-Evolution." World's Work 50(September 1925): 548-552.

"Monkey Trial, 1968." Newsweek 72(25 November 1968): 36-37.

Murphy, Sara. "Men Out of Monkeys or Monkeys Out of Men?" The New Republic 154(7 May 1966): 970.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. "Literalism, Individualism and Billy Graham." Christian Century 73(23 May 1956): 640-642.

"No Evolution for Texas." The Literary Digest. 90(14 August 1926): 30-31.

"The Prosecution Rests its Case." The Churchman 129(12 January 1924): 8.

Shipley, Maynard. "The Forward March of the Anti-Evolution Movement." Current History 29(January 1929): 578-582.

_____. "Growth of the Anti-Evolution Movement." Current History 32(May 1930): 330-332.

Slaten, A. Wakefield. "Academic Freedom and the Dotted Line." Education Review 65(February 1923): 74-77.

Sipes, L. M. "Regeneration--Man's Fundamental Need." Southwestern Journal of Theology." 4(April 1920): 38-44.

"Teaching of Evolution in the Baptist Institutions of Texas." Science 55(12 May 1922): 515.

"The Teaching of Evolution in the South." Science, 59 (20 February 1926): 234-235.

"The Teaching of the Theory of Evolution in the Schools of Texas." School and Society. 22(14 November 1925): 612-613.

Thompson, J. Arthur. "General Aspects of Recent Advances in the Study of Organic Evolution." Methodist Review Quarterly 60(April 1921): 202-211.

Walhout, Edwin. "The Liberal-Fundamentalist Debate." Christianity Today 7(1 March 1963): 1-5.

Secondary Sources

Books

Allen, Frederick Louis. Only Yesterday, An Informal History of the Nineteen Twenties. New York: Harper, 1931.

Bailey, Kenneth. Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Baker, Robert. The Blossoming Desert: A Consise History of Texas Baptists. Waco: Word Books, 1970.

Barnes, William Wright. The Southern Baptist Convention, 1845-1953. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1954.

Beale, Howard K. Are American Teachers Free? An Analysis of the Restraints Upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Burtt, Edwin A. Types of Religious Philosophy. Rev. ed. New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1951.

Carter, Paul A. The Twenties in America. The Crowell American History Series. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968.

Cole, Stewart Grant. The History of Fundamentalism. New York: Richard Smith, Inc., 1931.

Dabney, Virginius. Liberalism in the South. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1932.

Dana, Harvey Eugene. Lon Rutland Scarborough: A Life of Service. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1942.

Dawson, Joseph Martin. Brooks Takes the Long Look. Waco: Baylor University Press, 1931.

_____. A Century with Texas Baptists. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1947.

DeGroat, A. T. New Possibilities for Disciples and Independents. St. Louis: Dethany Press, 1963.

Dumond, Dwight Lowell. America in Our Time. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937.

Furniss, Norman F. The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

Gasper, Louis. The Fundamentalist Movement. Paris: Mouton and Company, 1963.

Gates, Errett. The Story of the Churches: The Disciples of Christ. New York: Baker and Taylor Company, 1905.

Gatewood, Willard B., ed. Controversy in the Twenties: Fundamentalist, Modernism, and Evolution. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969.

_____. Preachers, Pedagogues, and Politicians: The Evolution Controversy in North Carolina, 1920-1927. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966.

Gellerman, William. Martin Dies. New York: The John Day Company, 1944.

Ginger, Ray. Six Days or Forever? Tenessee v. John Thomas Scopes. 2nd. ptg, paperback ed. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969.

Gould, Lewis L. Progressives and Prohibitionists: Texas Democrats in the Wilson Era. Austin: Univeristy of Texas Press, 1973.

Hall, Colby D. Texas Disciples. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1953.

Held, John. Religion, A Factor in Building Texas. San Antonio: Naylor Company, 1940.

Henry, Carol. Fifty Years of Protestant Theology. Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1950.

Herbert, Gabriel. Fundamentalism and the Church. Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1957.

Hicks, John Donald. Republican Ascendency, 1921-1933. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964.

James, Powhattan. George W. Truett: A Biography. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1945.

Jorstad, Erling. The Politics of Doonsday: Fundamentalists of the Far Right. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.

Kenedy, Gail, ed. Evolution and Religion, The Conflict between Science and Theology in Modern America. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1957.

Leuchtenburg, William Edward. The Perils of Prosperity, 1914-32. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Levine, Lawrence W. Defender of the Faith, William Jennings Bryan: The Last Decade, 1915-1925. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

McBeth, Leon. The First Baptist Church of Dallas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1968.

McPherson, Chalmers. Disciples of Christ in Texas. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1920.

Miller, Robert Moats. American Protestantism and Social Issue. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958.

Murphy, DuBose. A Short History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Texas. Dallas: Turner Company, 1935.

Nail, Olin W., ed. History of Texas Methodism, 1900-1960. Austin: Capitol, 1961.

Overstreet, H. A. and Bonaro. The Strange Tactics of Extremism. New York: Norton, 1964.

Packer, James Innell. Fundamentalism and the Word of God, Some Evangelical Principles. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966.

Paschal, George, Jr. and Jusith Benner. One Hundred Years of Challenge and Change: A History of the Synod of Texas of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1968.

Phelam, Macum. A History of the Expansion of Methodism in Texas, 1867-1902. Dallas: Mathis, Van Nort and Company, 1937.

Redekop, John Harold. The American Far Right: A Case Study of Billy James Hargis and the Christian Crusade. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968.

Roy, Ralph Lord. Apostles of Discord. Boston: Beacon Press, 1953.

_____. Communism and the Churches. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1960.

Rudnick, Milton L. Fundamentalism and the Missouri Synod. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing Company, 1966.

Sandeen, Ernest Robert. The Origins of Fundamentalism. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

_____. The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Shannon, David A. Between the Wars: America, 1919-1941. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Stedman, Murray S. Religion and Politics in America. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1964.

Stevick, Daniel B. Beyond Fundamentalism. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964.

Sweet, William Warren. Methodism in American History. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1933.

_____. The Story of Religion in America. Rev. and enl. ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1950.

Tatum, E. Ray. Conquest or Failure? Biography of J. Frank Norris. Dallas: Baptist Historical Foundation, 1966.

Tindall, George B. The Emergence of the New South, 1913-1945. Vol. X of A History of the South, edited by Wendell Holmes Stephenson and E. Merton Coulter (10 volumes). Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press and the Littlefield Fund for Southern History of the University of Texas, 1967.

Vernon, Walter N. Methodism Moves Across North Texas. Dallas: Historical Society, North Texas Conference, Methodist Church, 1958.

Walker, Brooks R. The Christian Fright Peddlars. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1964.

White, Edward. Science and Religion in American Thought, The Impact of Naturalism. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952.

Wood, Presnall and Floyd W. Thatcher. Prophets with Pens. Dallas: Baptist Standard Publishing Company, 1969.

Articles

Bailey, Kenneth K. "The Enactment of the Tennessee Anti-evolution Law." Journal of Southern History 14 (November 1950): 472-490.

Grabiner, Judith V. and Peter D. Miller. "Effects of the Scopes Trial: Was it a Victory for the Evolutionists?" Science 185(6 September 1974): 833.

Hudson, Charles. "The Structure of a Fundamentalist Christian Belief System." In Religion and the Solid South. Ed. Samuel, S. Hill, Jr., et at. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

Marsden, George. "Defining Fundamentalism." Christian Scholar's Review 1(Winter 1971): 141-151.

Moore, James R. "Evolutionary Theory and Christian Faith: A Bibliographical Guide to the Past Darwinian Controversies." Christian Scholar's Review 4(1975): 211-218.

Neibuhr, Richard. "Fundamentalism." Encyclopedia of Social Science. Ed. Edwin Robert Anderson Seligman and Alvin Johnson. New York: Macmillan Company, 1937.

Russell, C. Allyn. "J. Frank Norris: Violent Fundamentalist." Southwestern Historical Quarterly 75(January 1972): 271-302.

Sandeen, Ernest. "Toward a Historical Interpretation of the Origins of Fundamentalism." Church History 35(March 1967): 66-83.

Unpublished Works

Bonner, Elizabeth Mary. "A Study of the Church of Christ in Texas." Master's thesis, University of Texas, 1941.

Boren, Carter E. "Early History of the Disciples of Christ in Texas." Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1937.

Bouldin, Donald Glenn. "The J. M. Dawson--J. Frank Norris Controversy: A Reflection of the Fundamentalist Controversy Among Texas Baptists." Master's thesis, Baylor University, 1969.

Bryant, Thurman Earl. "The Ethics of George Washington Truett." Th.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1959.

Connolly, William. "The Presching of J. Frank Norris," Master's thesis, University of Nebraska, 1961.

Dunn, James. "The Ethical Thought of Joseph Martin Dawson." Th.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966.

Ferris, John Thomas. "The Religious Right: A Study in American Religious Fundamentalism." Master's thesis, North Texas State University, 1963.

Haynes, Julietta. "A History of the Primitive Baptists." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas. 1959.

Johnson, Charles Price. "Southern Baptists and the Social Gospel Movement," Th.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1948.

Kendrick, Dalude. "The History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1959.

Measures, Royce Lee. "The Relationship of J. Frank Norris to the Northern Fundamentalist Movement." Th.M. thesis, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1970.

Morris, Gwin, "He Changed Things: A Biography of J. Frank Norris." Ph.D. dissertation, Texas Technological University, 1972.

Renfer, Rudolf. "A History of Dallas Theological Seminary." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1959.

Ritchie, Homer G., "The Life and Career of J. Frank Norris." Master's thesis, Texas Christian University, 1967.

Shamburger, William M. "A History of Tarrant County Baptist Association." Th.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1953.

Terre-Blance, Henry S. "J. Frank Norris: The Man and his Ministry." Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1965.

Thompson, James Joseph. "Southern Baptist Religious Thought; 1919-1931." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1971.