

Consensus

Volume 13

Issue 1 *Perspectives on Evangelism/Fundamentalism/
Neo-Conservatism*

Article 3

5-1-1987

Fundamentalism and Canadian Lutheranism

Walter Freitag

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus>

Recommended Citation

Freitag, Walter (1987) "Fundamentalism and Canadian Lutheranism," *Consensus*: Vol. 13 : Iss. 1 , Article 3.
Available at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol13/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consensus by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

Fundamentalism and Canadian Lutheranism

Walter Freitag

Professor of the Church in Historic Witness and Biblical Interpretation, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Saskatoon

The phenomenal growth of the so-called evangelical churches across the length and breadth of our country is a matter of perplexity if not also of envy for many pastors and lay people. Evangelical ministerial associations rival those of the established churches in city after city; most of the TV evangelists who dominate the airwaves every Sunday morning are of this stamp; Billy Graham crusades in our country and across the world have given fundamentalism, now called evangelicalism,¹ international recognition. Baptist, Alliance and Pentecostal churches,² many of which have become large congregations, have sprung up in all parts of the nation. These and churches like them are attracting people to their fellowship, and, what is more, many of our lay people while they are still loyal to the Lutheran church are drawn to the evangelicalism of those churches. That being the case, it will not do to ignore this phenomenon in the hope that it will go away. The fact is that we have paid far too little attention to it. In general, we know less than we should about it or what it represents; whether or not it has influenced Lutheranism in our country, and to what degree, we know even less. In this article, the primary emphasis will be upon the earlier fundamentalist, rather than the more recent evangelicalist phase, without however separating the two too vigorously.

Fundamentalism

The fundamentalist movement was a movement of protest.³ Briefly, it was militantly anti-modernist Protestant evangelicalism. A significant number of pastors and layfolk in various Reformed church bodies in the northeastern United States rose

up in the early decades of this century to defend the faith in particular against the liberal theology which had made deep inroads into the life of their churches.⁴ They joined hands across denominational lines to form a theological common front against liberalism by calling for a return to orthodoxy while, at the same time, conducting a political struggle within each of their denominations for control of the positions of leadership, whether of ecclesial office, church boards or educational institutions.⁵

It was also, in the words of Sydney E. Ahlstrom, a reaction to the profound social transformation which put the traditional content of preaching and teaching under severe stress. To these problems were added the intellectual difficulties provoked by scientific discoveries, religious scholarship and pervasive shifts in moral and religious attitudes. First, there was a set of specific problems that had to be faced separately: Darwin unquestionably became the nineteenth century's Newton, and his theory of evolution through natural selection became the century's cardinal idea. But the struggle over the new geology was a vital element in which new conceptions of time and space were absorbed. Historical research meanwhile posed very detailed questions about the Bible, the history of doctrine and other world religions. Accompanying these specific problems was a second and more general challenge: the use of positivistic naturalism, the cumulative result of modern methods for acquiring knowledge. In every discipline from physics to biblical criticism, myth and error were being dispelled, and the result of this activity was a worldview which raised problems of the most fundamental sort.⁶

In this respect, the fundamentalists felt that liberal theologians were much too willing to change doctrine to suit the mood and spirit of the age, much too ready to accommodate the new secular world of learning. They wanted nothing to do with that sort of theology which, in the succinct words of H. Richard Niebuhr, presented a "God without wrath [who] brought men without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of Christ without a cross".⁷ To have the Christian faith reduced to an optimistic, humanistic belief in progress, and to have the truth and authority of the Bible discredited and profaned, that by all odds was far too much. It was simply not enough to believe in "the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man and the infinite value of the individual soul"⁸—often taken as a motto of liberalism—nor enough to declare *that one*

believed. One also had to know *what* was to be believed. The return to the fundamentals, the basic doctrines of the faith, was utterly essential.

But since the doctrines themselves were under attack, it was deemed to be necessary to show why they were true, how it was that they were authoritative for the faith. The fundamentalists hit upon the strategy of using the verbal theory of inspiration and the corollary notion of inerrancy to defend the Bible.⁹ God was the author of the Bible, and since God cannot err, the Bible had to be inerrant. In so doing, they also set the Bible over against the new secular ways of thinking, not just in the manner that those were being exhibited in the emerging sciences, but also in the fashion in which such ways were being displayed in the historical disciplines not to mention the various higher critical methods which were being applied to the Bible.¹⁰ In effect, the Bible was to be interpreted according to its own self-authenticating principles, which in turn also determined how the Bible, human beings and the world were to be understood. The Bible was unique, unlike any other book, no matter how sublime; profane hands were neither to trifle with it nor to challenge its authority. Neither impious presupposition nor godless methodology was to rule over the Bible, nor should they even in the humanities and the sciences.

The name "fundamentalist" to describe anyone ready to do battle royal for the fundamentals of the faith, to insist upon that irreducible minimum of belief without which one could not be Christian, appears to have been used first by Dr. C.C. Laws in his July, 1920, editorial in the Baptist *Watchman-Examiner*.¹¹ While such eminent personalities as John Gresham Machen¹² were unhappy with the designation, it stuck. That may have been due to the fact that, about a decade earlier, two laymen in the United States had provided the funding for a major publishing venture. Twelve booklets called *The Fundamentals* were sent, free of charge, "to every pastor, evangelist, missionary, theological professor, theological student, Sunday-School superintendent, YMCA and YWCA secretary, in the English-speaking world, so far as the addresses could be obtained".¹³ Issued between 1909 and 1915, the total number distributed may have been as high as three million.

Had each contributor to this series published his article separately, the impact would probably have been negligible. Three

additional factors, however, made it significant: 1) the contributors by and large were well-known scholars; 2) the scope was international with scholars from the British Isles, Canada and the United States represented; and 3) the articles came from an ecumenical consortium drawn from Reformed churches. The general impression of this series was that it was of solid intellectual work, moderate in tone, convictionally supported and covered a broad range. "The conservative case was firmly and honorably made."¹⁴

The first volume set a high standard. It contained seven papers, with the following titles: 1) "Virgin Birth of Christ" (J. Orr); 2) "The Deity of Christ" (B.B. Warfield); 3. "The Purpose of the Incarnation" (G.C. Morgan); 4) "The Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit" (R.A. Torrey); 5) "The Proof of the Living God" (A.T. Pierson); 6 "The History of the Higher Criticism" (D. Hague) and 7) "A Personal Testimony" (H. Kelly). In general, *The Fundamentals* dealt with essays on fundamental doctrines and on apologetics attacking current biblical criticism and the emerging scientific theories. Articles on modern heresies, evangelism and world missions as well as personal testimonies rounded out the list.

These documents taken together with the works of people like C.W. Hodge, J.G. Machen and B.B. Warfield—to mention just three—if they did not originate the fundamentalist movement certainly gave it substance and credibility. Fundamentalism was not an anti-intellectual movement nor was it obscurantist.¹⁵ In its insistence upon the authority of the Bible and upon belief in such articles as the virgin birth, substitutionary atonement and the bodily resurrection of Christ, it was defending the historic faith of the Christian church.

The struggle to defeat liberalism in these churches whose origins derived from the Reformed wing of the Reformation, despite the untiring efforts of many concerned personalities, did not succeed. By 1929, the fundamentalists found themselves looking for a home.¹⁶ At least one created a new denomination; most allied themselves with smaller groups.¹⁷ But if the controversy died, the movement itself did not. Joel A. Carpenter has shown that fundamentalism consolidated its forces during the Depression. Bible schools, both existing and newly created, were enlisted to strengthen the movement.

Summer Bible conferences, radio broadcasting and foreign mission activity created interest and enthusiasm to promote the cause. By 1952 Russell Hitt was to claim that Chicago had become the evangelical capital of the United States, listing over one hundred agencies—missions boards, denominational offices, colleges, Bible institutes, seminaries, publishing concerns and youth organizations. Among schools, he mentioned Moody Bible Institute, North Park College, Trinity Seminary and Bible College, the Mennonite Bible Seminary, the Salvation Army Training College and Emmaus Bible College.¹⁸

Fundamentalism was not monolithic. It was a mosaic made up of clusters of denominations and institutions of differing ethnic and doctrinal backgrounds. It consisted of conservative, millenarian evangelicals, holiness movements, peace churches, southern-based conservatives and black evangelicals. Carpenter also includes the immigrant confessional churches such as the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and the Christian Reformed Church in the list. Ahlstrom refers to radical adventists, dispensational millennialists, Presbyterians, holiness revivalists, Pentecostals and the Churches of Christ denomination.¹⁹ In effect fundamentalism had become a very complex ecumenical tradition. In 1941 Carl McIntire had founded the American Council of Churches, but many fundamentalists wanted a more constructive association. As a result, they established the National Association of Evangelicals in 1942. By 1956, when Carl Henry, formerly a professor of New Testament at Northern Baptist and Fuller seminaries, set up *Christianity Today*, a magazine which was to have a great future, the National Association of Evangelicals claimed support from communities numbering 1.5 million persons in total, with service connections to ten million more.

A disposition to disassociate the movement from the term "fundamentalism" had also arisen. The Scopes trial in Tennessee during the thirties had discredited it beyond repair.²⁰ Carl Henry's lectures on "Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology", given at two schools in May and June, 1956, printed in abridged form in *Christianity Today* beginning with the June 10, 1957²¹ issue, clearly show the shift which was occurring in the movement. A new generation, no longer satisfied with the old fundamentalism, whose shortcomings are meticulously recorded, was taking over. Evangelicalism—less

divisive, more cooperative, faithful to the substance of the faith, adhering to plenary inspiration, more open to social issues—had arrived on the scene. With that came something of a change in attitude, one more ready to study the works of experts whether in biblical criticism, theology or science without surrendering to the presuppositions in them; it was critical of ecumenical agencies such as the World Council of Churches, not in principle but on clearly stated grounds, while supporting ecumenical cooperation within its own orbit.

The new generation propelled evangelicalism onto the international scene. Through the adroit use of television and/or state of the art techniques in evangelism, with solid financial operations and management skills, evangelicals have become the “third force” in American Christendom.

Canadian Lutheranism and Fundamentalism

It is important first of all to determine whether or not there are legislative documents in our history as Lutheran jurisdictions in Canada that have been influenced by fundamentalism. Such eminent historians as Sydney E. Ahlstrom²² and E. Clifford Nelson,²³ while they assert that Lutheranism emerged largely unscathed from the fundamentalist controversy, concede that fundamentalism did influence the “Minneapolis Theses”, accepted by the former Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada until 1985. To this, one may add the “United Testimony of Faith and Life”. If Carpenter is right in listing the immigrant confessional churches such as the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod under the fundamentalist label, then the “Brief Statement” adopted by that church in 1932, re-affirmed in 1951 and again in the early 1970s, qualifies as such a document.

W.E. Mann tells us that Lutherans in Alberta were attracted to fundamentalism; this observation ought to be extended at least to the Prairies and Ontario. Research has not yet determined to what degree fundamentalist notions influenced our Bible institutes.²⁴ One indication would be the use of tracts by fundamentalists and Lutheran groups, another the extensive employment of radio for religious programming.²⁵ To what extent there was influence from such schools as that at Three Hills, Alberta, and similar institutions in south Saskatchewan has yet to be established. The impact of the

Aberhart-Manning phenomenon upon Lutheran circles has not been assessed but it is to be noted that Manning not only was heard by thousands through his radio program year after year, he also contributed an article to the journal *Christianity Today* which was read by Lutheran pastors.²⁶ It is probable that the gospel hymn tradition in many of our churches stems in part from fundamentalist sources.

In this connection, mention should be made of the program Walter Maier made famous, *The Lutheran Hour*, a program originating in 1930, which in due course was carried in Canada, reaching a wide audience. Rudnick addresses the question whether Maier was a fundamentalist, and concluded that he deliberately shaped his message in order to win fundamentalists who needed, or might need, a new spiritual home. Rudnick goes on to say some Missouri Synod pastors may have been misled by this fact thus tending to become fundamentalist. In sum, while there was a friendly disposition toward fundamentalism, there was no cooperation. Carl Henry was to lament the fact that Lutherans were not willing to support the fundamentalist cause.²⁷

Deeper than influences of this sort upon our churches and institutions is the fact that many of our Lutherans shared with the fundamentalists the concern to defend the Bible. Nor was this an accident. The pastors who founded our churches in this country and the generations of pastors since have held virtually identical positions to those of the fundamentalists on the Bible and on inspiration, even on such doctrines as virgin birth, millenarianism, predestination, substitutionary atonement and physical resurrection. In the United States one Lutheran group with strong leanings to the Missouri Synod became so embittered in controversy with that Synod over such issues that they organized themselves as the Anti-Missourian Norwegian Lutherans. In addition, nearly all of our pastors were educated in reprobation theology as presented by such teachers as Walther, Pieper, Reu and Rohnert,²⁸ which theology, in turn, reproduced the theology of honored savants from the age of orthodoxy such as Hollaz, Chytraeus, Quenstedt, Hutterus and Gerhard.²⁹ They also studied not only people like Walther and Pieper, but John R. Lavik's *The Bible is the Word of God: A Basic Issue Briefly Reviewed*.³⁰ *The Fundamentals* were read, and items from them used for sermon illustration by

some Missouri Synod pastors, and one may infer that that was also true of pastors in other Lutheran church bodies. Rudnick is also able to show that people like P.E. Kretzmann and W.F. Arndt of the Missouri Synod, among others, were acquainted with, but not dependent upon, such fundamentalist authors as J.M. Gray, R.A. Torrey, J.G. Machen and M.G. Kyle. To this list one must add other fundamentalist authors such as B.B. Warfield.

In effect, repristination theology is the Lutheran version of fundamentalism. Both are positions of protest; both wish to defend orthodoxy; both are militant. Both want to defend the Bible from attack on the grounds that God is its author and that it is unique. Both are scholastic and determined to define what is to be believed. If fundamentalists appeal to "correct belief" as the benchmark of faith, repristinationists demand adherence to "pure doctrine". Both are apologetic and polemical reactions to unacceptable theology. Neither is new, for both are reproductions of older doctrinal positions.³¹ The preference of both groups to be known as conservative not only has to do with a theological self-designation but also with a particular predisposition to culture. Both focus upon the individual and find social ethics, especially activist or advocacy ethics, very disturbing. When church bodies try to deal with such issues as abortion, feminism, homosexuality, divorce, the ordination of women or liberation theology, these groups are extremely uncomfortable with anything but traditional responses.³²

Another parallel between Lutheran groups in Canada and fundamentalism is also seen in the area of piety. The language of conversion is common currency between them. The use of personal testimony is a long established practice. Evangelistic fervor marks the pietist tradition; it has had its awakenings; it has also had its evangelistic preachers and movements both within and outside of the Lutheran church. In foreign missions, which owes so much to pietism, the number of Lutheran missionaries, both clergy and lay, both under Lutheran auspices and independent of such, is significant. The use of the free service as opposed to that controlled by a liturgical agenda displays another parallel. A congregationalist perspective of the church which is not willing to concede much to the corporate church also characterizes much of Canadian Lutheranism and fundamentalism. The inculcation of very specific moral standards of personal behavior is meant to apply to church and

society.³³ It is interesting, too, that two books of O. Hallesby, an influential Norwegian pietist were considered acceptable for publication in the fundamentalist Inter-Varsity Fellowship series.

It is more difficult to evaluate the relation of these groups to the secular world of the twentieth century. On the one hand, the evangelicals, including those of the Lutheran variety, are quite prepared to use the most advanced technology and business expertise to promote their own imperatives. On the other hand, it looks as if they wish to preserve, or better, to revitalize the golden age of a Christian past in a world which has already passed them by. The conflict with the secular world, with all of its scientific achievements, is not just a battle with a godless culture, it is also withdrawal from contact with a de-Christianized society. In effect two cultures, the one Christian and the other not, stand over against one another as two great solitudes, each less and less able to communicate with the other.

In the 1920s, the fundamentalists lost a battle and withdrew to lick their wounds, only, in more recent decades, to win various skirmishes. In the United States they have become a political force, a phenomenon which may come about in our country in the not too distant future.

Appraisal

Not too long ago, fundamentalism was considered a dead letter among pastors and theologians of the established churches. For many, it still is. For many others, it represents a poison pen letter spreading false news as if it were true. But for still as many others, it is a registered letter bringing the assurance of a faith for which the Bible is the absolute guarantee. For a lot of ordinary folk, fundamentalism provides certain answers in a very uncertain world. It proclaims absolute truths in a world bothered and besieged by relativities.

Nevertheless, as powerful as this tradition may be, it is not the only one in the field. Nor is it the only one that claims to be orthodox. There is another equally powerful stream in Canadian Lutheranism which would insist that it is essential to distinguish between Lutheran evangelicalism and evangelical Lutheranism. This is not just a matter of word order. Nor is

it a simple question of semantics. It has to do with a profound difference in the way theology is done and how it is to be applied. If the former begins with "The Bible says", the latter begins with "Christ says".³⁴

Lutheran evangelicalism is vulnerable. If the Bible is to be interpreted in such a way that any verse or text in it can be elevated to the level of doctrine which must be believed, then in principle it is possible to extend such statements almost at will to apply to any issue, religious or secular. It is just as obvious however that that tactic can be turned against those who use it.³⁵ But Lutheranism in general has not been persuaded that extra-confessional statements have become necessary or imperative since the Reformation.³⁶ It is convinced that it is more than sufficient to let the gospel of Jesus Christ be the hermeneutic of the Bible.

A German critic of ultra-conservative Lutherans accuses them of being "confessionally self-satisfied".³⁷ That is to say, such Lutheran evangelicals seem to find it utterly necessary to satisfy an unquenchable thirst for certitude in the faith, an irradicable need to anchor belief in an absolute authority, the infallibility and inerrancy of the Bible. The question is, what is it in the psychological makeup of such persons that accounts for such a need? It may be that the fear of having to surrender any item in their system of belief, whether from the quarter of secular science or of biblical criticism or of historical methodology, carries with it the inevitable collapse of everything in which they believe. Perhaps it may be the dread of a loss of convictional or confessional identity in such a case. Or is the explanation simpler, that evangelicals represent a position so strongly apologetic that belief itself has been shaped by the conviction that it must be defended above all. In the latter case, it would not be enough to have a personal belief in Christ as Savior; that would have to be buttressed by belief in an absolutely authoritative Bible.

In the light of what has been said, it is not at all surprising that evangelicals are biased against the ecumenical movement as represented in such agencies as the World Council of Churches. Professor Harold Floreen once remarked about extreme conservatives and pietists that "it really was a pity that they had deprived themselves of the right to speak to anyone but those of their own persuasion". This comment applies

with equal force to the evangelicals. While they are prepared to make common cause on matters of protest, and to cooperate with others in a variety of ways, as the National Association of Evangelicals demonstrates, they are not ready to commit themselves to more than that in the ecumenical arena. In that respect, they are separatists who oppose any entanglement in such consortia.

Conclusion

Fundamentalism has influenced Lutheranism in our country and it is a factor whose weight must be taken into account. More research and historical study of it are needed. But it is not the same thing as Lutheranism. One might perhaps more appropriately see Reformed fundamentalism as a tradition running parallel to what I have called Lutheran evangelicalism. At a variety of points, they share the same or similar concerns; at others, each goes its own way. Of those that they share, the issues of the doctrine of the Bible and of inspiration are pre-eminent; separation, unionism in Lutheran circles, is another.

That Lutheran evangelicalism has deep roots in Canadian soil is patent. It has held an honored position both among pastors and laity for decades. It represents a movement of protest against liberalism as well as rationalism and enthusiasm. It has strengths but it also has its points of vulnerability, not the least of which is the danger that it might well invite the very liberal reaction it wishes to avoid if it moves even further to the right on the theological spectrum than it already is.

Having said that, it must be recognized that only part of the story has been told. At least two additional articles are needed. One which would try to determine whether, and to what extent, Lutheranism is and has been an influence upon Reformed evangelicalism;³⁸ that would have the effect of distinguishing Lutheranism from it. Another would look at both Lutheranism and evangelicalism in the context of pluralism and ecumenism.³⁹ That would serve to clarify what has been called "the crisis of confessionalism".

The fundamentalists learned that polemics directed against each other, and to a degree even against opponents, were self-defeating. They also engaged in self-criticism and re-organized themselves as evangelicals in order to become a more constructive force. If fundamentalists were able to do that, the question

is whether Lutherans, who currently have other priorities on their agenda, will be willing to continue the inter-Lutheran dialogue, and even intra-Lutheran discussion, in that same sort of spirit. Among Lutherans the years of debate over church union have consumed a lot of energy, time and expense; they have taken their toll. But the struggle to come to a meeting of mind and heart even if interrupted at present should not be permanently discontinued. Lutheran unity in the interest of a Lutheran contribution to, and mission in, our country remains important.

Notes

- ¹ For books on fundamentalism, see: James Barr, *Fundamentalism* (London: SCM Press, 1977. 2nd ed., 1981); Stewart G. Cole, *The History of Fundamentalism* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1931); Mark A. Noll, Nathan O. Hatch, George M. Marsden, David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, eds., *Eerdmans' Handbook to Christianity in America* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983); Norman F. Furniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954); Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, repr. 1981); Gabriel Hebert, *Fundamentalism and the Church of God* (London: SCM Press, 1957); W. Hordern, *A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology* (New York: Macmillan, rev. ed. 1968); C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958); J.H. Krominga, *The Christian Reformed Church, A Study in Orthodoxy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949); George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980); J.I. Packer, *"Fundamentalism" and the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rev. ed. 1974); Milton L. Rudnick, *Fundamentalism and the Missouri Synod* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966); Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); J.R. Sclater, *Modernist Fundamentalism* (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1926). Articles will be cited throughout notes.
- ² Not all groups which have been labelled fundamentalists are happy with the designation.
- ³ Sandeen's definition of fundamentalism, namely, that it "was comprised of an alliance between two newly formulated nineteenth century theologies, dispensationalism and the Princeton theology which, though not wholly compatible, managed to maintain a united front against modernism until 1918", cited in his article, "Towards a Historical Interpretation of the Origins of Fundamentalism". *Church History*, 36/1, March

1967, 67, has not found universal acceptance. See also his article, "The Princeton Theology: One Source of Biblical Literalism in American Protestantism", *Church History*, 31/3, September 1962, 307-321. The feeling was that this definition was too narrowly a Calvinist-Princeton theology. LeRoy Moore, Jr., in his article, "Another Look at Fundamentalism: A Response to Ernest R. Sandeen", *Church History*, 37/2, June 1968, 202, suggests that one should distinguish between doctrinaire fundamentalism and fundamentalism as a movement. Joel A. Carpenter, with good reason, calls for a "reassessment of the nature and influence of fundamentalism" in "Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism, 1929-1942", *Church History*, 49/1, March 1980, 74. It is nevertheless clear that fundamentalism was a movement of protest; it was an interdenominational common front against liberalism and modernism; verbal, later plenary, inspiration was supported by most of its churches and their leaders; there was a common perception about the importance of certain doctrines, if not of all of them. In his book, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, Part Four, 199-228, Marsden reviews the various approaches to fundamentalism by historians in exemplary fashion. It should be noted that English and American fundamentalism have not undergone the same history and thus are not carbon copies of each other. See Marsden's article: "Fundamentalism as an American Phenomenon: A Comparison with English Evangelicalism", *Church History*, 46/2, June 1977, 215-32.

- ⁴ Hordern in his *Layman's Guide* defines fundamentalism in these terms; see also Sandeen's more recent full length book treatment of the theological constructs of fundamentalism, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*.
- ⁵ Cole, *The History of Fundamentalism*, provides detailed information about this with respect to the Northern Baptist, Presbyterian, Disciples', Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal denominations.
- ⁶ Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972, 4th printing. 1974) 763-64.
- ⁷ *The Kingdom of God in America* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1937) 193.
- ⁸ Hordern, *A Layman's Guide*, 49. Behind the motto is the famous book of Adolf von Harnack, *What is Christianity?* (1900).
- ⁹ An excellent discussion of this is found in Carl Henry, "Dare We Renew the Controversy? II. The Fundamentalist Reduction", *Christianity Today*, 1/20, June 24, 1957, 24-26. He points out that the older apologists of the fundamentalist movement did not reflect fundamentalism's "later uniformity and rigidity in formulating inspiration [which] resulted from reliance on cliches more than a readiness to define its fuller doctrinal implications.... But whether the self-authenticating character of an inspired and authoritative Scripture is derivable from objective considerations alone, or whether this self-authenticating character also involves the witness of Christ by the Spirit, was the issue in debate. The older

apologetic was less hesitant to begin with Christ—not because it sought to detach Christology from bibliology, but because it sensed the danger that biblicism might seem to ascribe superiority to some principle other than the Christological.”

- 10 *Ibid.*; see also the recent article by D.N. Livingstone, “B.B. Warfield, The Theology of Evolution and Early Fundamentalism”, *Evangelical Quarterly*, 57/1, January 1968, 69–83, which shows that Warfield and early fundamentalists were not as opposed to scientific hypotheses of biological evolution as has been thought.
- 11 Moore, “Another Look”, 196.
- 12 Hordern, *A Layman’s Guide*, 53.
- 13 Hebert. *Fundamentalism*, 17. Hebert provides a good description of the content of *The Fundamentals* on pp. 17–22; see too the brief overview in Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement*, 12–13.
- 14 Ahlstrom, *A Religious History*, 816.
- 15 Packer in “Fundamentalism”, 9–14, and in Appendix 1 of the same work vigorously opposes those who level such charges at fundamentalism, from A. Richardson’s description of fundamentalism as a theory supporting equal dictation to W. Ramsay’s definition of it as heretical. It is not a movement which requires hara-kiri intellectually of its adherents nor a position which calls for a closed mind, closed to further enlightenment or knowledge. See also Hordern, *A Layman’s Guide*, 65–70. For a contrary argument, see Barr, *Fundamentalism*.
- 16 Hordern, *A Layman’s Guide*, 53.
- 17 Machen withdrew from Princeton to form, with others, Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia; in the mid-thirties, he withdrew from his denomination to establish the Presbyterian Church of America. In E.R. Sandeen, “Fundamentalist and Evangelical Churches”, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed., we are also told that the Northern Baptist Convention people who left it formed the General Association of Regular Baptists.
- 18 Carpenter, “Fundamentalist Institutions”. 62–75: Gasper provides a massive amount of information for the period 1930–1956 on the history of the American Council of Churches and the NAE.
- 19 Ahlstrom, *A Religious History*, 807–823.
- 20 Hordern, *A Layman’s Guide*, 68; Ahlstrom, *A Religious History*, 909.
- 21 The magazine presents these adumbrated lectures under the title: “Dare We Renew the Fundamentalist Controversy?”. The sub-titles for each of the subsequent articles are successively: 1) “The Fundamentalist Reduction”; 2) “The Contemporary Restoration”; and 3) “The Evangelical Responsibility”. They appeared in *Christianity Today*, 1/18, June 10, 1957, 3ff.; 1/19, June 24, 1957, 23ff.; 1/20, July 9, 1957, 15ff.; 1/21, July 22, 1957, 23f. See also G. Bromiley, “Fundamentalism-Modernism, A First Step in the Controversy”, *Christianity Today*, 2/3, November 11, 1957, 3ff.
- 22 Ahlstrom, *A Religious History*, 813, 910.

- 23 E. Clifford Nelson, *Lutheranism in North America, 1914- 1970* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 27: "In this way, the situation came to an uneasy rest in 1920. The National Lutheran Council had been established, two theological and ecclesiastical points of view had emerged within the council, and cooperation was theoretically limited to 'external affairs.' Meanwhile, the churches cooperated in overseas relief for European Lutheran churches. Out of this action there developed an interest for a world organization of Lutherans. This brought National Lutheran Council bodies into the Lutheran World Convention (1923). Despite overseas and domestic cooperation, however, the next few years witnessed a pulling away from the United Lutheran Church and a drawing together of the Joint Synod of Ohio, the Iowa Synod, and the Norwegian Lutheran Church. One of the contributing factors, in addition to those evident from the previous discussion, was the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy of the 20s, in which the Lutherans actually took no part. The Midwest Lutherans, however, felt the United Lutheran Church was equivocal on the question of the inerrancy of the Bible. 'The Washington Declaration' asserted 'the supreme importance of the Word of God' and 'the authority of the Scriptures... as the only rule and standard by which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.' Stub, Lenski (Joint Synod of Ohio) and others were especially insistent that a statement on the verbal inspiration and consequent inerrancy of Scripture, in the context of modernism, ought to be promulgated. In this setting, the non-Synodical Conference Lutherans of the Mississippi Valley, especially the Norwegians and the Germans, were moving closer together. By 1925 a new alignment within the National Lutheran Council was in process."
- 24 W.E. Mann, *Sect, Cult, and Church in Alberta* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1955) 73, with reference to fundamentalist Bible schools, writes: "The fact that, among the leading denominations, only the Lutherans had set up similar lay training institutions in Alberta by 1946 emphasizes the strategic importance of this practice."
- 25 Mann, *Sect*, 70-71, deals with the importance of the summer camps; on p. 77 he refers to Lutheran colleges, Bible institutes and radio work by Lutherans, in connection with the argument that centralization was not pronounced among Lutheran Synods in Alberta.
- 26 H.H. Walsh, *The Christian Church in Canada*. (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1956) 315-25. has instructive things to say about fundamentalism, especially about Aberhart and the Prairie Bible Institute at Three Hills. Supplementing Walsh's treatment is John Webster Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era: The First Century of Confederation* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1972) 123-25, 177-78. Robert T. Handy, *The History of the Churches in the United States and Canada* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), on Lutheranism, 131, 134, 252, 350-51, 356, and fundamentalism, 291-94 and 390.
- 27 Rudnick, *Fundamentalism*, 90-102; also 110.

- 28 Rohnert and Pieper were both used as systematic theology texts at the seminary in Saskatoon. Pieper explicitly espouses repristination theology; Walther did, too, without accepting the old Lutheran fathers at every point.
- 29 The Saskatoon seminary library has many works of the old Lutheran orthodox fathers which saw use in the days when faculty and students had to master Latin.
- 30 Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1959.
- 31 See W. Freitag, *Prospect and Promise of Lutheran Unity in Canada* (Calgary: Foothills, 1974) 28-43. Despite Sandeen's major work, there are hints in more recent articles which suggest that the roots of fundamentalism should be traced further back even to the Reformation itself, that is, to Luther, Calvin, Muentzer and others. Repristination theology is one root but not the only one behind fundamentalism.
- 32 On just one of these issues, see for example the articles by Oscar Sommerfeld, "Headship Impressed upon Nature", and J. Robert Jacobson, "Woman in the Ministry of the Contemporary Church", in *Consensus*, 4/1, January 1978, 3-13 and 15-26 respectively, as well as W. Freitag, *The Ordination of Women* (Saskatoon: Zip Printing, 1978).
- 33 Mann, *Sect*, 45-47; also W. Freitag, "Lutheran Tradition", in John Webster Grant, ed., *The Churches and the Canadian Experience* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1963), and Freitag *Prospect*, chaps. 4 and 5. Also Roger W. Nostbakken, "Celebrating the Mosaic, A Perspective on Lutheran Worship in Canada", *Consensus*, 8/4, October, 1982, 13f.
- 34 Freitag, *Prospect*, 85.
- 35 Freitag, *Ordination*, Epilog.
- 36 There are now exceptions in the modern period also in Germany. For example, the important Leuenberger Konkordie, see H. Grandt, *Kirchliches Lehren in oekumenischer Verpflichtung, Eine Studie zur Rezeption oekumenischer Dokumente erarbeitet vom Oekumenischen Studienausschuss der Vereinigten-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands (VELKD) und des Deutschen Nationalkomitees des Lutherischen Weltbundes (DNB/LWB)* (Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1986) 21-30.
- 37 A. Birmele and T. Ruster, "Brauchen Wir die Einheit der Kirche?" in *Arbeitsbuch Oekumene*. no. 1. Echter Verlag/Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986, 15f.
- 38 Harold O.J. Brown, "Evangelicalism in America", *Dialog*, 24/3, Summer 1985, points the way by identifying Lutheranism, Pietism (particularly in its Anglo-Saxon transmutation), Wesleyan Methodism and American Revivalism as four sources for evangelicalism; further points of entry in Mark A. Noll, "Children of the Reformation in a Brave New World: Why 'American Evangelicals' differ from 'Lutheran Evangelicals' ", *Dialog*. 24/3, Summer 1985, 176-80; Erling Jorstad, "Pressers On and Holders Fast: Evangelicalism and Popular Culture", *Dialog*, 24/3, Summer 1985, 181-87, and R. Nostbakken, "The Context and

Mission of Canadian Lutheranism", *Consensus*, 6/1, January 1980, 16-27.

- 39 On this topic, see Carl Braaten, "The Crisis of Confessionalism", *Dialog*, 1/1, Winter 1962, 38-48, esp. 39: "The splintering off of sections of American Lutheranism today seems to me to be caused by this striving for confessional good works, by a pharisaic competition for a doctrinal righteousness. Therefore, one group says to another: 'You do not take the confessions seriously... at least, not seriously enough. You do not accept them as seriously as we do.' And this group in turn is outflanked by another rightist group which knows still deeper ways of taking the confession seriously. This mentality produces the perfectionist heresy on the doctrinal level. It is ironic that a church can become absolutely legalistic about some documents which condemn every form of legalism." See also Wolfhart Pannenberg, "The Crisis of the Scripture-Principle in Protestant Theology", *Dialog*, 2/4, Fall 1963, 307-13; V. Eckstrom, "Pluralism and Lutheran Confessionalism", *Lutheran Quarterly*, 29/2, May 1977, 109-49; Eric W. Gritsch, "Lutheran Teaching Authority: Historical Dimensions and Ecumenical Implications", *Lutheran Quarterly*, 25/4, November 1973, 381-94, and E. Clifford Nelson, "Das Problem der lutherischen Einheit in Amerika", *Lutherische Rundschau, Zeitschrift des Lutherischen Weltbundes*, 6, 1956/7, 42-50.